

# 15

## Concealment and Burial of the Báb

Chapter Five of

*A Prophet in the Modern Age*

*Biography of Siyyid 'Alí Muhammad, the Báb*

by A.L.M. Nicolas

Translated and annotated by Peter Terry

Hence the Báb was much vexed in his prison, and he remained there for a relatively long time<sup>1</sup> because the document which we have just cited is dated 1264,<sup>2</sup> and the execution of the martyr did not take place until 27 Sha‘bán of the year 1266.<sup>3</sup>

However the execution was preceded by a change of prison – he was made to leave Mákú for Chihríq.<sup>4</sup> Mírzá Taqí Khán,<sup>5</sup> the Amír Nizám<sup>6</sup> who was then the prime minister, seeing that the Bábí revolution loomed larger and greater and appeared to be formidable, told himself that the best way to calm all these revolts would be to do away with the one whom he considered to be the leader behind these events, that is to say, the Báb himself. He referred the matter to the shah<sup>7</sup> who felt obliged to remark that all these troubles were due to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí, the former Sadr A‘zam<sup>8</sup> of his father,<sup>9</sup> who ordained the imprisonment of the Reformer at Mákú without having him come first to Tehran where he could have made him submit to an enquiry.<sup>10</sup>

Násiri‘d-Dín Sháh remarked, ‘Also the vulgar believed that in him there was a [divine] knowledge or some miracle. If he had been allowed to come to Tehran for a public discussion, it would quickly have been seen that there was nothing special about him.’ These judicious reflections attracted a response worthy of admiration. ‘The words of kings, are the kings of words,’ observed the prime minister in a convincing tone, ‘which does not detract’, he added, ‘from the fact that today there is no longer any other way than to kill him.’ I do not know whether the conversation continued a long time in this vein.<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshar<sup>12</sup> was sent to Tabriz to proceed with the execution. When Sulaymán Khán arrived at his destination, Hamzih Mírzá Hishmat al-Dawlih,<sup>13</sup> who was then the governor of Ádhibáyján, decreed that the Báb be brought thence from Chihríq. At the same time his disciples were brought with him, those who followed him everywhere, that is Áqá Siyyid Husayn<sup>14</sup> and Mullá Muhammad-i-Yazdí.<sup>15</sup>

The ulama were then invited to a great conference but they refused to come, declaring that the ideas of the accused were heretical and that by this very fact he merited death.<sup>16</sup> Hishmat al-Dawlih, seeing the disgust – I here translate a Muslim author – of the ulama, had the Báb arrive at night, when he was encountered, in a meeting prepared for this purpose, by Mírzá Hasan Khán Vazír-Nizám<sup>17</sup> and Hájí Mírzá ‘Alí.<sup>18</sup> They interrogated him, asking for the explanation of a difficult hadith, and the Reformer – which is implausible – remained silent. So Hishmat al-Dawlih, taking the floor, asked him to compose verses on the subject of the crystal candlesticks.<sup>19</sup>

The Báb obeyed but his response was not recorded. Some moments later, when invited to repeat the same verses, he was unable to do so.<sup>20</sup>

From that point he was condemned and sentenced to death. However, it was wished that his execution be in public, for it was thought that if it took place secretly, nothing would stop the people from believing in his miraculous ascension to heaven. It was thus decided that the Báb would be marched through the streets of the town and executed in the great common,<sup>21</sup> which, strange as it may seem, in Tabriz is called the ‘Plaza of the Sáhib al-Zamán’.

Thus the Siyyid was taken with Mullá Muhammad-‘Alí Yazdí and Siyyid Husayn, and they were conducted to Hájí Mírzá Báqir,<sup>22</sup> the Imám Jum‘ih of the town, to Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání<sup>23</sup> and to Áqá Siyyid ‘Alí Zunúzí,<sup>24</sup> who delivered a fatwa decreeing the execution.

From there commenced a sorrowful march through the bazaars,<sup>25</sup> during which Áqá Siyyid Husayn – charged by his master with the execution of his last wishes – disavowed and renounced the Báb, and, upon an order from the tormenters, spit in his face. He accomplished the mission which was confided to him, and was, a little later, executed in Tehran.<sup>26</sup> Having arrived at the fatal Plaza, all efforts were made, in vain, to separate Mullá Muhammad-‘Alí<sup>27</sup> from his convictions – his wife and his little children were brought, but he obstinately refused to listen to them, limiting himself to one last request – the favour of being killed before his master.

It was then that a strange event occurred, unique in the annals of humanity. The two companions, solidly attached to one another, were placed before the Christian regiment of the Bahadurans.<sup>28</sup> Upon a signal given by their chief, the soldiers fired. Afterwards Mullá Muhammad-‘Alí, covered with wounds, dying, was seen to turn towards his master, his words terrifying the witnesses: ‘Master,’ he said, ‘Master, are you content with me?’ The bullets had cut the cords which held the Báb, who dropped to his feet, without a scratch. ‘Ah! If at this moment he had exposed his chest,’<sup>29</sup> says the historian of the ‘Kitáb al-Mutanabbi’ín’,<sup>30</sup> ‘and if he had cried, “O soldiers, O men, you are yourselves the witnesses of this miracle, that of 1000 bullets<sup>31</sup> not a single one could reach me and some even cut my bonds”, all would have begun to howl and throw themselves at his feet. But,’ continues our author, ‘God wished to make known the truth; that is why he made him run away.’

Concerning these last words, I am not, and cannot be, of the same opinion as I’tidád al-Saltanih. Christians are convinced that if Jesus Christ had wished to descend living from the cross, he could have done so without difficulty – he died voluntarily because he had to die in order to fulfil the prophecies. It is the same for the Báb, say the Bábís, who also wished to give clear evidence in support of his

words. He also died voluntarily because by his death he was to save humanity. Who will ever reveal to us the words the Báb might have pronounced in the midst of the nameless tumult that greeted his departure? Who will know what memories agitated his beautiful soul? Who will ever tell us the secret of his death?

Be that as it may, the soldiers took him again,<sup>32</sup> bound him once more to the infamous pole and this time Siyyid ‘Alí Muhammad rendered his soul to God. It was on Monday the 27th of Sha‘bán that this event took place.<sup>33</sup>

The Comte de Gobineau (Gobineau 1865), who in this agrees with the authors of the *Nasikhu‘t-Tavárikh* (Sipihr 1965), the *Rawdat al-Safá-yi Násiri* (Hidáyat 1959–60) and the *Mir‘at al-Buldan*,<sup>34</sup> in a word with all the official court historians, reports that after the execution the cadaver of the Báb was thrown into the town ditch and devoured by dogs. In reality, this was not so but we will see why this account was circulated – as much by the authorities of Tabriz who were not at all anxious to bring the reprimand of the government upon themselves through a complacency bought at high cost, as by the Bábís who desired in this way to influence the police investigations.

The irrefutable testimony of those who witnessed this drama and of its actors leaves me in no doubt that the body of Siyyid ‘Alí Muhammad was received into pious hands and that finally, after vicissitudes which I will recount, it received a sepulchre worthy of him.

When the execution was accomplished, the troops retired, the crowd dispersed and the bodies were committed to the soldiers on guard. The Comte de Gobineau, along with other authors, would have it that the body was marched through the streets of the town for three days. Although this is, in general, denied by tradition, I accept it to be true because it is believable. In any case, night having come, the body was left where it was, alone and abandoned, or it was guarded by soldiers. In the first case it is totally impossible that the numerous Bábís to be found in the town would have hesitated a single instant to steal the body while nobody watched. They have demonstrated too many proofs of their courage, their conviction and their enthusiasm to admit, for even a second, that they would have abandoned to the public the body of him whom they considered their god and which, moreover, would have been so easy to recover. But if the official historians are right, and if on the third day the body was thrown into the town ditch to become the prey of stray animals, it is very clear that after this it was no longer guarded and the sectarians could easily have appropriated it. Finally, even if it were guarded at night, its removal would have been relatively easy. One has no doubt been able to perceive in the course of this story what Persian sentinels are made of: their function essentially consists in sleeping in front of the thing they have been charged with guarding.

If one considers that ringing and dramatic arguments leave very few people untouched in Persia, one can easily accept that the Bábís could find a way into the hearts of these badly paid poor devils. Finally, courage not being, especially in this circumstance, the dominant characteristic of the enemies of the Bábí Faith, if one allows that the guard was composed of perhaps two or three soldiers, they would very probably have fled after a first serious attack.

This is what the Bábís resolved to do. The leaders, gathered at the home of Sulaymán Khán of Sá‘ín Qal‘a<sup>35</sup> in order to decide what measures to take to remove

the body of the martyr from the insults and brutalities of the infidels, decided to mobilize their men, to go in groups to the place where the Báb lay, to wage battle if necessary, and to carry off the precious relic no matter what the cost. Sulaymán Khán was a considerable man and head of a large family having ties of friendship with the Kalantar of Tabriz.<sup>36</sup> He prevailed upon his co-religionists for permission to warn this official of the decision that had been taken and to make known to him that it would be better for him to allow the removal of the body than to risk civil war breaking out in the town. The Kalantar, struck by the imminence of this peril and by the sum that was offered him, thanked Sulaymán Khán for his message, prayed him to advise his companions not to budge and to wait until he himself could ensure that the body of the Báb could be removed by his people. But the Bábís responded that they would not permit the assassins to sully the body of the august victim by touching it. The Kalantar thus consented that some Bábís go to the place of execution to remove the body and he sent some of his men with them to silence the soldiers on guard, who, receiving attractive payment, easily consented to keep quiet. Everyone being thus satisfied, it was arranged to say that the [body of the] Báb had been devoured by stray animals. This could easily be believed, for it was credible. Hence the plan offered the immense advantage of maintaining the peace in a generally turbulent city, enriching the actors in the comedy, freeing them of all responsibility and, on the other side, closing the eyes of the authorities. The two bodies were thus carried off; that of Muhammad-‘Alí-i-Zanjání<sup>37</sup> was buried and that of the Báb shrouded in a box and hidden in a house.<sup>38</sup>

I must here open a parenthesis to report what was told me by Subh-i-Azal during my visit to Cyprus:<sup>39</sup>

Before his death the Báb decreed in one of his verses that I entomb his body in a casket of diamonds, with God’s permission, and bury him opposite Sháh ‘Abdu’l-‘Azím.<sup>40</sup> He described the location of the sepulchre in such fashion that I alone could understand what he meant.

He died thus, as well as Muhammad-‘Alí-i-Zanjání. The executioners threw the members of the two martyrs one over the other haphazardly in such fashion that it was impossible to differentiate them.

I put both of them in a casket of crystal,<sup>41</sup> not being able to make one in diamonds, and buried it at the very place which the Prophet had indicated to me. The location of the sepulchre remained a secret for thirty years.<sup>42</sup> The Bahá’ís especially knew nothing of it but a traitor revealed it to them. These blasphemers disinterred the body and destroyed it. If they did not destroy it, and if they can show a new sepulchre which truly contains the casket of crystal and the body of the Prophet which they have stolen, we cannot bring ourselves to consider this new tomb as sacred as it is not the place indicated by the Báb.<sup>43</sup>

This version, which I reported to the Bahá’ís of Tehran, exasperated them and caused them to renew their anathemas against the recluse of Cyprus.

This is how things passed . . . We have said that the body of the Báb was hidden in one of the houses of Tabriz. It was that of Sulaymán Khán himself.<sup>44</sup> He informed Bahá’u’llah of what had happened and asked him for his instructions. Bahá’, in

conformity with the order he had received in the testament of the Báb,<sup>45</sup> entrusted the transport of this box to Jamál. It was carried to the Imám-Zádih Ma'súm,<sup>46</sup> which has since become the favoured cemetery of the Bábís, outside what is called the gate of Qazvín<sup>47</sup> – because it is there that the road from this town to the capital ends. It was placed in a niche that was then walled in with bricks.

Things remained this way for a long time, when, twenty-nine years ago, Mírzá Husayn 'Alí Bahá', being then at Adrianople,<sup>48</sup> gave the order to Hájí 'Alí-Akbar Shahrírází<sup>49</sup> and to Áqá Jamál<sup>50</sup> to remove the box from the place where it had been and to transport it elsewhere. They obeyed without understanding why they had been ordered to make this change; but they understood this instruction some time later when the Imám-Zádih, which was on the verge of collapse, was demolished and then rebuilt. Its demolition – if Bahá' had not taken this precaution – would have revealed the box and the precious relics would have fallen into profane hands.

I cede speech here to Hájí Mullá 'Alí-Akbar Shahrírází, who told me the whole story in this way:<sup>51</sup>

After having received the order in question we went, Áqá Jamál and I, to find the box at the Imám-Zádih Ma'súm. We found it behind the wall of bricks, which we had to destroy, and we took it to Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azím.<sup>52</sup> Night had come and we did not know what to do, finding nowhere we could safely place the box that had been entrusted to us. We crossed the village and came to the edge of Chishmih-'Alí,<sup>53</sup> passing in front of the Masjid-i-Máshá'u'lláh,<sup>54</sup> which was then half ruined and far from any habitation.

We had found a favourable location so we stopped. We opened the box and found the body enwrapped in a shroud. We left it where it was and wrapped the whole body in a shroud of silk we had brought. In the course of doing this we found on his chest a bouquet of flowers that had been placed there and which were completely dried out. We took this bouquet and shared the flowers. Then we replaced the body in the box which we carried into the mosque, where we placed it standing up under a little arch. In the opening of the two arches we built a wall of the bricks we found lying on the ground; some plaster had been brought to us by one of our co-religionists.

While we were thus occupied, we did not notice that we were being watched by farmers who had been intrigued by our entry into this solitary place.

After finishing our work, we went to Quts-i-Hesar,<sup>55</sup> a village situated below the Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azím, where we rested the whole day.

The evening having fallen, we travelled with Jamál. Having arrived at Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azím at the place where the two roads meet, the one going towards Chishmih-'Alí, the other towards Tehran, Jamál took the road to the town. I stopped him, saying it would be good if we returned to the Masjid-i-Masha'u'llah to see if we had left any obvious traces of us having been there and if our trust was really secure. As you will see, this was an inspiration from heaven.

We set out on the road and Jamál, whose mount was less tired, or more robust, than mine, preceded me. I shouted to him that I would wait for him where I was. He then went on and I stayed alone. I waited a very long time, so long that I became uneasy and I hastened to rejoin my companion.

I found him swooning on the threshold of the mosque. I tried to revive him but he was so troubled, so upset, that he did not have the strength to respond to my questions about what had caused him to faint. So I entered the mosque, fearing that something bad had happened, and, as it was dark, I felt for the wall we had built. I could feel that it had been destroyed! Half crazy, I stretched out my arms before me and found the box but at the same time discovered that it had been broken. In despair, I pulled it towards me violently but, finding it very heavy, my hope was restored. Very soon I had the immense joy of confirming that the body was still there. Relieved, I reassured my companion and we consulted about what we could do.

We did not see any alternative other than to trust to Providence and try to take the box back into the town. So we put it on one of our donkeys and set out.

Arriving near the fortifications, we stopped, much perplexed. If we tried to take our burden through the gate, the customs men and soldiers would stop us to examine the contents and we be imprisoned and our box confiscated. To cross through the ditch and climb up the bank was difficult and dangerous. We were at the point of despair when the storm that had been threatening for a long time suddenly broke. The rain poured down and the crowd of pilgrims crushed themselves into the gateway. Profiting from the occasion, we mixed in with them and, holding our abá<sup>56</sup> over the box, in all the chaos we were able to pass through without being noticed.

We carried the box to one of our number, Áqá Mírzá Hasan Vazír,<sup>57</sup> the son-in-law of Siyyid ‘Alí Majdu’l-Ashraf;<sup>58</sup> I installed myself in his house without revealing the secret to him.

I continued for fourteen months as the guardian of this trust. I do not know how our co-religionists were told of this temporary sepulchre but I soon received letters from every province about it, and from all points of the Empire Bábís came on pilgrimage. I had to tell all of these people that I did not know what this was all about, that everything that had been said was false, but the pilgrimages continued nevertheless.

From the beginning, alarmed by these comings and goings that might arouse the attention of the authorities, I referred to Bahá’, informing him that some Isfáhánís intended to buy the land on which the house was built in order to construct a befitting tomb on it.

Finally, at the end of fourteen months, as I have already said, Hájí Sháh Muhammad, surnamed Amín, came from ‘Akká.<sup>59</sup> He was the bearer of an order enjoining me to deliver the trust to him without questioning him about what he was going to do with it. I gave it to him without asking him for any explanation.

Hájí Sháh Muhammad, who was later killed at Tabriz in the insurrection of Shaykh ‘Ubayd’u’lláh,<sup>60</sup> carried the body in great secrecy to an unknown place, probably the house of one of his co-religionists.

Thus did things continue. We were all ignorant of the place where the remains of our Prophet were to be found, when, seventeen years ago, Áqá Mírzá Asad’u’lláh Isfáhání<sup>61</sup> came from ‘Akká to Jamál. He took charge of the trust but no one knew where he was going to take it and to whom he confided it. Finally, two years ago,<sup>62</sup> Asad’u’lláh returned and transported the relic to ‘Akká. It is said that the final sepulchre is found at the foot of Mount Carmel.<sup>63</sup>



Hence, it was only long after his death that Siyyid ‘Alí, the greatest figure of modern times, he who, for love of his fellow men, took part in the most terrifying adventure ever dreamt of with a courage all the more marvellous for being tranquil and unchanging, and who is without doubt a hero without equal, finally rests in eternal peace. May the earth be light upon him!

## Bibliography

- ‘Abdu’l-Bahá. *A Traveler’s Narrative*. Wilmette, IL: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 1980. (Originally published as *A Traveller’s Narrative*. Trans. E.G. Browne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.)
- Afnan, Abu’l-Qasim. *Ahd-i A’lá: Zindigani-yi Hadrat-i Báb* (The Bábí Dispensation: The Life of the Báb). Oxford: Oneworld, 2000.
- Amanat, Abbas. *Pivot of the Universe: Násir al-Dín Sháh Qájár and the Iranian Monarchy, 1831–1896*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- *Resurrection and Renewal: The Making of the Bábí Movement in Iran, 1844–1850*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- The Báb. *Muntakhabát-i áyát az ár-i Hadrat-i Nuqta-yi Úlá*. Tehran: Bahá’í Publishing Committee, 1978.
- *Selections from the Writings of the Báb*. Haifa: Bahá’í World Centre, 1976.
- The Bahá’í World*. vols. 1–12, 1925–54. rpt. Wilmette, IL: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 1980.
- Bahá’u’lláh. *Kitáb-i-Íqán*. Wilmette, IL: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 1989.
- Balyuzi, H.M. *The Báb: The Herald of the Day of Days*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1973.
- *Bahá’u’lláh: The King of Glory*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1980.
- *Eminent Bahá’ís in the Time of Bahá’u’lláh: With some Historical Background*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1985.
- Bamdad, Mahdí. *Sharh-i Hal-i Rijal Írán dar Qarn-i 12, 13, 14 Hijra*, vol. 1. Tehran, 1968–74.
- Curzon, Lord. *Persia and the Persian Question*, vol. 2, 16. Cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam, *Dawn-Breakers* 1970, p. 595, n. 2.
- Faydí, Muhammad ‘Alí, in *Hadrat-i Nuqtah-i-Úlá*. Tehran, 1973.
- Frahvashtí, ‘Alí. ‘Á’in-i Báb’. Cited in MacEoin, *Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History*.
- de Gobineau, Comte Joseph Arthur. *Religions et philosophies dans l’Asie Centrale*. Paris: Didier & Cie, 1865.
- Gulpáygání, Mírzá Abu’l-Fadl. *Kashf al-Ghitá’ an Hiyal al-A’dá*. Cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 431, n. 3.
- Hidáyat, Ridá Qulí Khán, Lálá-báshí. *Rawdat al-Safá-yi Násiri*, vol. 10. Tehran, 3rd ed. 1959–60.
- Huart, Clement. *La Religion du Bab*. Paris, 1889. Cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam, *Dawn-Breakers*.
- Iranian National Bahá’í Archives (INBA); Iranian National Manuscript collection (INBMC).

- Ishrâq Khâvarî, ‘Abdu’l-Hamîd, ed. *Mâ’idiy-i-Âsmâni*. Cited in MacEoin, *Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History*.
- *Rahîq-i Makhtûm*. 2 vols. Tehran: Bahá’í Publishing Trust 1973–4.
- Kazemzadeh, Firuz and Kazem Kazemzadeh. ‘The Báb: Accounts of His Martyrdom’. *World Order* (Fall 1973).
- Khusravî, Muhammad ‘Alî Malik. *Târikh-i Shuhadâ-yi Amr*, vol. 3. Tehran, 1973–4. *Kitâb-i-Nuqtatu’l-Kâf*. Leiden: Brill, 1910.
- Latimer, George Orr. *The Light of the World*. Boston: George Orr Latimer (self-published), 1920.
- MacEoin, Denis. *The Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History: A Survey*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Mázandarâni, Asadu’llâh Fâdil. *Asrâr al-Áthâr*, 5 vols. Tehran: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 124–9 BE/1968–73.
- *Tarikh Zuhur al-Haqq*, vol. 3. Tehran: n.p. 1941?, at <http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/~bahai/areprint/vol2/mazand/tzh3>.
- Momen, Moojan. *The Bábí and Bahá’í Religions, 1844–1944. Some Contemporary Western Accounts*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1981.
- Mubagajian, Atrpet Sargis. *Imâmat: Strana Poklonnikov Imâmov* (Persidskoe Dukhovenstvo) [Imâmate: The Country of the Worshipers of the Imâms]. Alexandropol, 1909. <http://bahai-library.org/books/biblio/history.html>.
- Muhammad Hasan Khân. *Mir’at al-Buldan*.
- Mu’in al-Saltana Tabrizî, Hâjji Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdu’l-Bâqî. *Târikh-i Mu’in al-Saltana*, Cited in Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*.
- Nabil-i-A‘zam. *The Dawn-Breakers: Nabil’s Narrative of the Early Days of the Bahá’í Revelation*. Wilmette, IL: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 1970.
- Nicolas, A.L.M. *Le Beyan Persan*, vol. 1, 1911.
- Ruhe, David S. *Robe of Light: The Persian Years of the Supreme Prophet, Bahá’u’lláh*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1997.
- ‘Sharh-i Hal’. Tehran, 1946. Cited in Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*.
- Sheil, Lady. *Glimpses of Life and Manners in Persia*. Cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 595–6, n. 2.
- Shoghi Effendi. *God Passes By*. Wilmette, IL: Bahá’í Publishing Trust, rev. ed. 1995.
- Sipihr, Mírzá Muḥammad Taqí, Lisán al-Mulk. M.B. Bihbudî, ed. *Násikhu’t-Tavárikh: Qájáriyya*, 4 vols. Tehran, 1965.
- Taherzadeh, Adib. *The Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh*, vol. 1. Oxford: George Ronald, 1974.
- *The Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh*, vol. 2. Oxford: George Ronald, 1977.
- *The Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh*, vol. 3. Oxford: George Ronald, 1983.
- *The Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh*, vol. 4. Oxford: George Ronald, 1987.
- Târikh-i Jadíd*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.



The Universal House of Justice. Letter of an ad hoc Committee appointed by the Universal House of Justice to Robert Stauffer, 20 March 1983. <http://bahai-library.org/wwwboard/messages00/584.html>

Za'im al-Dawlih Mírzá Muhammad Mahdí ibn Muhammad Taqí. *Miftáh Báb al-Abwáb aw Tàrikh al-Bábíya*. Cairo: Matbá'át Majallát al-Manár 1903, pp. 233–5. Cited in Amanat 1989, p. 400, n. 107.

## Notes

1. The Báb was imprisoned at Mákú for nine months (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 259; 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 12; *Kitáb-i-Nuqtatu'l-Káf*, p. 129, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 374, n. 9), and he departed for Chihriq 20 days after Naw-Rúz (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 259), the fourth Naw-Rúz after his declaration, corresponding to the hijra year 1264 (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 255–6). Since the eve of Naw-Rúz was on the thirteenth day of Rabí' al-Thání of that year (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 255–6), then the twentieth day after Naw-Rúz must have been on the fourth day of Jamádi al-Úlá 1264. Amanat 1989, p. 380, gives precisely this date, with its Gregorian equivalent of 10 April 1848. Another conversion of this date is 8 April 1848, based on these two date converters:  
<http://www.rabiah.com/convert/>  
<http://www.ori.unizh.ch/hegira.html>  
 Nine months before this date would place the Báb's arrival at Mákú during the month of Sha'bán 1263, corresponding to 15 July 1847 to 12 August 1847 (<http://www.ori.unizh.ch/hegira.html>) or to 14 July 1847 to 11 August 1847 (<http://www.rabiah.com/convert/>).
2. The Báb could have written this tablet to Muhammad Sháh from Mákú at any time during the last five months of 1263 and the first four months of 1264. Nicolas's dating of this tablet to 1264 is entirely probable, although not proved beyond reasonable doubt.
3. The date of the Báb's death is reported in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 517), 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27), and Avarih (vol. 1, p. 245; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 114) as 28 Sha'bán 1266. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 517), states that it took place at noon, while 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27), affirms that it occurred before noon. In his dispatch dated 22 July 1850 to Lord Palmerston, the British Foreign Secretary Lt.-Col. Sheil reported the martyrdom of the Báb but seems to have omitted the date of this event (F.O. 60/152; cited in Balyuzi 1973, pp. 202, 241). At the time of the execution of the Báb, R.W. Stevens, the British consul then serving in Tabriz, was absent from the city, having left his brother George Stevens in charge; George did not report this event to Lt.-Col. Sheil, who seems to have been informed through some other channel (Balyuzi 1973, p. 202).

On 24 July R.W. Stevens returned to Tabriz and promptly filed a report of the execution to Sheil (F.O. 248/142; cited in Balyuzi 1973, pp. 202, 241; Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 114). Amanat 1989 (p. 402, n. 114) notes that R.W. Stevens reported that the Báb's martyrdom took place on 27 Sha'bán 1266/8 July 1850 but casts doubt on the British consul's positive knowledge of the event, inasmuch as he was not present in Tabriz at the time of its occurrence. Amanat 1989 (p. 402, n. 114) notes that Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 3, p. 305, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 114) also reports this event as occurring on 27 Sha'bán 1266, but that this chronicler mistakenly identifies 27 Sha'bán/8 July as a Monday, while Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 517) correctly identifies 28 Sha'bán/9 July as a Sunday, and he reasons that this makes the Bábí/Bahá'í dating more reliable than the Muslim account and the British diplomatic report. It might also be noted that Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 507–8) relates the testimony of the Báb's amanuensis, Siyyid Husayn Yazdí, with regard to the night just prior to

the Báb's martyrdom, and it seems entirely unlikely that so devoted a disciple could have mistaken the date of his master's martyrdom. Various eyewitness reports of the martyrdom of the Báb were collected and translated by Dr Firuz Kazemzadeh and his father Kazem Kazemzadeh and published as 'The Báb: Accounts of His Martyrdom', in *World Order* (Fall 1973, pp. 23–6).

4. The date of the Báb's departure from Máh-Kú for Chihríq has been cited in note 1 above as 4 Jamádi al-Úlá 1264/8 or 10 April 1848. Since Chihríq is approximately 80 miles southwest of Máh-Kú, it seems likely that the Báb would have arrived in Chihríq a few days later, at the latest about 9 Jamádi al-Úlá 1264/13 or 15 April 1848. MacEoin 1992 (p. 82) indicates that the Báb departed Máh-Kú on 9 April 1848 and arrived at Chihríq at the beginning of Jamádi al-Thání 1264/early May 1848. It is entirely improbable that this journey would have taken an entire month. Hájí Mirzá Áqásí ordered that Ridá-Qulí Khán-i-Afshár lead the escort of the Báb from Máh-Kú to Chihríq (Balyuzi 1973, p. 134). For information about Ridá-Qulí Khán-i-Afshár's father, Hájí Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár, see note 12 below. Ridá-Qulí Khán was married, through the intervention of his father, to the daughter of Siyyid Kázim Rashtí (Balyuzi 1973, pp. 13–14). This chief of the Báb's escort was attracted to his charge during the journey from Máh-Kú to Chihríq (Mu'in, pp. 169–72, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 367, n. 192) and subsequently became a zealous Bábí (Balyuzi 1973, pp. 134–5; Amanat 1989, p. 247, n. 250). Mu'in (pp. 173–6, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 367, n. 194) also reports that Ridá-Qulí Khán was deprived of his family estate at Sá'in Qal'a by his anti-Bábí father, and then poisoned by his son, motivated also by religious enmity.

The transfer of the Báb from Máh-Kú to Chihríq is reported by Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 259) to have been motivated by Hájí Mirzá Áqásí's 'fear and resentment' at the influence exercised by the Báb over his jailer, 'Alí Khán of Máh-Kú. 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 13) reports that the Báb was moved because of the entreaties of the 'accomplished' Muslim clerics of Ádhirbáyján. Amanat 1989 (p. 378, n. 23) indicates that Prince Dolgorukov, the Russian minister in Tehran from 1845 to 1854 (MacEoin 1992, p. 170, n. 63), in a dispatch dated 4 February 1848 to the Foreign Minister of the Czar, reported that the Báb was transferred away from the Russian border, i.e. from Máh-Kú to Chihríq, during the previous year, in 1847. It seems likely that the Báb was not transferred until April 1848 but perhaps Prince Dolgorukov was informed of the decision to transfer the Báb prior to its taking effect. In any case, it appears from this dispatch that one of Hájí Mirzá Áqásí's motivations for effecting the removal of his prisoner from Máh-Kú to Chihríq may have been to calm the fears of the Czar's representative at court that the Báb's presence in that location might result in civil unrest and that its consequences could cross over the border into the Russian Empire. Chihríq was chosen for the Báb's imprisonment because the governor of the fortress and chief Khán (leader) in the region was Yahyá Khán Shakaki, a Naqshbandí Súfí, the brother of Muhammad Sháh's favourite wife and an ally of Hájí Mirzá Áqásí (Amanat 1989, p. 380, n. 33). Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 301) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 13) call him simply 'Yahyá Khán the Kurd', and Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 301) also reports that his sister was the mother of Náyibu's-Saltanih, one of the daughters of Muhammad Sháh – this would likewise identify his sister as one of Muhammad Sháh's wives. According to Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 302), Yahyá Khán was transformed through his contact with the Báb, as were the Kurdish inhabitants of the village of Chihríq and those of Iski-Shahr, an hour's distance from the fortress. Soon after the death of Muhammad Sháh, his Grand Vazír, Hájí Mirzá Áqásí, was deposed and Násiri'd-Dín Sháh appointed Mirzá Taqí Khán the new Grand Vazír. According to 'Abbás Mirzá Mulk Ara (in *Sharh-i Hal* 1946, p. 17, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 380, n. 33), shortly after Hájí Mirzá Áqásí's fall from power, Yahyá Khán was summoned to Tabriz and imprisoned there, apparently because of his relationship with the former Grand Vazír. This would indicate that

Yahyá Khán was not governor of Chihriq during the last period of the Báb's imprisonment in that fortress. The last reference to Yahyá Khán in *Nabil-i-A'zam* (p. 322) is immediately upon the Báb's return to Chihriq after the trial in Tabriz, which probably occurred in August 1848, a month prior to Muhammad Sháh's passing and Hájí Mírzá Áqásí's disgrace. See the next paragraph for details. It should be noted that there is another Yahyá Khán in this story, an attendant of 'Abbás Mírzá Sháh and of his son Muhammad Sháh (Balyuzi 1973, p. 149). He was a resident of Tabriz and the father of Hájí Sulaymán Khán ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 28; Balyuzi 1973, p. 149). Balyuzi reports (p. 149) that it was intended that Hájí Sulaymán Khán follow his father in service to the court but that instead he went to the 'Atabat, where he studied with Siyyid Kázim Rashtí. Subsequently he embraced the Cause of the Báb and visited his master at Chihriq (Balyuzi 1973, p. 149). *Nabil-i-A'zam* (pp. 518–19) reports that Hájí Sulaymán Khán tried to effect the deliverance of the Báb but arrived in Tabriz on the second day after the Báb's execution. *Nabil-i-A'zam* (p. 519) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 28) indicate that Hájí Sulaymán Khán was instrumental in the initial retrieval and safeguarding of the mortal remains of Anís and the Báb, and *Nabil-i-A'zam* (pp. 519–20) indicates that Hájí Sulaymán Khán reported the details of this matter to Bahá'u'lláh in Tehran.

According to 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 14), the Muslim clerics of Tabriz wrote to the government in Tehran after the Báb had been in residence at Chihriq for three months. Three months after the Báb's arrival, which probably occurred about 9 Jamádi al-Úlá, would be 9 Sha'bán. *Nabil-i-A'zam* 1970 (p. 301) reports that the Báb was brought to Tabriz towards the end of Sha'bán. Is there any conflict between these two dates? Not at all. 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 14) reports that subsequent to the appeal of the clerics of Tabriz to Tehran, Hájí Mírzá Áqásí ordered the Báb to be taken from Chihriq to Tabriz to be examined by the ulama. It would have taken some days for the message of the ulama to reach Tehran, for the edict of the Grand Vazír to reach Chihriq, and then for the Báb to be conducted via Urúmiyyih to Tabriz. The Báb's imprisonment at Chihriq, which began in early Jamádi al-Úlá 1264/April 1848, was interrupted by his journey to Tabriz in Sha'bán 1264/July 1848 (Amanat 1989, p. 387; Balyuzi 1973, p. 139). MacEoin 1992 (p. 82) dates this journey in Sha'bán 1264 but later in that month, in August 1848 (the only day of Sha'bán which fell in August is the 1st; cited in *Nabil-i-A'zam* 1970 p. 301, n. 1), probably calculating the Báb's three months imprisonment at Chihriq from an arrival date of Jamádi al-Thání 1264/May 1848. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 147) dates the Báb's return to Chihriq in early August 1848, which must have corresponded to Ramadán 1264. Amanat 1989 (p. 394) indicates that the death of Muhammad Sháh took place less than two months after the Báb's trial in Tabriz. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 147) reports the date of Muhammad Sháh's death as 4 September 1848, while Amanat (p. 394) states only that the monarch died in September 1848. Hence it appears that scarcely a month separated the return of the Báb to Chihriq and the death of Muhammad Sháh.

Whatever the duration of this interval, *Nabil-i-A'zam* 1970 (p. 323) reports that the Báb wrote the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí immediately after his return to Chihriq; that Mullá Muhammad 'Alí-i-Zanjání, known as Hujjat (Proof), personally delivered that tablet to the Grand Vazír; and that Bahá'u'lláh recalled the circumstances of that delivery as they had been related to him by Hujjat himself, shortly after the fact. Hájí Mírzá Áqásí must have received this epistle shortly before the death of Muhammad Sháh and just prior to his own fall from power.

*Kitáb-i-Nuqtatu'l-Káf* (p. 132, cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 92, n. 70) included the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* among the letters written to Muhammad Sháh and Hájí Mírzá Áqásí during the Báb's imprisonment at Chihriq. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 147) states that Hájí Mírzá Áqásí had already fallen from power when Hujjat delivered the Báb's letter to

him in Tehran. This is entirely unlikely, given Bahá'u'lláh's account of the meeting between Hujjat and the Grand Vazír.

MacEoin 1992 (p. 92, n. 73) notes that the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* can be dated from a reference in the text (INBMC 64, p. 140) to the 40 months that had transpired since the Báb had written to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí for the first time. MacEoin (p. 58) cites the first letter of the Báb to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí as having been written most likely in 1844 and affirms that two manuscripts of this letter have survived (p. 192). The Báb meticulously listed all of his writings from 1 Muharram 1260/22 January 1844 to 15 Muharram 1262/14 January 1846 in the *Kitáb al-Fihrist* (cited in MacEoin, pp. 50–2), and no mention is made therein of a letter to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí. However, the Báb wrote the *Qayyúm al-Asmá'* during this period, as is attested by the *Kitáb al-Fihrist* and other independent sources – Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 61), *Tárikh-i-Jadid* 1893 (p. 39), 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 4) – and copies of this work were conveyed by Mullá Husayn Bushrú'í to Muhammad Sháh and Hájí Mírzá Áqásí in 1260/1844 according to the Báb's tablet to Muhammad Sháh from Máh-Kú. Forty months prior to August 1848 would have fallen around April 1845, and certainly by that date Hájí Mírzá Áqásí would have received a copy of the *Qayyúm al-Asmá'*. It is also possible that the *Kitáb al-Fihrist* is not a complete record of the Báb's writings during this period and that he may have written a letter directly to the Grand Vazír subsequent to his pilgrimage, from Búshihir, in April 1845. Inasmuch as the Báb wrote the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí in August 1848, he may have been referring to one of the *khutub* he wrote as he was returning to Shiraz after his pilgrimage, which are listed in the *Kitáb al-Fihrist* (MacEoin 1992, p. 51) and briefly described by MacEoin (p. 63). According to the *Khutba al-Jidda* (cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 48, n. 25), the Báb sailed for Iran after the completion of his pilgrimage on 4 March 1845, arriving at Búshihir about two and a half months later, circa 19 May 1845. During this voyage, the Báb's vessel would undoubtedly have put into port a number of times and it may well have docked at a port in southern Iran, such as Bandar Abbas, in the strait of Hormuz and opposite the modern kingdom of Oman, in April 1845, 40 weeks prior to the writing of the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* in August 1848. Indeed, Amanat 1989 (p. 241) states that the Báb's sea journey from Persia to Arabia took 71 days and that the boat stopped at Kangan, Muscat and Mocha on its way from Búshihir to Jidda. This period of time closely resembles the two and a half months which the Báb spent returning from Jidda to Bushihir. Inasmuch as we do not know of any epistle to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí which can be accurately dated to April 1845, it is difficult to follow MacEoin's reasoning that the date of the *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih* can be dated from a reference in the text.

When the Báb returned to Chihríq, he remained imprisoned at that location from Ramadán 1264/August 1848 until Rajab 1266/June 1850 (Kazem-Beg, vol. 7, p. 371 – cited in French in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 302, n. 2; cited and translated into English in Momen 1981, p. 75; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 395, n. 90). Nabil-i-A'zam (pp. 504, 506) and Gobineau 1865 (p. 213; cited in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 504, n. 1) report that Mírzá Taqí Khán – see notes 5 and 13 below for details – ordered Navváb Hamzih Mírzá, the governor of Ádhirbáyján, to arrange the transfer of the Báb from Chihríq to Tabriz for a second time, without divulging the purpose of this journey.

Amanat 1989 (p. 395) alleges that the Báb was escorted by a detachment of Afshár horsemen from Sá'in Qal'a. Inasmuch as this was the location of the family estate of Hájí Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár, who was the Grand Vazír's special envoy charged with overseeing the Báb's execution (Amanat 1989, p. 399), it may be that Hájí Sulaymán Khán was the instigator of this initiative. On his way to Tabriz, the Báb stayed at Salmás (Mu'in, p. 289, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 396, n. 91), where he was the guest, for the second time, of Mírzá Lutf 'Alí Salmási, the former steward of Muhammad Sháh who was dismissed when he conveyed one of the Báb's letters to His Majesty

(Mu‘ín, pp. 175, 223; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 384, n. 47). Amanat (p. 396) reports that the Báb reached Tabriz on 19 June 1850.

During the first three months of his imprisonment at Chihriq (Jamádi al-Úlá 1264/April 1848 – Sha‘bán 1264/July 1848) and the 22 months that followed his return from Tabriz (Ramadán 1264/August 1848 – Rajab 1266/June 1850), the Báb received many visitors, attracted many new followers and friends, and wrote many letters and other works. His visitors included his uncle Hájí Mirzá Siyyid ‘Alí [Khál-i-A‘zam] (Amanat 1989, p. 384; Balyuzi 1973, p. 150); Hájí Sulaymán Khán (Balyuzi 1973, p. 149); Muhammad Taqí Hashtrudi (Mu‘ín, pp. 255–8, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 384, n. 46); Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Karím Ahmad Qazvíní Kátib (Mázandarání, p. 370); Shaykh Mullá Mirzá ‘Alí called ‘Azím by the Báb (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 306–7); Mullá Báqir Tabrizí (Nabíl-i-A‘zam, pp. 504–5; Balyuzi 1973, p. 151); Mullá Ádí Guzal Marághih’i, called Sayyáh (the traveller), the student of Mullá ‘Alí Akbar Marághih’i (Nabíl-i-A‘zam, pp. 431–3; Mu‘ín, p. 186; Mázandarání, p. 59; all cited in Amanat 1989, p. 383, n. 43) – about whom see more details in note 15 below; Mullá ‘Alí of Kuhnih Sháhr (Mu‘ín, pp. 176, 231, 240, 254; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 384, n. 45); Dakhil Maraghih’i (ibid.; Faydí, p. 280). The Russian agent M. Mochenin states in his memoirs, as reported in Kazem-Beg (vol. 7, p. 371; cited in Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 302, n. 2; Momen 1981, p. 75; Amanat 1989, p. 395, n. 90) that he heard the Báb preaching in Chihriq shortly before his transfer to Tabriz, in June 1850, and that the eager listeners were so numerous that the courtyard of the fortress was too small to accommodate all of them, such that the majority remained in the street. His new followers, who became converts during his imprisonment at Chihriq, included the Indian dervish whom the Báb named Qahru’lláh (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 305–6; *Kitáb-i-Nuqtatu’l-Káf*, pp. 212–14; Mu‘ín, pp. 226–30; all cited in Amanat 1989, pp. 384–5); ‘Mirzá Muhammad-‘Alí and his brother Búyúk-Áqá, both siyyids of distinguished merit who had risen with fevered earnestness to proclaim their Faith to all sorts and conditions of people among their countrymen’ (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 303); and ‘Mirzá Asadu’lláh, who was later surnamed Dayyán by the Báb’ (ibid. pp. 303–5; Mázandarání, p. 64, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 383, n. 42); and others (Amanat 1989, p. 384), described by Nabíl-i-A‘zam (p. 303) as including ‘a number among the most eminent of the siyyids, the ‘ulamás, and the government officials of Khuy’. The Báb’s writings while at Chihriq included the following:

1) While according to some scholars (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 248; Shoghi Effendi 1995, pp. 24–5; MacEoin 1992, pp. 84, 85, 88), the Bayán-i-fársí was revealed at Máh-Kú, Balyuzi 1973 (p. 132) indicates only that the Bayán-i-fársí was begun at Máh-Kú, while Amanat 1989 (p. 374) states that the Báb compiled parts of the Bayán-i-fársí at Máh-Kú. It is then possible that this book was begun at Máh-Kú and completed at Chihriq.

2) The Bayán al-‘Arabíyya was written in Máh-Kú (MacEoin 1992, p. 85), at Chihriq (Balyuzi 1973, p. 152), or at some time during these two imprisonments (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 25).

3) The Lawh-i-hurúfát (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 304), which is also called the *Kitáb-i hayákil-i-váhid* by the Báb in Dalá’il-i-sab’ih (pp. 45–6, lithographed edition; cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 90, n. 59); called the *Kitáb-i-hayákil* (Book of Talismans) and the *Kitáb-i-dar hayákil-i-váhid* (a book concerning the temples [talismans] of unity) in Bahá’u’lláh’s letter to Mirzá Ibráhím Shirázi (INBA 3003C, p. 19; cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 89, n. 55); called *Risála-yi Ja’fariyya* in Bahá’u’lláh’s letter to Mullá ‘Alí Muhammad Siráj Isfáhání (Ishráq Khávarí, vol.



7, p. 60, cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 89, n. 56); and called *Kitáb-i-haykal* in another letter written by Bahá'u'lláh (*Ishráqát*, p. 47; cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 89, n. 58). This work is not to be confused with the Báb's *Sahífa-yi Ja'fariyya* (*ibid.* pp. 66–7, 90, 198); with Bahá'u'lláh's *Súrah-yi haykal* (*ibid.* p. 90, n. 61); or with Mirzá Yahya Subh-i-Azal's *Kitáb-i hayákil* (*ibid.*). Nor should it be confused with the *hayákil* written by the Báb. These are elsewhere described by MacEoin (p. 90, n. 61; pp. 99–101, 186).

4) The *Haykal al-Dín* is preserved in at least three manuscripts (MacEoin 1992, pp. 91, 186) and was lithographed along with the *Bayán al-'Arabíyya* (*ibid.* pp. 91, 254). MacEoin describes the *Haykal al-Dín* as bearing a close resemblance to the *Bayán al-'Arabíyya* and taking the form of eight chapters of Bábí laws, each denominated a *váhíd*. In the lithographed version, two commentaries are appended, allegedly written by the Báb on 12 Sha'bán 1266/22–3 June 1850 (*ibid.* p. 91).

5) The *Kitáb al-Asmá'* is also known as the *Tafsír al-asmá'* and the *Kitáb asmá'í kulli shay* (MacEoin 1992, p. 91), and 'Chahár sha'n' (*Frahvashtí*, cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 91, n. 67; p. 251) was composed during the last days of the Báb at Chihriq according to Mázandarání 1968–73 (vol. 1, p. 126). This book consists of 19 *váhids*, each of 19 *abwáb*, each *báb* containing four grades of writing (MacEoin 1992, p. 91). MacEoin (pp. 92, 188) refers to 26 manuscript copies of this work, many of which are defective.

6) The *Kitáb-i panj sha'n*, which is also entitled *Shu'un-i khamsa dar Bayán-i shu'un-i da'wat* and the *Kitáb al-Bayán fi'l-shu'un al-khamsa*, is found in 11 manuscripts (MacEoin 1992, pp. 189–90), and it was also lithographed but this version is missing five passages out of the total of 65 (MacEoin 1992, p. 93). According to MacEoin (p. 95), the last five passages, or last two sections in the particular manuscript of Panj Sha'n consulted by him (INBMC 64:60, pp. 85–9, 89–94; cited in MacEoin p. 90, n. 60) are more or less identical with the *Lawh-i-hurúfát* – see 1, above, for details.

7) Two tablets addressed to Muhammad Sháh, listed in MacEoin 1992 (p. 97, n. 94; p. 193) are published in Persian (*Muntakhabát-i áyát az ár-i Hadrat-i Nuqta-yi Úlá*, pp. 5–8; pp. 9–13 and Mázandarání 1941, pp. 82–5) and in English translation (*The Báb* 1976, pp. 18–23, 24–8). Amanat 1989 (p. 381) maintains that during his first few months at Chihriq, the Báb wrote two letters to Muhammad Sháh which were the first of a series of Arabic letters known as his *Khutab-i Qahríyyih*. Afnan 2000 (p. 354) states that the Báb wrote to Muhammad Sháh from Chihriq (p. 460) and cites a portion of one such letter in Arabic (p. 354).

8) The *Khutbiy-i-Qahríyyih*, mentioned above and by MacEoin 1992 (p. 92), addressed to Hájí Mirzá Áqásí and apparently written immediately after the Báb's return to Chihriq from his trial in Tabriz, is found in two manuscripts (MacEoin 1992, p. 186), and may be one of the *Khutab-i Qahríyyih* (sermons of wrath) quoted by Mu'in (pp. 151–60, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 383, n. 41) and Faydí 1973 (pp. 304–6; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 383, n. 41).

9) Amanat 1989 (p. 381) asserts that the Báb wrote two letters to Hájí Mirzá Áqásí during his first months at Chihriq which were the first of the *Khutab-i Qahríyyih*. The quotation he cites from Mázandarání 1941 (p. 84; Amanat 1989, p. 381, n. 36) consists of a portion of one of the Báb's letters to Muhammad Sháh, according



to MacEoin 1992 (p. 97, n. 94; p. 193). Mázandarání 1941 (pp. 85–9; cited in MacEoin, p. 92, n. 78) quotes a letter written to Hájí Mírzá Áqásí that is different from the *Khutbiy-i-Qahriyyih*.

10) Letters to his followers: i) Thirty-seven letters and other short pieces, in Browne Or. F. 25 (cited in MacEoin 1992, pp. 95, 208–9); ii) Six letters, in Browne Or. F. 21, numbers 9, 16, 18, 23, 24, 25 (cited in MacEoin, p. 95, n. 90); iii) Ten letters, in Mázandarání 1941 (cited in MacEoin, pp. 95–6); iv) Nine letters, published in facsimiles in an Azalí compilation entitled '*Qismatí az alwáh-i khatt-i Nuqta-yi Úlá wa Áqá Siyyid Husayn-i Kátib*' (cited in MacEoin, p. 96); v) Three letters, in Za'ím al-Dawla 1903 (cited in MacEoin 1992, p. 97).

11) Letter to the ulama in every city of Iran, and the 'Atabat, referred to by Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 24) as probably having been written in Máh-Kú or Chihriq; which information MacEoin (p. 98) suggests is derived from Bahá'u'lláh 1989 (p. 178). Amanat quotes a letter written by the Báb in late 1849 to the ulama of Tabriz, reproduced in Mu'in (pp. 263–4, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 394, n. 86, 87). Abu'l-Qasim Afnan says that the Báb wrote a letter to the ulama of Tabriz while incarcerated at Chihriq.

12) *Munáját* (prayers), *ziyaratnámás* (tablets of visitation), *hayákil* and *dawá'ir* (talismans in the shape of pentacles and circles) written at this time are described in MacEoin 1992 (pp. 99–101, 186, 195, 203, 210).

Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 307) reports this testimony from Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí, one of the transcribers of the writings of the Báb in Máh-Kú (*ibid.* p. 31), speaking of the last days of the Báb in Tabriz, shortly before his martyrdom:

At about the same time that the Báb dismissed Azím from His presence, I was instructed by Him to collect all the available Tablets that He had revealed during His incarceration in the castles of Máh-Kú and Chihriq, and to deliver them into the hands of Siyyid Ibráhím-i-Khalíl, who was then living in Tabriz, and urge him to conceal and preserve them with the utmost care.

Given the sheer quantity of writings cited above, it is quite remarkable that so many of them survive to the present day. However, it seems that Siyyid Ibráhím was not altogether unsuccessful in discharging his sacred trust. Indeed, Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 31), writing circa 1888 about the location of the Báb's nine commentaries on the Qur'án authored at Máh-Kú, states that their 'fate is unknown until now'.

5. Mírzá Taqí Khán, whose full name was Mírzá Taqí Khán Farahani (Amanat 1989, p. 451), was appointed Grand Vazír by Násiri'd-Dín Sháh (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 332, 500; 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 20; Balyuzi 1973, p. 152). He was determined to uproot the Bábí movement as it seemed to represent a challenge to the absolute authority of the central government; nor did he hesitate to employ the most brutal measures in order to effect his purpose (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 500–4; 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, pp. 20–2; Gobineau 1865, pp. 211–13, cited in Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 501–2, n. 2; Balyuzi 1973, pp. 148, 152; Amanat 1989, pp. 395–7). While Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 164) called Hájí Mírzá Áqásí the 'Antichrist of the Bábí Revelation', it is nevertheless incontestable that Mírzá Taqí Khán was singlehandedly responsible for effecting the martyrdom of the Báb and of hundreds, if not thousands, of his followers during his Grand Vazírship, from the autumn of 1264/1848 to the spring of 1268/1852, when he was assassinated by order of Násiri'd-Dín Sháh (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, p. 595; Curzon,

- Persia and the Persian Question*, vol. 2, p. 16, cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 595, n. 2; Sheil, *Glimpses of Life and Manners in Persia*, pp. 251–2, cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 595–6, n. 2; Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 82; Ruhe 1997, p. 129). Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 596, 598) recites a litany of ‘deeds of blackest infamy’ of the so-called ‘Amír Kabír’, which amply demonstrates that the Bábís could not but regard him as the most formidable of their many enemies. For information on Mírzá Taqí Khán, the reader is urged to consult Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 332, 443, 445–8, 450–2, 500–2, 504–6, 539, 546–7, 554–6, 558, 568, 595, 597, 598, 615); ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 20–1, 25, 26, 28–30); Balyuzi 1973 (pp. 146, 148, 152, 184, 185, 203, 207, 209, 212); and Amanat 1989 (pp. 27, 29, 281, 329, 339n, 355, 363, 366, 388n, 393, 395–9, 405–6, 411). Amanat 1997 contains much more information about Mírzá Taqí Khán.
6. Mírzá Taqí Khán was also called Amír-Nizám (Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 332, 500, 504, 506, 526, 539, 547, 595; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 20); Amír Kabír (Balyuzi 1973, p. 148; Amanat 1989, pp. 394–401); and Amír (Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 332; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 25).
  7. Násiri’d-Dín Sháh assumed the throne on the demise of his father, Muhammad Sháh, on 4 September 1848, and hence he was the reigning sovereign at the time of the Báb’s execution. Ruhe 1997 (p. 129) reports that Násiri’d-Dín Sháh was made monarch at 17 years of age, while Balyuzi 1973 (p. 140) and Amanat 1989 (p. 387) indicate that Násiri’d-Dín Mírzá was 17 during the first examination of the Báb at Tabriz, earlier that same year. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 140) indicates that Násiri’d-Dín Mírzá had been recently appointed governor of Adhribáyján, and Amanat 1989 (p. 387) indicates this appointment as dating from February 1848. As the trial took place in July 1848, and Muhammad Sháh died in September 1848, it seems that these reports are mutually compatible.
 

‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 20) describes Násiri’d-Dín Sháh as being ‘in the prime of youthful years’. In view of the various accounts of the machinations to which Háji Mírzá Áqásí resorted in order to avoid a meeting between the Báb and Muhammad Sháh, it seems entirely realistic and justifiable that Násiri’d-Dín Sháh should have blamed the imprisonment of the Báb at Máh-Kú and the missed opportunity for an examination of the Báb’s claims at Tehran on the former Grand Vazír. Nicolas appears to base his account here on Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 3, p. 302, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 396, n. 93).
  8. Sadr-A‘zam is a title meaning ‘prime minister; dignity of premier; chief seat’ (Steingass, p. 788). Not only did Háji Mírzá Áqásí serve as Grand Vazír to Muhammad Sháh, but according to Amanat 1989 (p. 79, n. 42), he may also have been the Sháh’s Súfí *pir* (guide) in the Ni‘matulláhi tariqah of which he, under the name Mullá ‘Abbás Írávání, was incontestably an adherent. It should also be noted that Muhammad Sháh consistently showed respect and reverence for Sufis (Amanat 1989, p. 79, n. 43).
  9. Násiri’d-Dín Sháh’s father was Muhammad Sháh.
  10. Háji Mírzá Áqásí’s rationale for circumventing such an enquiry in Tehran was afterwards explained by him to Prince Farhad Mírzá.
  11. Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 501–2) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 25) indicate that Mírzá Taqí Khán, the Amír-A‘zam and Grand Vazír, decided that the only way to extirpate the Bábí movement was to strike at its source and bring about the execution of the Báb. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 25, 30) states that he came to this decision without consulting Násiri’d-Dín Sháh or any of his fellow ministers of the court, whereas Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 502, 504) affirms that he summoned his counsellors and that only one of them, Mírzá Áqá Khán-i-Núrí, the Minister of War, dared to advise him against this course of action. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 152) seems to follow Nabil-i-A‘zam in his account of this decision, and Amanat 1989 (p. 396) cites Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 3, pp. 302, 303) and Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 502, 504). Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 615)

states that a rumour was spread among the Bábis to the effect that shortly before his own demise, Mírzá Taqí Khán was haunted by a vision of the Báb, whom he regretted having executed, and that he wished to effect the release of Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí, the Báb's amanuensis, and of Táhirih, as well as the abandonment of further persecution of the Bábis. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 615–16) also reports that Mírzá Áqá Khán-i-Núrí, who assumed the position of Grand Vazír after the forced departure of Mírzá Taqí Khán – and whom he described (pp. 502, 504) as the only minister to advise against the execution of the Báb – was inclined to follow a policy of reconciliation with the Bábis during the first period of his administration, until the attempt, in 1852, on the life of Násiri'd-Dín Sháh. 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 29–30) affirms that the attempt of one Bábí to assassinate the shah was not representative of the wishes of the Bábí community and was moreover due to the ignorance of that individual. Nor was it justified, for the decision to execute the Báb had been taken by Mírzá Taqí Khán alone and without the cognizance of the shah. It should be noted that Táríkh-i-Nabil (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970) was composed circa 1887–92, while 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 was published in Persian in 1890 and in English translation in 1891. Note also that Násiri'd-Dín Sháh did not die until 1896 (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 296; *Webster's Biographical Dictionary*, p. 1084). It seems likely that if the shah had been instrumental in the decision to execute the Báb, the Bahá'í reports to the contrary would have come to the attention of his government and that efforts would have been carried out to correct such a misapprehension.

This story recalls the Book of Esther, in which Haman, the chief minister of King Ahashverosh (Artaxerxes), conspires without the knowledge of His Majesty to bring about the genocide of the Jewish people resident in his realms. In that story, Mordechai advises Esther to inform the King of the impending doom of her entire people, and as a result of this action, the Jewish people are saved, Haman is condemned along with his treacherous associates and Mordechai is appointed chief minister in his place. In this 19th-century story, Mírzá Áqá Khán-i-Núrí (like Mordechai) advised Mírzá Taqí Khán (like Haman) not to carry out a death sentence but he did not go to the shah himself and so the sentence was carried out. Ultimately, though, Mírzá Áqá Khán-i-Núrí replaced Mírzá Taqí Khán as Grand Vazír, and, just like Haman, Mírzá Taqí Khán went to his death by order of his sovereign.

12. Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 391, 402, 428) is also called Sulaymán Khán (*ibid.* pp. 391), Háji Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár (Balyuzi 1973, p. 125), Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár-i-Shahriyári (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 378), and Háji Sulaymán Khán Afshár Sá'in Qal'a Amír al-Umará' (Amanat 1989, pp. 247, 460). He was a son-in-law of Fath 'Alí Sháh, the King of Persia prior to Muhammad Sháh (Amanat 1989, p. 247) and a devoted follower of Siyyid Kázim Rashtí, who had promised that he would meet the Qá'im (Balyuzi 1973, p. 134). He was on such close terms with Siyyid Kázim Rashtí that he was able to effect the marriage of one of his master's daughters with his son, Ridá-Qulí Khán-i-Afshár (Balyuzi 1973, p. 134). After the passing of his master, this Shaykhi chose to follow Háji Muhammad Karím Khán Kirmání instead of the Báb (Balyuzi 1973, p. 134; Amanat 1989, p. 367). Sulaymán Khán met the Báb while on pilgrimage (the Báb, in Mázandarání 1941, p. 271, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 246, n. 240 and p. 247, n. 250; Balyuzi 1973, p. 134). The Báb addressed a letter to Sulaymán Khán, probably during his pilgrimage, listed in Kitáb al-Fihrist (MacEoin 1992, p. 51), and three manuscripts of letters addressed to Sulaymán Khán are extant (MacEoin 1992, pp. 191, 192). Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 235; cited in Balyuzi 1973, pp. 124–5) reports that in the course of his journey from Kulayn to Tabriz, while in the village of Síyáh-Dihán, the Báb was visited by Mullá Iskandar, whom he commissioned to deliver a message to Háji Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár, then in Zanján and preparing to leave for Tehran:

He whose virtues the late siyyid unceasingly extolled, and to the approach of whose Revelation he continually alluded, is now revealed. I am that promised One. Arise and deliver Me from the hand of the oppressor.

Hájí Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár ignored the message. *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (pp. 378, 391, 402, 428) and Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 3, p. 244, cited in *Amanat* 1989, p. 367, n. 193) report in some detail the contribution made by Hájí Sulaymán Khán to the destruction of the Bábís at Shaykh Tabarsí. *Amanat* (p. 399) indicates that Hájí Sulaymán Khán was subsequently sent to Tabriz by Mírzá Taqí Khán as his ‘special envoy and troubleshooter’ to assist Mírzá Hasan Khán (*Amanat* 1989, p. 399), the Vazír Nizám (secretary of the army) of Ádhirbáyján, and the Amír Kabír’s brother and confidant (*Amanat* 1989, p. 398), in effecting the execution of the Báb. Other details pertaining to Hájí Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár can be found in *Amanat* (pp. 246n, 247, 367, 398n, 399). He must not be confused with Hájí Sulaymán Khán, the Bábí, from Tabriz (see note 35 below).

13. Hamzih Mírzá Hishmat al-Dawlih (Balyuzi 1973, pp. 152–3) was also called Navváb Hamzih Mírzá (*Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970, p. 504), and identified as a prince of the Qájár family (*ibid.*; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 25; *Amanat* 1989, p. 398). *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (pp. 504, 506) indicates that Navváb Hamsih Mírzá appointed one of his trusted officers and a mounted escort to accompany the Báb from Chihriq to Tabriz. *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (p. 504) states that Mírzá Taqí Khán, the Grand Vazír, did not disclose the reason why the Báb was being transferred to Tabriz and that the governor of Ádhirbáyján assumed that no harm would come to the Báb. Once the Báb had been delivered to Tabriz and the order for his execution was conveyed to Navváb Hamzih Mírzá, he was unwilling to carry out this order (*Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970, p. 506; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1851, p. 25). *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (p. 506) reports him as having told the Vazír-Nizám, Mírzá Hasan Khán, the brother of the Grand Vazír:

The Amír would do better to entrust me with services of greater merit than the one with which he has now commissioned me. The task I am called upon to perform is a task that only ignoble people would accept. I am neither Ibn-i-Zíyád nor Ibn-i-Sa‘d that he should call upon me to slay an innocent descendant of the Prophet of God.

Shoghi Effendi noted (in *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970, p. 506, n. 2) that Ibn-i-Zíyád and Ibn-i-Sa‘d were ‘persecutors of the descendants of [the Prophet] Muhammad’.

The sentiments of Mírzá Taqí Khán, the Grand Vazír, are further attested to by *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (p. 504), citing a discussion prior to this event with court officials in Tehran. He protested:

Such considerations are wholly irrelevant to the issue with which we are faced. The interests of the State are in jeopardy, and we can in no wise tolerate these periodic upheavals. Was not the Imám Husayn, in view of the paramount necessity for safeguarding the unity of the State, executed by those same persons who had seen him more than once receive marks of exceptional affection from Muhammad, his Grandfather? Did they not in such circumstances refuse to consider the rights which his lineage had conferred upon him?

It is quite extraordinary that Mírzá Taqí Khán should have sought to justify his actions towards the Báb and his followers by referring to the assassination of the Imám Husayn and the suppression of his followers by order of Mu‘áwiya, whom Sunni and Shi‘i Muslims alike consider a usurper of authority and a murderer of innocents. *Nabíl-i-A‘zam* 1970 (p. 506) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 25, 26) state that Hamzih Mírzá explained his reasons for not carrying out the order of execution; that the Vazír-Nizám conveyed this message to the Grand Vazír; and that Mírzá Taqí Khán sent a second order to his brother, directing him to carry out the sentence immediately.

When Hamzih Mírzá would not do so, feigning illness (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 506), Mírzá Hasan Khán took matters into his own hands. For more information about Hamzih Mírzá, Amanat (p. 398, n. 101) recommends that the reader consult Bamdad 1968–74 (pp. 462–8).

14. Áqá Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí, also called ‘Azíz, in this context probably meaning ‘precious, dear’ (Steingass, p. 848), and given this name by the Báb in the Qayyúm al-Asmá’ (sura 79, last verse), according to MacEoin 1992 (p. 204). He served as the principal amanuensis of the Báb, accompanying him to Máh-Kú, Chihríq and Tabriz. According to Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 80) and MacEoin (p. 204), Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí was chosen as one of the Letters of the Living by the Báb. Sources for his life include Ishráq Khávárí 1973–4, vol. 1, (pp. 757–60); Khusraví 1973–4; Mázandarání 1941 (pp. 459–60, 460–1). See notes 15 and 26 for more details of his life.
15. Nicolas calls this disciple of the Báb Mullá Muhammad Yazdí. There is one Bábí by this name, Mullá Muhammad Rawdih-i-Khán-i-Yazdí, who is listed among the Letters of the Living in Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 80) and Balyuzi 1973 (p. 27). Amanat gives this individual’s name as Mullá Muhammad Rawza [Rawdih] Khan Yazdí, and Zakir, and reconstructs some of his actions in relation to the Bábí Cause (pp. 176, 178–9, 286). It is fairly certain, however, that Mullá Muhammad Yazdí was not a constant companion of the Báb. There were two Yazdís who reportedly were companions of the Báb, and these were Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí and his brother Siyyid Hasan-i-Yazdí. Nicolas mentions the first of these and perhaps he simply got the name wrong for the second. Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí joined the Báb in Shiraz shortly before the Báb departed for Isfahan, and the Báb sent him on ahead to join his other disciples in that city (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 192–3). Whether or not his brother accompanied him either to Shiraz or Isfahan is not indicated. Two other disciples who had settled in Shiraz, Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Karím and Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí, were also sent by the Báb to Isfahan at that time (ibid. p. 192). In Isfahan the Báb instructed Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Karím Qazvíní, Shaykh Hasan Zunúzí and Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí to transcribe his writings (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 212). Towards the end of his stay in Isfahan, the Báb sent Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Karím (Qazvíní) and Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí as emissaries to the other Bábís in that city to advise them to scatter throughout the region (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 214). The Báb then instructed Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí to proceed to Kashán, where they met shortly after the Báb’s arrival there, on his way to Máh-Kú (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 219). Two days after the Báb arrived in Kulayn, he was joined by Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí, his brother Siyyid Hasan-i-Yazdí, Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Karím (Qazvíní) and Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 227). Nabíl-i-A‘zam (p. 243) records a conversation between the Báb and Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí in Tabriz while on his way to Máh-Kú and it is apparent from the context of this conversation that at least this one of two brothers was in the immediate company of the Báb at that time. Siyyid Husayn reports the transition to Máh-Kú: ‘. . . orders were issued to transfer Him and me to the castle of Máh-Kú and to deliver us into the custody of ‘Alí-Khán-i-Máh-Kú’í’ (ibid.). Then Siyyid Husayn describes their residence in Máh-Kú:

For the first two weeks, no one was permitted to visit the Báb. My brother and I alone were admitted to His presence. Siyyid Hasan would, every day, accompanied by one of the guards, descend to the town and purchase our daily necessities. Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí, who had arrived at in Máh-Kú, spent the nights in a masjid outside the gate of the town. He acted as an intermediary between those of the followers of the Báb who occasionally visited Máh-Kú and Siyyid Hasan, my brother, who would in turn submit the petitions of the believers to their Master and would acquaint Shaykh Hasan with His reply (Nabíl-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 245).



At one point the warden of the fortress in Máh-Kú, 'Alí Khán, dreamed a dream, and upon waking he permitted other Bábís to visit the Báb, but Nabil-i-A'zam asserts (p. 257), 'Until that time no one of the disciples of the Báb but Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí and his brother had been allowed to spend the night within the castle.' From Máh-Kú the Báb went to Tabriz and was then sent to Chihríq. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 302–3) writes that at Chihríq, 'To no one would Yahyá Khán refuse admittance to the castle. As Chihríq itself was unable to accommodate the increasing number of visitors who flocked to its gates, they were enabled to obtain the necessary lodgings in Iski-Shahr, the old Chihríq, which was situated at an hour's distance from the castle.' Up until sometime in Dhu'l-Qa'dih 1265, the Báb was attended in Chihríq by Siyyid Hasan-i-Yazdí along with his brother, the Báb's amanuensis, Siyyid Husayn. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 431) informs us that the Báb sent out 'Mullá Ádí Guzal, one of the believers of Marághih, who for the last two months had been acting as His attendant instead of Siyyid Hasan, the brother of Siyyid Husayn-i-'Azíz', to make a pilgrimage to Shaykh Tabarsí on his behalf. Gulpáygání (p. 241, cited in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 431, n. 3) identifies the full name of this Bábí as Mirzá 'Alíy-i-Sayyáh-i-Marághih'í. 'He had acted as a servant of the Báb in Máh-Kú, ranked among His leading companions, and subsequently embraced the Message of Bahá'u'lláh.' It appears, then, that Siyyid Hasan-i-Yazdí was no longer a companion of the Báb from Dhu'l-Qa'dih 1265, as there is no mention of him accompanying the Báb to Tabriz.

Finally, the Báb was summoned to Tabriz, where the officer who had escorted him, Navváb Hamzih Mirzá, 'instructed one of his friends to accommodate Him in his home and to treat Him with extreme deference' (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 506). Mirzá Hasan Khán, the Vazír-Nizám and brother of the Grand Vazír, arrived shortly thereafter and ordered the transfer of the Báb 'and those in His company from the house in which He was staying to one of the rooms of the barracks' (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 506–7). 'Deprived of His turban and sash, the twin emblems of His noble lineage, the Báb, together with Siyyid Husayn, His amanuensis, was driven to yet another confinement . . .' (ibid. p. 507). He was engaged in a conversation with Siyyid Husayn in that very barracks when it was interrupted and he was taken to the place of execution. When the first volley failed to touch him, the Báb was found 'seated in the same room which He had occupied the night before, engaged in completing His interrupted conversation, with Siyyid Husayn' (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 513). For the last time, the Báb and Siyyid Husayn were together in the flesh. Nabil-i-A'zam reiterates that Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí was 'the Báb's amanuensis both in Máh-Kú and Chihríq' (p. 629) and reports his imprisonment in the Síyáh-Chál in Tehran (pp. 629–30) and that he was joined in that prison by his 'Comforter', Bahá'u'lláh, in whose company he 'was privileged to remain until the hour of his death' (p. 631), which took place, in 1852, at the hands of the executioner of Táhirih, 'Azíz Khán-i-Sardár.

It is evident from this survey of the companions of the Báb that Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí accompanied him virtually non-stop from his departure from Shiraz to the time of his death in Tabriz, and that Siyyid Hasan-i-Yazdí was also in his company for most of that period. There were other close companions of the Báb, including Mullá 'Abdu'l-Karím Qazvíní and Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí, but none were as constantly in the company of the Báb as the two brothers from Yazd.

16. Neither Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 nor 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 refer to a second gathering of the ulama of Tabriz and this seems to confirm Nicolas's allegation. Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 509) reports that Mirzá Muhammad-'Alí (see note 15 above) was summoned before a group of mujtahidún, who unsuccessfully tried to persuade him to renounce his ties with the Báb. Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 510) also states that the Báb was conducted first to the house of Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání, then to that of Mirzá Báqir and finally to that of Mullá Murtadá-Qulí, and that none of these three mujtahidún consented to



meet the Báb face to face, although all three handed death warrants to the government authorities who were charged with carrying out the execution. This version of the events of that morning is also found in Balyuzi 1973 (pp. 155–6). Amanat 1989 (p. 398) indicates that the ulama of Tabriz were reluctant to associate themselves with this execution. Mu‘in (pp. 303–4) refers to a threatening message allegedly sent to the ulama of Tabriz by the Vazír-Nizám, warning them of the Grand Vazír’s wrath should they refuse to sign death warrants for the Báb (cited in Amanat 1989, p. 398, n. 102).

Mu‘in (p. 305, cited in *ibid.* p. 399, n. 104) indicates that Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání was reluctant to sign a death warrant. Muhammad Taqí, who was an eyewitness to his father’s last meeting with the Báb, writes in his *Risála* (mentioned in Amanat 1989, p. 399, n. 105; p. 400, n. 106, 107) that Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání tried to persuade the Báb to renounce his claims but that the Báb firmly refused to do so (Za‘ím al-Dawlih 1903, pp. 233–5 (cited in Amanat 1989, p. 400, n. 107)), on the authority of his grandfather, Mullá Muhammad Ja‘far and his father, Mullá Muhammad Taqí, both of whom he alleges to have been present on this occasion, gives similar testimony to the *Risála* of Muhammad Taqí. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 26) states that the *farrásh-báshí* (chief of police) delivered the Báb and Anís over to the chosen executioner, with the death warrants of Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání, Mullá Mírzá Báqir, Mullá Murtadá-Qulí and others. Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 510) says the same but mentions only three death warrants. The actual content of these death warrants is described by Mu‘in (vol. 1, p. 241), two different versions, according to Amanat 1989 (p. 400, n. 108).

Amanat 1989 (p. 398, n. 101) indicates that inasmuch as he was unable to bring together the clergy, Hamzih Mírzá summoned a small gathering of state officials to examine the Báb. Present at this examination, besides Hamzih Mírzá, were Mírzá ‘Alí Khán and Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár (Amanat 1989, p. 398, n. 101). Nicolas, citing no source, includes the Vazír-Nizám, Mírzá Hasan Khán, in this meeting, and does not mention the presence of Hájí Sulaymán Khán.

17. Mírzá Hasan Khán Vazír-Nizám was the secretary of the army in Ádhirbáyján and the brother of Mírzá Taqí Khán, the Grand Vazír, also known as Amír Kabír. The fate of Mírzá Hasan Khán subsequent to the execution of the Báb is not mentioned in any of the sources consulted for this study.
18. Hájí Mírzá ‘Alí is also called Mírzá ‘Alí Khán Ansárí, the son of Mírzá Mas‘ud, and is named as having carried out the examination of the Báb before the state officials (Amanat 1989, p. 398, n. 101). Nothing more is said about this individual in any of the sources.
19. According to Amanat 1989 (p. 398, n. 101 and references), there is disagreement among those present regarding the quality of the verses revealed by the Báb.
20. Here it is reported that the Báb cannot reveal the same verses twice on the subject of crystal candlesticks, while in chapter 4 of Nicolas’s book the Báb is asked to reveal verses on the subject of his cane and then is told that his audience cannot understand his verses. In both cases it is clear that the examiners are toying with the Báb, not taking his claim to divine inspiration at all seriously, nor comparing his verses with the only other revealed verses in their possession, namely, those of the Qur’án. The Prophet Muhammad is not reported to have revealed the same verses a second time upon demand, nor is it alleged that all the verses of the Qur’án are readily understood by its readers. Indeed, the Qur’án in Surat al-‘Imrán states, as a matter of principle (Q 3:7):

He it is who has revealed the Book to you; some of its verses are unambiguous (*muhkamátun*), they are the basis of the Book, and others are figurative (*mutashábihátun*). So that those in whose hearts is perversity will follow that part of it

which is figurative, seeking to mislead others and to give it [their own] interpretation. However none knows its interpretation except God, and those who are firmly rooted in knowledge.

This theme is referred to with specific reference to this Quranic passage by the Báb in *Dalá'il-i-sab'ih* and by Bahá'u'lláh in the *Kitáb-i-Íqán*.

21. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 502) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 26) alike affirm that Mirzá Taqí Khán intended that the Báb be given a public execution. The specifics of the manner in which this execution would be carried out may have been left to Mirzá Hasan Khán and his associates.
22. Hájí Mirzá Bâqir, also called Mirzá Bâqir (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 510), Mullá Mirzá Bâqir ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 26), and Mullá Muhammad Bâqir the Imám Jum'ih (Amanat 1989, p. 398), was the son of Mirzá Ahmad (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 510; Amanat 1989, p. 398), the Imám Jum'ih of Tabriz who participated in the first examination of the Báb ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 14) and signed a death warrant for the Báb at that time (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 510). Mirzá Ahmad had died in 1265/1849 (Amanat 1989, p. 398, n. 99 and references) and it is indicated that Hájí Mirzá Bâqir was one of the ulama of Tabriz who were reluctant to involve themselves in the condemnation and execution of the Báb. Amanat (p. 399, n. 103) indicates that there is some disagreement among the sources (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 509–10; Sipih 1965, vol. 3, p. 304; Mázandarání 1941, p. 9; Mu'in, pp. 300–1) regarding the signatories of the fatwa calling for the execution of the Báb but all of these sources seem to indicate that Hájí Mirzá Bâqir Imám Jum'ih was one of the signatories. Balyuzi 1973 (p. 155) likewise lists him as one of the three clergymen who signed the death warrant for the Báb: 1) Hájí Mirzá Bâqir, the Imám Jum'ih of Tabriz, is not to be confused with 2) Hájí Siyyid Muhammad-Bâqir-i-Rashtí, known as Harati (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 19, 97, 264), also called Mullá Muhammad Taqí Harati (Amanat 1989, pp. 61, 158n, 262, 264–6, 283–4); nor with 3) Mullá Muhammad Bâqir-i-Tabrizí (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 50–5, 63, 69), also called Mullá Bâqir-i-Tabrizí (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 368, 504–5), and named one of the Letters of the Living (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 80, 368, 504); nor with 4) Muhammad Bâqir, the nephew of Mullá Husayn Bushrú'í and one of the Letters of the Living (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 80), also called Mullá Bâqir (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 287, 683); nor with 5) Mullá Bâqir, the Imam of Chinár-Súkhtih (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 476); nor, finally, with 6) Muhammad-Bâqir, the son of Zaynu'l-'Abidin, the fifth Imam of the Ithná 'Ashari Shi'a ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, note O, pp. 296–8; cited in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. lii).
23. Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání, described by Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 316) as a 'one-eyed and white-bearded renegade' and by 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 26) as a 'learned divine', was a Shaykhi mujtahid (Amanat 1989, p. 39, n. 18) and one of the students of Shaykh Ahmad Ahsá'í who were reportedly envious of the attention he paid to Siyyid Kázim Rashtí, his subsequent appointment as the leader of the Shaykhi school (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 11). Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání was one of the claimants to the leadership of the Shaykhis after the passing of Siyyid Kázim Rashtí according to Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 9; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 285, n. 207). Mu'in (p. 299, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 285, n. 208) reports that Mullá Mámáqání tried to preserve Shaykhism as a sect with only minor differences from the Úsulís and hence comfortably within the fold of Ithna 'Ashari Shi'i Islam. Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání was a participant in the Tabriz trial of the Báb (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 316–20; 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 14; Balyuzi 1973, pp. 140–4) and his memories of the trial of the Báb were preserved by his son, Shaykh Muhammad Taqí Mámáqání in a *Risálá* which is cited in part in Murtadá Mudarrisí Chahárdihí, *Shaykígarí va Bábígarí az Nazhar-i Falsafa, Tárikh Ijtímá'* (pp. 308–15, cited in Amanat 1989, pp. 386–9). Mullá Muhammad Taqí Mámáqání claimed that the official report of this trial, penned

- by Hájí Mírzá Mahmúd, the Nizámu'l-'Ulama', was replete with misrepresentations (Balyuzi 1973, p. 143), and he wrote a refutation of those points. Apparently, and perhaps in reaction to the widespread dissemination of the Shaykh's *Risála*, Mullá Hájí Mírzá Mahmúd tried to recall all copies of his tract and destroyed those he could retrieve (Balyuzi 1973, p. 143). Mámáqání claimed that his report was the most accurate and reliable (Amanat 1989, p. 389, n. 69), in comparison with the official chronicles of Mírzá Muhammad Taqí Sipíhr, *Násikhu't-Tavárikh*, Ridá Qulí Khán Hidáyat, Lálá-báshí, *Rawdat al-Safá-yi Násiri*. A detailed comparison of the various accounts has not yet been effected. Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání was, according to various accounts, one of the mujtahids who wrote a fatwa condemning the Báb of heresy and sentencing him to death (Balyuzi 1973, p. 155); the most prominent of the three leading mujtahids who wrote that fatwa ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 26; Amanat 1989, p. 399); and the first of the mujtahids to be approached for his fatwa by the farrásh-báshí on the day of the Báb's execution (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, p. 510).
24. Siyyid 'Alí Zunúzí was a well-known mujtahid in Tabriz (Amanat 1989, p. 401), and Nicolas follows Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 3, p. 304, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 399, n. 103) in numbering him among the mujtahidún who delivered a fatwa condemning the Báb to death. Amanat (p. 399, n. 103) calls this 'an obvious error'. His stepson was none other than Muhammad-'Alí (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, p. 507), also called Muhammad-'Alíy-i-Zunúzí (ibid. p. 306), Mírzá Muhammad-'Alíy-i-Zunúzí (ibid. p. 507), Áqá Muhammad-'Alí ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 26), and Mírzá Muhammad-'Alí (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 508, 509, 512), and was surnamed Anís (ibid. p. 306). Very little is known about Anís except that his stepfather, Siyyid 'Alíy-i-Zunúzí (ibid. pp. 306, 509; cited in Balyuzi 1973, p. 153) locked him into his home, refusing to allow him to join the Báb at Chihriq (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 306–7; Balyuzi 1973, p. 153). It is also reported that the Báb assured Anís, in a vision which he related to Shaykh Hasan-i-Zunúzí, a relative and one of the amanuenses and companions of the Báb, that he would be granted the privilege of sharing his master's martyrdom (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 307–8; cited in Balyuzi 1973, pp. 153–4). There are reports in Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 509), Balyuzi 1973 (p. 156) and Amanat 1989 (p. 401) to the effect that attempts were made to persuade Anís to retract his confession of faith in the Báb's claims but to no avail. Amanat 1989 (p. 401, n. 111) cites Avarih (vol. 1, p. 240) and Mázandarání 1941 (pp. 31–7), both of which claim to be accounts of an exchange between Anís and a Shaykhí mulla seeking to elicit his return to Islam. Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 509–10) reports a brief exchange between Anís and Mullá Muhammad Mámáqání, among others, and it is worth noting that Mámáqání was regarded as perhaps the leading Shaykhí 'Alím in Tabriz.
  25. The humiliating removal of the Báb's turban and sash, the twin emblems of the 'siyyid' (descendant of the Prophet Muhammad) is reported in Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 507) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 26), as well as Balyuzi 1973 (p. 153) and Amanat 1989 (p. 402). He was conducted around the city and through the bazaar before being brought to the square for his execution in order to demonstrate the government's full control of the situation (Amanat 1989, p. 402). This whole scene evokes many similar images of the public humiliation – the parade through the city streets and the open air – of Jesus of Nazareth, as depicted in the Gospels.
  26. Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí, the amanuensis of the Báb, held his last earthly conversation with his master in the prison cell adjoining the place of the Báb's martyrdom, between the firings of the two regiments (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 513–14; 'Abdu'l-Bahá, p. 27). He was the Báb's amanuensis in both Máh-Kú and Chihriq (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, p. 629) and was imprisoned with Bahá'u'lláh in the Síyáh-Chál (ibid. pp. 629–30) until his death in 1852 at the hand of Táhirih's executioner, 'Aziz Khán-i-Sardár. According to MacEoin 1992 (pp. 13, 84, 182), a manuscript copy of the Bayán-i-fársi in the hand of

Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí is preserved at the Bahá'í International Archives in Haifa. Also in the handwriting of this amanuensis are 27 folios of the *Kitáb al-Asmá'* in the same location (ibid. p. 188) and six examples of letters reproduced in facsimile in the Azalí compilation entitled *Qismatí az alwah-i-khatt-i-Nuqta-yi-Úlá wa Siyyid Husayn-i-Kátib* (ibid. pp. 204, 254). The authenticity (and authorship) of the letters in this collection has yet to be independently confirmed. There is another trace of his influence which has been discovered, and a very interesting one at that. E.G. Browne (in Appendix 2 to *Tárikh-i-Jadíd* 1893, pp. 395–6; cited in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, p. 518, n. 1) quoted Háji Mirzá Jání Kashání to the effect that Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí, whom he calls Áqá Siyyid Muhammad-Husayn, gave some of the writings of the Báb to the Russian consul at Tabriz (presumably Anitchkov, according to Amanat 1989, p. 381, n. 35), who came to ask Siyyid Husayn about the Báb shortly after his martyrdom. Browne indicates that this story is confirmed by the testimony of Bernard Dorn ('Bulletin de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg', vol. 8, p. 248), who, in describing a manuscript of one of the Báb's works in the possession of the Academie, indicates that it was 'received directly from the Báb's own secretary, who, during his imprisonment at Tabriz, placed it in European hands'. Amanat 1989 (p. 381, n. 35) notes that this interview is also found in *Kitáb-i-Nuqtatu'l-Káf* (p. 267), and Momen 1981 (p. 48).

Inasmuch as Siyyid Husayn was imprisoned shortly after the Báb's execution, it appears that the government authorities were not convinced by Siyyid Husayn's feigned repudiation of the Báb just prior to his martyrdom, an act which had been enjoined upon him by the Báb himself according to Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 508) and Mázandarání 1941 (p. 460, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 381, n. 35). Two years later, immediately following the attempt on the life of Násiri'd-Dín Sháh in 1852, Siyyid Husayn was imprisoned in the Sáyáh-Chál with Bahá'u'lláh until his execution (Nabil-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 629–31). Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 631) indicates that Siyyid Husayn was comforted in his separation from the Báb by Bahá'u'lláh, 'One who alone could banish, by the light of His presence, the anguish that had settled upon his soul'. Whether this indicates that Siyyid Husayn recognized the prophetic station of Bahá'u'lláh is not evident from this passage.

27. The attempts to persuade Mirzá Muhammad-'Alí (Anís) from his Bábí convictions are described in note 24 above. No mention is made in any of the Persian sources, however, to the pleas of this young man's wife and children. However, given the young age at which Persians were customarily married at this time, it is not improbable that he was married and had little children.
28. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 511–14) indicates that Sám Khán and his men were designated the first executioners of the Báb. 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 26–7) indicates the same, identifying Sám Khán as a colonel and his men as the Christian regiment of Urúmiyyih. Mu'in (p. 306, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 117) states that Sám Khán, better known as Sám Khán Urus, was a convert to Islam. This is clearly not reflected in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 or 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980. Perhaps he became a convert to Islam after the execution of the Báb? Hidáyat 1959–60 (vol. 10, pp. 210, 329, 416–22; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 117) reported that the Bahaduran regiment participated in all the major campaigns of Muhammad Sháh's reign under Sám Khán's leadership. Za'im al-Dawla 1903 (p. 238; cited in Amanat 1989, p. 402, n. 116) indicates there were three regiments present at the place of execution and that Áqá Ján Bag Khamsih, the leader of the Násirí regiment refused, so the Bahaduran regiment was chosen. He indicates that *Kitáb-i-Nuqtatu'l-Káf* (p. 249; cited in ibid.) seems to confirm this report. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 state that Sám Khán and his men were selected first. Nabil-i-A'zam (p. 514) indicates that upon the failure of the Bahaduran regiment to injure, let alone kill the two condemned ones, Sám Khán was excused and Áqá Ján Khán-i-Khamsih, colonel of the bodyguard, known as the

Khamsih or Násirí regiment, carried out the execution. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27) indicates the same, naming the colonel of the bodyguard as Áqá Ján Big-i-Khamsih.

29. Amanat 1989 (p. 403) has translated this passage from Sipihr 1965 (vol. 3, p. 305, cited in *ibid.* n. 122) and it is reproduced here in full for the convenience of the reader (the words in brackets are supplied by Amanat in order to assist reading comprehension):

[His] escape [to one of the rooms in the barracks] was a demonstration of the might of the [Islamic] shari‘a since at that time when the bullets hit the rope and he was set free, if he exposed his bosom and cried out: ‘O ye the soldiers and the people, didst thou not see my miracle that of a thousand bullets not even one hit me but instead untied my bonds’, then no one would have fired a shot at him any more and surely the men and women in the barracks would have assembled around him and a riot would have broken out. It was God’s will that the truth should be distinguished from falsehood and doubt and uncertainty be removed from among the people.

30. The author of the *Kitáb al-Mutanabbi’in* is ‘Alí-Qulí Mírzá, I’tidád al-Saltanih. Not to be confused with Muhammad Hasan Khán, Saní‘ud-Dawlih, I’timád al-Saltanih Marághiyí. See note 34 for details related to the latter author. MacEoin 1992 (p. 253) indicates that part of the *Kitáb al-Mutanabbi’in* is incorporated in *Fitna-yi Báb* by ‘Abdu’l-Husayn Navá‘í, who also wrote an article entitled ‘Siyyid ‘Alí Muhammad Báb va Kitáb al-Mutanabbi’in-i-I’tidád al-Saltanih’ (*Yaghma*, vol. 3).
31. Dr Firuz Kazemzadeh and his father Kazem Kazemzadeh compiled various eyewitness accounts of this event, some of them being translated for the first time from Persian and Russian, in Kazemzadeh 1973. According to Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 513) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27), Mírzá Muhammad-‘Alí (Anís) was untouched by the shots fired by the Bahaduran regiment. This seems to be confirmed by Kazem-Beg (translated from the Russian of *Bab i babidy* by Kazem Kazemzadeh in Kazemzadeh 1973). Justin Sheil’s Foreign Office report to Lord Palmerston, cited by Balyuzi 1973 (p. 202) and by Momen 1981 (p. 78) does not make any mention of Mírzá Muhammad-‘Alí (Anís) in connection with the martyrdom of the Báb. Neither does Clement Huart, the French Orientalist, in *La Religion du Bab* (pp. 3–4; cited in Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 513, n. 1). Sipihr 1965 (p. 305, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 403, n. 120; and translated by Dr Firuz Kazemzadeh for Kazemzadeh 1973) reports that Anís was killed in the first attempt and this is repeated by Gobineau (translated by Kazem Kazemzadeh in *ibid.*) and Za‘im al-Dawlah 1903 (translated by Dr Firuz Kazemzadeh in *ibid.*). Owing to the similarity of their accounts, it seems that both Gobineau and Za‘im al-Dawla 1903 based their descriptions of this event on Sipihr, and hence should not be taken as independent sources. A conversation between George Latimer and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá on 19 November 1919 seems to confirm Sipihr 1965 in this regard (Latimer 1920, p. 70):

Mr Latimer: ‘Was the Babi, Aga Mohammed Ali, who was martyred with the BAB, killed with the first volley or the second?’

Abdul Baha: ‘With the first one he was killed. He was mutilated. But the body of His Holiness the BAB was not hit by the first discharge.’

However, this conversation was not confirmed either in substance or wording by ‘Abdu’l-Bahá and it is possible that Latimer or his translator may have misunderstood his meaning.

Kazem-Beg stated that after the first attempt, the ‘Christian soldiers immediately ran and showed the people the ropes severed by bullets; the criminal was again tied; Áqá Muhammad-‘Alí was shot first, then the Báb’ (Kazem-Beg, in Kazemzadeh 1973). This seems to suggest that neither Áqá Muhammad-‘Alí nor the Báb was struck by the first attempt, made by the Christian regiment, but that in the second attempt



first Áqá Muhammad-‘Alí was struck and then the Báb. Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 512) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (pp. 43–4) state that the regiment consisted of three files of soldiers, each of 250 soldiers (Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970), and that each file was ordered to fire a volley of shots in its turn. Perhaps the attempt by the Christian regiment, after firing three volleys, did not injure either Áqá Muhammad-‘Alí or the Báb but severed the ropes that secured the Báb, resulting in his seemingly miraculous disappearance from the scene. Once the next regiment was summoned to make a second attempt at this public execution, perhaps Áqá Muhammad-‘Alí was hit by the first file of soldiers and the Báb by the second or third, and hence after him. This might explain this difference among the various accounts.

While Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 512) and Balyuzi 1973 (p. 157) report that the regiment consisted of 750 men and that they fired in three volleys, one row at a time, Amanat 1989 (p. 403) states only that there were three volleys. Hence, it seems that I‘tidád, here reported by Nicolas to have cited one thousand shots, is exaggerating the number of bullets fired during the first attempt to execute the Báb and his companion.

32. While one source says the Báb ‘ran away’ and accuses him of cowardice, and Sipih 1965 (cited in Amanat 1989), Gobineu (translated by Kazem Kazemzadeh in Kazemzadeh 1973) and Za‘im al-Dawla 1903 agree with this source, Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 513) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27) indicate that after his disappearance from the place of execution, the Báb was found in the cell he had occupied earlier and in the company of Siyyid Husayn-i-Yazdí. Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 513–14) reports that the farrásh-báshí who was in charge of finding the Báb and returning him to the place of execution was so shaken by these events that he resigned his post and left the scene; Nabil-i-A‘zam further indicates that the farrásh-báshí told this story to his neighbour, Mírzá Siyyid Muhsin, who was immediately converted to the Bábí Cause and who later showed Nabil-i-Zarandí the exact location of the room where the Báb was found and the nail from which he was suspended during the execution. Amanat 1989 (p. 403, n. 121) cites a report – without identifying the source – that a Muslim army sergeant, Ghuj ‘Alí Sultán, retrieved the Báb, struck him in the face and dragged him back to the firing squad. In Sipih 1965 (cited in Amanat 1989), Quch-‘Alí Sultán is described as ‘having hit him several times on the back of his head, returned him to the place of execution’. The same account is found almost word for word in Za‘im al-Dawlah 1903. Gobineau (in Kazemzadeh 1973) states that once freed of his bonds by the first attempt on his life, the Bab ‘fell on his feet, quickly rose and sought to flee; then, all of a sudden seeing a guardhouse, he ran into it . . . when the Báb had entered the guard-room, an infantry captain, or Sultán, by the name of Quch-‘Alí came in after him and cut him down with his sabre. The Báb fell without saying a word; then the soldiers, seeing him in a pool of blood, approached and ended his life with their rifles at point-blank range.’ It thus appears that Amanat could have derived his information from any one of these sources.

Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 514) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27) insist that the Muslim regiment led by Áqá Ján of Khamsih stepped in to carry out the death sentence against the Báb. Nabil-i-A‘zam (p. 525) seems to have kept track of this Muslim regiment: he indicates that during the year 1266/1850, one third of the regiment died in an earthquake and that three years later the remaining five hundred mutinied and were mercilessly shot by order of Mírzá Sádiq Khán-i-Núrí.

33. See note 3 above for a detailed consideration of the date of the Báb’s execution.
34. *Mir‘at al-Buldan*, a work in several volumes (Khazeh Fananapazir, email 14/1/02) was written by Muhammad Hasan Khán (Fananapazir; and J.R.I. Cole, email 14/1/02), known as I‘timád al-Saltanih (Cole) and as Saní‘ud-Dawlih, I‘timád al-Saltanih Marághiyí (Fananapazir). Cole points out that the author died in 1896 and he refers to the publication of his history in Tehran by Nashr-i-Asfar, with the first



volume dated 1364/1985. Fananapazir points out that the author of this history was the son of Hájibu'd-Dawlih Hájí 'Alí Khán Marághiyí, 'a cruel persecutor of the Bábís' and that his son, 'the author, was fair in description of geography, etc. but not in matters related to the [Bábí] Cause'. MacEoin 1992 (p. 252) cites *Kitáb al-ma'áthir wa'l-áthár* (Tehran, 1306/1888–9) by the same author.

35. There are two individuals named Hájí Sulaymán Khán who were directly associated with the Bábís during this period. Ridá-Qulí Khán-i-Afshár converted to the Bábí Cause (Mu'in, pp. 173–6, cited in Amanat 1989, p. 367, n. 194) and was apparently deprived of his family estate at Sá'in Qal'a by his anti-Bábí father, Hájí Sulaymán Khán-i-Afshár (see note 4 above). On the other hand, there is another Hájí Sulaymán Khán, a fervent and active Bábí, who is referred to in the context of the safeguarding of the Báb's body, in Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 518–20) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 28). When the body was retrieved from the street, it was first brought, according to Afnan 2000 (p. 408), to the house of Mírzá Hasan Vazír, the son-in-law of Hájí Mírzá 'Alí Tafrishí (Faydí 1973, p. 357), known as Majd al-Ashráf. From there the body was transported to Tehran by Hájí Sulaymán Khán, according to various accounts.

In a conversation between George Latimer and 'Abdu'l-Bahá on 19 November 1919, we find the following report (Latimer 1920, p. 70):

Then Mr Latimer asked about the taking of the body of the BAB to Teheran.

Abdul Baha: 'It is just as it is written in the Traveller's Narrative. Read it in the Traveller's Narrative. It is the same. All the other accounts are without foundation. Suleyman Khan, the martyr, brought His Blessed Body to Teheran.'

Actually, *Traveller's Narrative*" (that is, 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1891) does not state that the body of the Báb was brought to Tehran by Sulaymán Khán. It only states ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 28) that he retrieved the body of the Báb, placed it in a box and sent it away from Adhírbáyján according to instructions from Tehran. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 519) tells a similar story, indicating that Sulaymán Khán had the Báb's body retrieved, placed in a box and transferred 'to a place of safety'. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 521) does not report who delivered the body of the Báb to Tehran but he does state that he was in Tehran at the time and that the remains were transferred by Áqáy-i-Kalím and Mírzá Ahmad 'from the Imám-Zádih-Hasan, where they were first taken, to a place the site of which remained unknown to anyone excepting themselves'. Balyuzi 1973 (pp. 159–60) seems to rely on Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1891, and does not clarify this matter. It would seem that 'Abdu'l-Bahá's words, cited above, are the only definite account we have of who was responsible for transferring the body of the Báb from Tabriz to Tehran. Shoghi Effendi 1995 (pp. 273–4) states that, according to Bahá'u'lláh's instructions, the remains of the Báb were 'transported to Tíhrán and placed in the shrine of Imám-Zádih Hasan. They were later removed to the residence of Hájí Sulaymán Khán himself in the Sar-Chashmih quarter of the city, and from his house were taken to the shrine of Imám-Zádih Ma'súm, where they remained concealed until the year 1284 AH (1867–1868) . . .'. This would seem to explain Nabil-i-A'zam's omission of the name of Hájí Sulaymán Khán with regard to the process of the actual transfer of the Báb's body from Tabriz to Tehran – it was intended that this process be secret so that enemies of the Bábís (and later of the Bahá'ís) would be incapable of seizing the sacred relic. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 610–11, 613–19) makes copious reference to the martyrdom of Sulaymán Khán, and other sources cited by Amanat 1989 (p. 367, n. 189) include Sipíhr 1965 (vol. 4, p. 42), Mázandarání 1941 (p. 26n), Browne in *Tárikh-i-Jadíd* 1893 (pp. 330–1), Momen 1981 (pp. 128–46), and *Vaqayi' Ittifaqiya* (no. 82). Sepehr Manuchehri has indicated that Mázandarání 1941 (vols. 3 and 4) contains much material on Hájí Mírzá Sulaymán Khán, the Bábí, and on the transfer of the Báb's remains from Tabriz to Haifa. According to Manuchehri,

Mázandarání 1941 categorically denies that the Bábís intended to ‘wage battle if necessary’ in order to retrieve the body of the Báb. Instead, the Bábís sent two or three persons who pretended to be ‘mentally disturbed’ to the vicinity of the site. They were instructed not to leave the site under any circumstances. Bábí women were directed to bring them food and water. They were to remain there and attempt to smuggle the body out at a suitable time.

36. Hájí Mihdi Khán, the Kalantar (mayor) of Tabriz, was a long-standing friend of Hájí Sulaymán Khán (Balyuzi 1973, p. 159). Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 519) calls the Kalantar a dervish and a member of the Sufi community, while ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980 (p. 28) states that he was ‘of the mystic temperament and did not entertain aversion or dislike for any sect’ – important indications, inasmuch as Hájí Mírzá Áqásí and Muhammad Sháh were also Sufis, if clearly of a different stripe. The Kalantar arranged for Hájí Alláh-Yár (Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, p. 519; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 28), a private servant of the mayor (‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 28), known for his exploits (Balyuzi 1973, p. 159) to recover the bodies of Anís and the Báb. These were delivered to Hájí Sulaymán Khán on the second night after the Báb’s death (Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970, pp. 518, 519; ‘Abdu’l-Bahá 1980, p. 27), at midnight. Both Nabil-i-A‘zam (p. 518) and ‘Abdu’l-Bahá (p. 27) report that an official of the Russian consulate sent an artist to draw a sketch of the two bodies as they lay at the edge of the moat before they were recovered by the Bábís. Nabil-i-A‘zam (p. 518) received his report from Hájí ‘Alí-Askar, a relative of an official of the Russian consulate, who showed him that sketch ‘on the very same day it was drawn’.

It was such a faithful portrait of the Báb that I looked upon! No bullet had struck His forehead, His cheeks, or His lips. I gazed upon a smile which seemed to be still lingering upon His countenance. His body, however, had been severely mutilated. I could recognize the arms and head of His companion, who seemed to be holding Him in his embrace. As I gazed horror-struck upon that haunting picture, and saw how those noble traits had been disfigured, my heart sank within me.

This sketch was thought to be lost until the Armenian author Atrpet Sargis Mubagajian published numerous photographs of early Bábís and some allegedly of the Báb in the second half of his *Imámat* 1909, entitled ‘Bábíty I Bekhaiti’ (pp. 87–208). Denis MacEoin, who inspected this volume himself and who was familiar with authenticated pictures of the Báb, wrote in his bibliography of Bahá’í literature, in which we find Atrpet’s work cited, that ‘none of which [photographs] appear to be in the least authentic’. This assessment is confirmed by an Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Universal House of Justice to look into this question, replying on 20 March 1983 to a letter of Robert Stauffer dated 9 February 1983 asking about these pictures:

In an early sketch of Atrpet Sargis Mubagajian’s sources of information for his book ‘Bábízm i Bekhaizm’, a report was found among the documents filed by Shoghi Effendi indicating that Mubagajian went to Tabriz to investigate the Bahá’í Faith. He, unfortunately, met with Jalil Mishkar Khú’í, a Covenant-breaker, and received his information from this man. What Mubagajian was told, particularly about the period after Bahá’u’lláh, was grossly incorrect. Jalil also sold Mubagajian other pictures and portraits which later appeared in the book. The report further states that the portraits identified as those of Bahá’u’lláh, the Báb and Táhirih are obviously forged. However, the drawing made of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá in his youth bears, of course, a great resemblance to the original picture.

Ismael Velasco (email 16/1/02) reported that ‘Bahiyiyh Nakhjavani and Bill Collins have done some research into this at the [Bahá’í] World Centre. It seems the portrait [found in Atrpet’s book] that was purportedly drawn by an artist who had been brought by the Russian consul to the spot where the bodies [of the Báb and Anís] were thrown

the day after the Báb's martyrdom may not be authentic. Bill Collins wrote:

"I served at the Bahá'í World Centre Library for thirteen years, and on a number of occasions, I was presented with difficult problems of identification. One of these problems had to do with a supposed sketch of the Báb's body that appeared in a Russian article. We could find no historical evidence that this sketch was anything other than the author's imagination. Yet there were people who criticized the finding that this was almost certainly not drawn at the time the Báb's body was thrown by His enemies beside the moat in Tabriz."

It appears then that the original sketch of the Báb after his martyrdom has not been found and that the pictures found in Artpet's book are forgeries.

37. Mullá Muhammad-'Alí-i-Zanjání was named Hujjat-i-Zanjání by the Báb (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 178, 529, 683) and was also called simply Hujjat (Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, pp. 531–80). Nicolas has confused him with Muhammad-'Alí Zunúzi of Tabriz, named Anís, who was the Báb's companion in death. Nicolas's source for this mis-information would appear to be Mírzá Yahyá, as he quotes him to this effect (cited in note 41 below). Nicolas claims that the body of the Báb's companion was buried while that of the Báb himself was shrouded in a box and hidden in a house. Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 519) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 27) affirm that the bodies of both these martyrs, the Báb and Anís, were carried away by the Bábís, and Nabíl-i-A'zam (p. 519) indicates that both were laid in a single casket. This is confirmed by Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 273) and by Mírzá Yahyá as well (see note 41 below).
38. As has been indicated in note 35, other reports confirm Nicolas's statement that the body of the Báb was placed in a casket and hidden in a house.
39. Nicolas attests that he was in contact with Mírzá Yahyá Subh-i-Azal in Cyprus for two years, in 1894 and 1895 (Nicolas 1911, 'Introduction', p. i, n. 1). Inasmuch as Nicolas refers here to his visit to Cyprus, it would seem likely that he may have made two visits, one in 1894 and another in 1895. Mírzá Yahyá did not die until 1911, so it appears that Nicolas discontinued contact with him by choice rather than necessity.
40. Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 520–1) indicates that Bahá'u'lláh ordered the transfer of the Báb's body from Tabriz to Tehran, 'prompted by the wish the Báb Himself had expressed in the "Ziyárat-i-Sháh-'Abdu'l-'Azím", a Tablet He had revealed while in the neighbourhood of that shrine and which He delivered to a certain Mírzá Sulaymán-i-Khatíb, who was instructed by Him to proceed together with a number of believers to that spot and to chant it within its precincts.' Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 521) quotes some of the words of the Báb with regard to this location:

'Well is it with you,' the Báb addressed the buried saint in words such as these, in the concluding passages of that Tablet, 'to have found your resting place in Rayy, under the shadow of My Beloved. Would that I might be entombed within the precincts of that holy ground!'

Lord Curzon (*Persia and the Persian Question*, pp. 345–7, cited in Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970, p. 521, n. 1) described this sanctuary, which is located about six miles southeast of Tehran.

41. As was affirmed in note 38, Nabíl-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 519) and Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 273) report that the two bodies, of the Báb and Anís, were placed together in a single casket. This is corroborated here by Mírzá Yahyá. It is entirely unlikely, however, that the Báb's body could have been buried in a crystal casket, inasmuch as this would be so heavy, so cumbersome and possibly so costly as to make the movement of such a relic extremely difficult. Hence this contention of Mírzá Yahyá is highly suspect. None of the extant letters of the Báb, including those that have been published by the Azalís (see MacEoin 1992, p. 96) confirm Mírzá Yahyá's claim that he was personally and

exclusively chosen by the Báb to carry out the burial of his master in a location which he alone could identify. This is also unlikely because, had he been the only person who could identify this location, the priceless remains of the Báb might easily have been lost forever, should Mírzá Yahyá have died prior to informing another of the secret location. Finally, Mírzá Yahyá, if he has been accurately quoted by Nicolas, wrongly identifies the martyred companion of the Báb as Muhammad-‘Alíy-i-Zanjání, called Hujjat, rather than Mírzá Muhammad-‘Alí, called Anís.

42. Afnan 2000 (p. 408) affirms that the body of the Báb was taken to the house of Mírzá Hasan Vazír, the son-in-law of Majd-i-Ashráf. Faydí 1973 (p. 357) indicates that the full name of Majd-i-Ashráf was Hájí Mírzá Siyyid ‘Alí Tafrishí. Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 521) states that the location of the Báb’s body was a closely guarded secret, apparently known only to Bahá’u’lláh and to Áqáy-i-Kalím (Bahá’u’lláh’s brother, also known as Mírzá Músá) and Mírzá Ahmad, who were charged with effecting its concealment by Bahá’u’lláh, and perhaps also by ‘Abdu’l-Bahá. However, Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (p. 521) indicates that upon the departure of Bahá’u’lláh for Adrianople, Áqáy-i-Kalím was to inform Munír, one of his fellow disciples, of the location but that he was unable himself to find the site. Bahá’u’lláh left Constantinople for Adrianople on 1 December 1863 (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 161) and it seems likely that Áqáy-i-Kalím wrote to Munír by this time, if not earlier in the year. Ismael Velasco (email 14/1/02) indicated that Mírzá Músá, Áqáy-i-Kalím, was ‘a leading disciple of Bahá’u’lláh’ who acted ‘as His shield until ‘Abdu’l-Bahá grew up’ and that he was present when Bahá’u’lláh ‘received [a] copy of [the] Qayyúmu’l-Asmá’ sent by Mullá Husayn’. For a description of this event, the reader may refer to Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 106–107). For more details regarding Mírzá Músá, Áqáy-i-Kalím, please see Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 183, 255, 286, 288, 397, 432, 441, 582); Balyuzi 1980 (pp. 13, 36, 62, 66–7, 102, 105, 107, 112, 121, 128–9, 137, 139, 141, 148–50, 153, 155, 181, 184, 199, 204–7, 219, 221, 225–7, 229–30, 236, 243, 246, 275, 277, 283, 288, 315, 319, 327, 330, 347–8, 363, 369); Balyuzi 1985 (pp. 261–2); Taherzadeh 1974 (pp. 15–16, 53, 67n, 131, 144, 205, 228, 247, 284, 316n; Taherzadeh 1977 (pp. 58, 67, 154, 160, 163–4, 200, 211, 247n, 332, 402, 405; Taherzadeh 1983 (pp. 23, 181, 225n, 361, 424–5; Taherzadeh 1987 (pp. 242, 420n, 438).

Nabil-i-A‘zam 1970 (pp. 521–2) indicates that the casket containing the bodies of the Báb and Anís was subsequently discovered by Jamál, an adherent of the Cause who had been informed of its location while Bahá’u’lláh was in Adrianople. Shoghi Effendi 1995 (pp. 273–4) states that in 1284 AH (1867–8) in Adrianople Bahá’u’lláh wrote a tablet to Mullá ‘Alí-Akbar-i-Shahmírzádí, whom he had appointed a Hand of the Cause (Balyuzi 1973, p. 189n), and to Jamál-i-Burújirdí, ordering them to transfer the sacred remains to a new location. It appears that the Jamál in Nabil-i-A‘zam may be identical with Jamál-i-Burújirdí. This is confirmed by Adib Taherzadeh, who reports in *The Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh* (1977, vol. 2, pp. 402–3):

At this juncture it is appropriate to mention that before going to Adrianople, Jamál-i-Burújirdí had rendered an important service to the Faith in Persia. He and Mullá ‘Alí-Akbar-i-Shahmírzádí, known as Hájí Ákhúnd, whom Bahá’u’lláh later appointed a Hand of the Cause of God, had been instructed by Him in 1284 AH (1867–8) to transfer the remains of the Báb which were concealed within the Shrine of Imám-Zádih Ma’súm to another place of safety.

The story of this transfer as found in Shoghi Effendi 1995 (pp. 273–6) is virtually identical to that found in Nicolas, and both accounts seem to be based on the memoirs of Mullá ‘Alí-Akbar-i-Shahmírzádí. Photographs of the shrine of Imám-Zádih Ma’súm are published in *Bahá’í World*, vol. 5, p. 544; and vol. 6, p. 65. Hence Mírzá Yahyá’s contention, that the location of the bodies remained a secret for 30 years, when they

were apparently concealed in 1850 and moved in 1867–8, is also highly suspect; furthermore, his claim that the Bahá'ís in particular knew nothing of the whereabouts of the precious trust is preposterous, inasmuch as Bahá'u'lláh called upon two Bahá'ís to move the remains when he foresaw that they could be endangered by being left in the shrine of Imám-Zádih Ma'súm. His statement that the Bahá'ís disinterred the body and destroyed it is unbelievable, when one considers that Bahá'ís universally regard the Báb as a Manifestation of God, greater in station to any previous prophet, and the first of the two Manifestations of a cycle of fulfilment destined to last half a million years. Indeed, the Bahá'ís have a higher regard for the Báb than did the Bábís, inasmuch as the writings of Bahá'u'lláh depict his prophetic standing in more superlative terms than those employed by the Báb himself.

43. Mírzá Yahyá allows that if the Bahá'ís did not destroy the body of the Báb, and if they possess this sacred relic, nevertheless the tomb they chose for it is not sacred as it is not placed in the location stipulated by the Báb. According to the verses of the tablet cited by Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 521), the Báb wanted to be buried in Rayy, near the shrine of Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azim and just outside of Tehran, because he wished to have a resting place 'under the shadow of My Beloved'. Given the many hints in his writings to the identity of 'Him whom God shall manifest', which Bahá'u'lláh claimed to fulfil, it seems reasonable to regard this tablet as an expression of the Báb's wish to be buried close to Bahá'u'lláh. 'Abdu'l-Bahá seems to have had the Báb's wishes in mind as well as those of Bahá'u'lláh when he ordered that the Báb's remains be transported from Tehran to 'Akká, where they arrived on 19 Ramadán 1316/31 January 1899 (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 274). Finally, in the Bayán-i-fársi the Báb stated that certain geographical locations and buildings are sacralized through their association with holy souls. The Manifestation of God is the 'divine presence' during his earthly sojourn, and after his passing, the places associated with him are holy to his followers. His house becomes the House of God, his city the City of God. The Báb made all his ordinances and teachings contingent upon their acceptance by 'Him Whom God shall manifest', and hence, if Bahá'u'lláh, the successful claimant to this title, decreed that the Báb's remains be located in a place different from the place ordained by the Báb himself, it would appear that this is entirely in harmony with the Báb's wishes.

Regarding Mírzá Yahyá's version of these events, Nicolas writes:

I hesitated for a long time to write down these words of Subh-i-Azal in my story. Everything he says is contradictory and unbelievable, but I thought that impartiality made it a duty for me to report what I heard. I will limit myself to remarking that Subh-i-Azal does not explain how the body came to him, or where and how he procured the casket of crystal. The confused members of the two victims respond to nothing that history tells us. If the two sects differ in opinion as to the person of the successor of the Báb, at least they envelope the Báb himself with the same love and the same respect. To accuse one of them of having destroyed him seems to be a calumny of which Mírzá Yahyá repents, moreover immediately, as he adds as a corrective that it is possible that the body was not destroyed. That the Bahá'ís would have ignored the location of the sepulchre for thirty years is impossible, because at the start there were only Bábís. Finally, how could Azal have hidden this [location] from his brother Bahá' in whom he had the greatest confidence and whom he even accuses of having abused that confidence?

Nicolas's comments are telling, considering that he relied on Mírzá Yahyá and his followers for much of his information and many of his copies of the writings of the Báb.

44. Nicolas does not identify his source here. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 519) states that Hájí Sulaymán Khán transferred the remains of Anís and the Báb from the silk factory in Milán 'to a place of safety'. 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 (p. 28) reports that the sacred



remains were placed in a box in the workshop of a Bábí of Mílán and that afterwards, in obedience to instructions from Tehran, they were sent away from Ádhirbáyján to a secret location. Inasmuch as Hájí Sulaymán Khán's father was a Tabrizí (Balyuzi 1973, p. 149), and 'one of the nobles of Ádhirbáyján' ('Abdu'l-Bahá 1980, p. 28), it is very likely that the family had a residence in Tabriz itself and that the bodies of the Báb and Anís were taken to that location subsequent to their consignment to a casket. Furthermore, it is recorded by Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 273) that the casket was concealed in the Tehran residence of Hájí Sulaymán Khán after it was removed from the shrine of Imám-Zádih Hasan and before it was taken to the shrine of Imám-Zádih Ma'súm.

45. Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (pp. 519–20) indicates that Hájí Sulaymán Khán reported the location of the casket and its sacred trust to Bahá'u'lláh who was then in Tehran. Nabil-i-A'zam (pp. 520–1) also indicates that Bahá'u'lláh gave instructions for the transfer of the Báb's body in compliance with a formal statement of the wishes of the Báb himself regarding his burial that was in his possession.
46. Nicolas identifies the resting place of the casket, which Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 and 'Abdu'l-Bahá 1980 refrained from doing, either because they were not informed of its whereabouts or, more likely, because they did not wish to endanger its continued existence by making its location public knowledge in an untimely fashion. When Nabil-i-A'zam was compiling his history, circa 1887–92, and when 'Abdu'l-Bahá was seeing his history published, in 1890 and 1891, the body of the Báb had already been transferred to another safe house, as it had been imperiled by the renovations being made to the Imám-Zádih Ma'súm. However, the casket was still in the keeping of the Bahá'ís in the vicinity of Tehran and it may have seemed risky to them to openly discuss the present whereabouts of this sacred trust. In 1899 the sacred remains made their way to 'Akká and out of Persia altogether; hence, what would have constituted a risky and potentially disastrous disclosure in 1890 was an entirely appropriate statement of historical fact in 1905.
47. Qazvín is a city located around one hundred miles northwest of Tehran.
48. Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 274) gives the date of this ordinance of Bahá'u'lláh as 1284 AH (1867–8), which would have been 37 to 38 years prior to 1905, when Nicolas published *Seyyed Ali Mohammed dit le Báb*. Twenty-nine years prior to 1905 would have been the year 1876. Bahá'u'lláh left Adrianople – from where, according to both authors, he wrote a tablet ordering the transfer of the Báb's remains – on 22 Rabí' al-Thání 1285 AH (12 August 1868) according to Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 180). Therefore, it is plainly impossible that he could have sent this order 29 years before the publication of Nicolas's book, as he had left Adrianople eight or nine years prior to that time. Was Nicolas referring to an earlier date, perhaps the time when he met and talked with Hájí Mullá 'Alí-Akbar Shahmírzadí? If so, then this meeting must have taken place eight years before the publication of his book, in 1897. This is entirely possible. Another possibility is that Nicolas did not calculate this period of time accurately, and as we have witnessed repeatedly in the course of this biography, as a chronicler of events the calculation of time was not one of his strong points.
49. Hájí 'Alí-Akbar Shahmírzadí, also known as Hájí Ákhúnd, was appointed a Hand of the Cause of God by Bahá'u'lláh (Balyuzi 1973, p. 189). Biographical references to Shahmírzadí can be found in Balyuzi 1980 (pp. 399, 454); Balyuzi 1985 (pp. 105–6, 139, 175, 258, 261–3, 265–6); Taherzadeh 1977 (p. 402); Taherzadeh 1983 (pp. 85–6, 200, 425–7); Taherzadeh 1987 (pp. 14, 185, 255, 275, 277, 279, 292, 294–301, 306, 311–12, 315–26, 337–8, 348, 380–1, 436).
50. Jamál-i-Burújirdí is described by Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 521) as 'an old adherent of the Faith' and it thus appears that he had been a Bábí for some time prior to the martyrdom of the Báb. Mázandarání 1941 (vols. 5 and 6) and the memoirs of Dr Afrukhtih

- and Dr Mu'ayyad contain biographical information related to this learned man, this devoted teacher who travelled throughout Persia to promote the Cause of Bahá'u'lláh. It has been reported that Jamál-i-Burújirdí eventually became proud of his knowledge and his eloquence, and it is certain that after the passing of Bahá'u'lláh he refused to accept 'Abdu'l-Bahá, the eldest son of Bahá'u'lláh who had been appointed by him in the Kitáb-i-Aqdas and the Kitáb-i-'Ahdí to serve as the leader of the Bahá'í community. He demanded that 'Abdu'l-Bahá appoint him the head of the Bahá'í Faith in Iran, even as George I. Kheirallah demanded to be made head of the Faith in North America. When 'Abdu'l-Bahá refused to accede to this demand, Jamál-i-Burújirdí joined forces with Mírzá Muhammad 'Alí, 'Abdu'l-Bahá's rebellious half-brother, in making a sustained attack upon the leadership of the appointed heir of Bahá'u'lláh. He maintained his opposition to 'Abdu'l-Bahá until his death at a very advanced age.
51. This account is virtually identical to that found in Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 274), although it is told in greater detail by Nicolas.
  52. Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azím is the shrine to which the Báb apparently referred in his tablet and which Nabil-i-A'zam 1970 (p. 519) indicates as the preferred resting-place of the Báb. Sepehr Manuchehri states that it is found in southern Tehran.
  53. Chashmih-'Alí is translated as the 'Alí Springs by Balyuzi (p. 190). Sepehr Manuchehri reports (email 22/1/02) that

Chishmih-'Alí is now a part of the Nadí-Abad district in southern Teheran. It was famous for its natural spring water system. The local carpet dealers and weavers believed the quality of water would enhance the colour richness of their carpets and hence it was a popular spot for washing carpets. During the reign of Fath-'Alí Shah, a portrait of the king was engraved on the rocks surrounding the spring water way. Hence the name 'Chishmih-'Alí'.

54. Masjid-i-Masha'u'lláh, the 'abandoned and dilapidated' mosque (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 274) 'used to be in Chishmih-'Alí and was destroyed [a] long time ago to make way for development' (Sepehr Manuchehri in an email 22/1/02).
55. Quts-i-Hesar, according to Sepehr Manuchehri, is located approximately five kilometres from the shrine of 'Abdu'l-'Azím in southern Tehran. This name was retained right up to the 1979 Islamic Revolution.
56. 'Abá' is the Persian and Arabic term that denotes the heavy cloak or robe which was the preferred garb of most middle and upper class Persian men in the 19th century.
57. Áqá Mírzá Hasan Vazír is called Mírzá Hasan-i-Vazír by Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 190). Balyuzi 1973 (p. 190n) indicates that Yunis Khán-i-Afrukhtih learned that the descendants of this believer had pieces of linen that had been soaked in the blood of the Báb; he persuaded them to donate these relics to the leadership of the Bahá'í Faith and they are now kept in the International Bahá'í Archives.
58. Siyyid 'Alí Majdu'l-Ashráf is referred to in note 35, as being the father-in-law of Mírzá Hasan Vazír. Faydí 1973 (p. 357) gives his full name as Hájí Mírzá Siyyid 'Alí Tafrihi. MacEoin 1992 (p. 19) identifies his name as Hájí Mírzá Siyyid 'Alí Tafarshí Majdu'l-Ashráf.
59. Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 274) indicates that Hájí Sháh Muhammad-i-Manshadí, surnamed Amínu'l-Bayán, was commissioned by Bahá'u'lláh to receive the sacred remains from Mullá 'Alí-Akbar Shahmírzádí, as is also stated by Nicolas. Sepehr Manuchehri has pointed out that many details are known regarding the life of this believer, including references to him in tablets written by Bahá'u'lláh and 'Abdu'l-Bahá; in Mázandarání 1941 (vols. 5 and 6); and in Hájí Muhammad Tahir Malmirí's *Tárikh-i-Yazdí*.
60. When Mullá 'Alí-Akbar Shahmírzádí told his story to Nicolas, he was not apprised of the place in which Hájí Sháh Muhammad-i-Manshadi concealed the casket but

Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 274) indicates that he buried it beneath the floor of the shrine of Imám-Zádih Zayd.

61. Mírzá Asadu'lláh-i-Isfáhání was informed by Bahá'u'lláh of the location of the trust and was instructed to transfer it elsewhere, which he did, first to his own home and later to other locations (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 274).
62. Nicolas indicates that Mírzá Asadu'lláh Isfáhání returned to Tehran from 'Akká to effect the transfer of the sacred relic to the Holy Land, and this is confirmed by Shoghi Effendi 1995 (p. 274). Nicolas quotes Mullá 'Alí-Akbar Shahmírzádí to the effect that this occurred 'two years ago', and as the year of this transfer is stated as 1899, this would date his telling of this story to the year 1901.
63. The present location of the remains of the Báb and his fellow martyr, Anís, is a tomb whose site was 'blessed and selected by Bahá'u'lláh' (Shoghi Effendi 1995, p. 267); the construction of which was supervised by 'Abdu'l-Bahá and completed on 28 Safar 1327 AH, 21 March 1909; the superstructure, ornamentation and adjacent gardens of which were carried out with infinite care by Shoghi Effendi; and the 19 terraces and stairway of which were completed in summer 2001 under the supervision and management of the Universal House of Justice. The architectural emblem of the World Order of Bahá'u'lláh is the shrine of the Báb on Mount Carmel, in Haifa, Israel.