and benefits, and were permitted to return [as vassals of the Mughals]. Again they became rebellious, and the Shāh-zādahs again detached Swīdāē [Sahūdah]. He soon reduced the disaffected, and put all concerned in the outbreak to death.

After these events a council was held by the Shāh-zādahs, and it was agreed that each one, with the troops under him, should march towards different points [where this council was held is not stated], subdue such territories as lay in his way, and destroy the fortified places. Mangū, accordingly, continued to advance on the left hand towards Jīrkah [جیرک] or Chirkah [چیرک], keeping along the banks of the Jīrkah or Chirkah river, and Bajmān [This name is doubtful. It is written بجمان—Najmān, or Bajmān—Kaşman—Taţmān—and Bajman—without any points. It may also be read Tajmān, or it may be Taghmān, but it seems to be Bajmān, from the various modes here given, who was a great Amīr, and redoubtable warrior of the tribe or people of the Aolbarlang [اولبارلاق] of the peoples of Kīchāk, and Kāğiř Olūkah [کاجیر اویکه] of the tribe of Ās [Ossete], he made prisoners. It happened in this wise. Bajmān, with a body of robbers, who had escaped the sword [probably at the time Küktēē and Swīdāē [Sahūdah], at the commencement of Üktēē's reign, moved into those parts. See note 6, page 1115], having been joined by other fugitives, were harrying the parts around and carrying off property, and the sedition was increasing daily. The Mughals were unable to lay hands on this Bajmān, and he used to hide in the vast forests of canes along the banks of the Ātil or Wolga. Mangū caused two hundred vessels to be prepared, on each of which he embarked 100 Mughals, while Mangū himself, and his brother, Tūkal, moved along down either bank with their forces. [Neither Mangū nor his brother embarked on board these vessels: they would have defeated their own object if they had done so.] At last the troops under Mangū reached one of these forests of canes, and discovered traces of a recent encampment. After some search, an old woman, who had been left behind because she was sick, was discovered. On being questioned, she, to save her life, confessed that Bajmān and his followers had recently decamped, and were then lurking in a certain island, which she pointed out, with all his property and effects. As his boats were not there, and he was unable to cross to the island, Mangū sent messengers to hasten onwards his vessels; but it so happened that, before the vessels arrived, a high wind arose, and the waters became so disturbed, and the waves rose so, that the shallow part which constituted the ford, pointed out by the old woman, became partially exposed from one side to the other. Mangū pushed across with his troops and caught Bajmān, who requested that Mangū would put him to death with his own hand, but this he declined, and directed his brother, Tūkal, to cut him in two. On this island Kāğiř Olūkah, the Amīr of the Ās, was also slain. Mangū passed part of the summer on this island, and when the weather became very hot he moved into another country.
Charkas, and Ās, as far as the Bahr-i-Zulmat [Sea of

The people styled Tschermiss probably, who, in ancient times, dwelt between the Volga and Tanais or Don.

Said to have been a city of Kîfchâk giving name to a province.

These events are recorded as having taken place in the year 633 H. = September, 1235-36 A.D.

Bâtû Khân, in the beginning of 634 H.—the latter part of 1236 A.D.—in concert with his brothers, Ùrdah, Barkah, and other Shâh-zâdahs, undertook an expedition against Tokâshh [تکاش] and Barfâs, and, after some delay, subdued their [those?] territories. Towards the close of this year, the Shâh-zâdahs present held a kiârsûr, and it was therein determined to make war on the Urus [أروس]. Bâtû, Ùrdah, Kyük, Mangû, Kolkân, Kâdân, and Bûrîf, accordingly, invested the city of Arpân, and, after three days, it was captured by storm, and the city of I-kahh [إي كاه] met the same fate. In the capture of I-kahh, Kolkân [not the son of the Chingiz Khân, as supposed, merely because he bore an uncle's name who died long before, but Chaghâtae's son] was mortally wounded. One of the Amiris of the Urus, named Armân [آرمان], also written Azmân [آزمان], advanced with an army against the Mughâis, and, after many endeavours on his part, he was killed, with the greater part of his troops. The Mughâis now captured the city of Makâr [مكن] after five days' investment, and the ruler [Hâkim] of the city, who was named Ülâ-tîmûr [أولاد تمور—Vladimir, son of the Grand Duke George of Russia?], was likewise killed. The city of Borkî-f-Buzurg—Great Borkî [بورک اوزرگ]—was also invested, and, after eight days, during which its people fought desperately, it was taken, and fell into Mangû Khân's hands. In the space of five days, the Mughâis took the city of Kârîkîa [كاريكا], which is the native country of the Wazîr of Lâdân or Lâwân. The Amir of that country, Wankâh Porko [وكنك ورنو], fled, and took shelter in a forest, and after some trouble he was captured and killed.

After this, the Mughal Shâh-zâdahs made a retrograde movement [to the river Don?] and held counsel together respecting their future operations. It was agreed that they should continue to advance, tomîn by tomîn, to Jîrkah or Chîrkâh, and capture and destroy every city and town and fortified place that came in their way. Bâtû, on this occasion, appeared before the city of Kâsal Ankâh [كل انك] and invested it for two months, but could not succeed in taking it. Subsequently, Kâdân, and Bûrîf, arrived with their contingents, and, after three days, it was carried. After this they came to a pause, and took up their quarters in houses [for the winter?], and took their ease.

Towards the close of the year 635 H. [which commenced the end of August, 1237-38 A.D.], Mangû and Kâdân marched into the country of the Charkas [Cheremis of Nichî Novgorod], and, in the midst of winter, entered it. The Bâdshah of the Charkas, named Bûkân [بوقان—possibly Yûkân—يوكان], was slain, and the country fell into the possession of the Mughâis. In this year likewise, Shai'bân, Tûkâl, and Bûrîf, turned their attention to the country of Marîm [مرم], and subdued it from Hejakân [هياكان—perhaps Jejakân—هياكان] as far as Kârâr [كرار].

Barkah, during this year, set out towards Kîfchâk; and Uzzîk [أوزيغ], Kôzan [كوزان], Kâzan [كازان], and other leaders and their dependants, after
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Darkness—the Arctic Sea?; and the whole submitted to his authority.

He was a very sagacious man, and friendly towards the

great slaughter, were captured, and their country devastated. After this, Barkah returned to the urdū of his uncle, Üktâie Kâ'ân, bearing along with him such a vast amount of spoil as cannot be computed.

In the year 636 H.—August, 1239-40 A.D.—Kâdan and Bûrî proceeded towards the city of Mankâs [مکاس] during the height of winter, and took it, after forty-five days' investment. In the following year, 637 H.—August, 1239-40 A.D.—Mangû Khâñ and Kôblâie were directed to return from the Dašht-i-Kifchâk, while Bâtu Khâñ and his brothers, and Kâdan, Bûrî, and Bûgâhak, marched to attack the country of Urus [again], and the tribe and soldiers of Halâhân [ملاهان]—called Halâ Khâñ—ملاهان by some. The great city of the Urus [أرمان] was captured by Mangû in nine days. The Mughals continued to advance towards the cities of Ülâ-tfmûr [Vladimir] and Jfrkâh or Chîrkâh, tomar by tomar, taking and destroying all the fortified places they met with in their route. During this expedition, after three days, the city of Üch-Üâhîl Uldâmûr [غîل ایوانی اولدمور] was taken, which evidently refers to the city of Kief.

"The Russians," according to the "Modern Universal History," quoting Petreius, par. ii., were reduced to a most deplorable situation, perpetually distressed by their own sovereigns, harassed by their neighbours, and exposed to all the calamities of war; when, to complete their misery, the Tartars [Mughals?], still greater savages than themselves, poured in upon them with irresistible fury, and actually made a conquest of their country. History does not inform us of the particulars of this remarkable event, any farther than that innumerable multitudes of those barbarians, headed by their khan Battu or Battur, after ravaging great part of Poland and Silesia, broke suddenly into Russia, and laid waste everything before them, marking their steps with every act of cruelty. Most of the Russian princes, among whom was the great Duke George Sevodolitz, were made prisoners, and racked to death; in short, none found mercy but those who voluntarily acknowledged the Tartars [Mughals?] for their lords. The relentless conqueror imposed upon the Russians everything that is most mortifying in slavery, insisting that they should have no other princes than such as he approved of. [History repeats itself often: this reads much like part of recent treaties which one power wished to impose upon the 'Usmânîî Turks, and another upon Afghâns; and that they should pay him a yearly tribute, to be brought by their sovereigns themselves, now his vassals, on foot, who were to present it humbly to the Tartarian [Mughal?] ambassador on horseback. They were also to prostrate themselves before the haughty Tartar [Mughal?], to offer him milk to drink and, if any drops of it fell down, to lick them up—a singular mark of servility, worthy of the barbarian who imposed it, and which lasted near two hundred and sixty years."

A duke or prince of the Kûs or Russians attended, as a vassal of the Mughals, the installation of Kyûk Khân, but was compelled to stand outside the audience tent or khargah. This is confirmed by John de Plano Carpini, who reached Kyûk's urdū in 1246 A.D.—644 H.—before Kyûk was elected, and he found Jeroslaus standing at the door of the khargah.
Musalmāns, and, under his protection, they used to live contented and happy. In his camp, and among his tribes, there were masjids with regular congregations, an Imām, and Mu‘azzīn, all duly organized; and, during the period of his reign, and the term of his life, the territories of Islām sustained neither harm nor injury by his command, nor from his dependents nor troops. The Musalmāns of Türkistān, under the shadow of his guardianship, enjoyed great affluence and infinite security.

Out of every country of I-rān which fell under the jurisdiction of the Mughals, he [Bātū] had a specified assignment, and his factors were placed over such portions as had been allotted to him, and all the Grandees and Leaders of the Mughal forces were obedient unto Bātū, and used to look upon him in the light of his father Tūshī.

When Kyuk departed from the world, all concurred in the sovereignty of Bātū, with the exception of the sons of Chaghatāe, and made this request to him, that he would accept the throne of the Mughals, and assume the sovereignty, in order that all might obey his commands. Bātū did not consent; and Mangū Khān, son of Tūlī, son of the Chingiz Khān, was raised to the sovereignty, as will, subsequently, be related.

Some among the trustworthy have stated on this wise, that Bātū, privately, and in secret, had become a Musalmān, but used not to make it known, and that he reposed implicit confidence in the people of Islām. For twenty-eight years, more or less, he ruled over this extent of country [as previously mentioned], and died. The mercy

---

6 As head of the race and family. See page 1177.
7 Not mentioned by any other author, but extremely probable. It is also stated again at page 1164.
8 So he says respecting Üktāe Kā’ān.
9 After his return from the seven years campaign, by command of his uncle, Üktāe Kā’ān, Bātū was raised to the sovereignty over all the parts of Kīchāk, and the farther west, including the extensive territories which he had subdued and made tributary; and he proceeded to the presence of his uncle, and remained with him some time. He subsequently returned to his own dominions.

In 639 H. he was struck with paralysis, hence his inability to come to the Urdūe Bālīg to hold a kūrtītā on the death of Kyūk; and, in the year 650 H., he died on the banks of the Ātil or Wolga, at the age of forty-eight, having been born in 602 H. There is some discrepancy regarding the date of
of the Almighty be upon him, if a true believer, and, if an infidel, may the Almighty lessen his punishment [in hell]! They buried him in conformity with the Mughal custom; and among that people it is the usage, when one of them dies, to prepare a place under ground about the size of a chamber or hall, in largeness proportionate to the rank and degree of the accursed one who may have departed to hell. They furnish it with a throne and covering for the ground, and they place there vessels and numerous effects, together with his arms and weapons, and whatever may have been his own private property, and some of his wives, and slaves, male or female, and the person he loved most above all others. When they have placed that accursed one upon the throne, they bury his most beloved along with him in that place. In the night-time the place is covered up, and horses are driven over it, in such a manner that not a trace of it remains. This custom of theirs—God curse them!—is comprehended by all Musalmāns. Here an astonishing anecdote which the author has heard is recorded, in order that readers thereof may, respecting the things of the world to come, increase their reverence; but God is all knowing.

AN ASTONISHING ANECDOTE.

An astonishing anecdote, which was heard from the Khwājah [opulent merchant], whose word is reliable, whom his decease. Some say it happened in 645 H., some in 653 H., others in 654 H., and that he was aged forty-seven, and others, again, give 662 H. as the date; but, as nearly all agree that he was born in 601 or 602 H., and died at the age of forty-seven or forty-eight, there is no doubt that 650 H. is the correct year of his death.

Bāṭū Khān founded the city known as the Sarāe, on the Ātil or Wolga. He was succeeded by his son, Surtāk, who will be mentioned farther on.

That quaint old traveller, Sir John Maundeville, had heard a correct version of the mode of interment, which he gives in detail, and winds up saying: "Many cause themselves to be interred privately by night, in wild places, and the grass put again over the pit to grow; or they cover the pit with gravel and sand, that no man may perceive where the pit is, to the intent that never after may his friends have mind or remembrance of him."—Early Travels in Palestine. London: Bohn.

Rubruquis states, and quite correctly too, with reference to burials, that, if the deceased be of the race of the Chingiz Khān, his sepulchre is rarely known. See note at page 1089, para. 5.
they used to style Rashid-ud-Din, the Ḥakim, a native of Balkh, is here related, in order that it may be acceptable to the Sultān of the Sultāns of Islām.

This Khwājah, Rashid-ud-Din, the Ḥakim, had come into Hindūstān from Khurāsān, in the year 648 H., for purposes of trade, and he accompanied the author of this Ṭabākāt, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, on a journey [from Dihlī] to Multān.3 He related as follows: “One of the Mughal lords, in the territory of Karā-Kuram,4 who possessed numerous followers and servants and great wealth, [died and] went to hell. They accordingly caused a place to be prepared, with the utmost ceremony, for the interment of that accursed one, and placed with him arms and other effects, and furniture and utensils in great quantity. A couch also, adorned and decorated, they had prepared; and desired to bury, along with him, the most loved of his people. They consulted together as to whom among his servants they should inter who would be the one to whom he was most attached.

“There was a youth of the confines of Tirmid of Khurāsān,4 who, in his childhood, had fallen captive into the hands of this Mughal gābr5 in the beginning of the misfortunes of Khurāsān; and, when he reached puberty, and grew into youth and virility, and attained unto man’s estate, he turned out exceedingly active, intelligent, expert, and frugal, in such wise, that everything belonging to that accursed one, in whole and in part, came under the youth’s disposal; and, as this Mughal had called him son, on this account, the whole of the property and effects, and cattle, and whatever else belonged to him, the youth had taken under his control. All the servants and followers of that

3 This was on the occasion of our author’s proceeding thither in order to despatch the slaves to his “dear sister” in Khurāsān. Perhaps they went along with Rashid-ud-Din’s own kāfolah; indeed, it is most probable that they accompanied it. At page 687, our author says he set out himself in Zī-Ḥijjah of 647 H., and returned again to Dihlī in Jamāḍ-ul-Akhir, 648 H.

4 In a few copies, “the territory of Karā-Kuram of the Mughals,” as though that was some other Karā-Kuram.

5 The Āmūlah being correctly considered as the boundary of Khurāsān.

6 An Essay on “Fire-Worship” in Mughalīstān is not required to elucidate this any more than in Hindūstān or Upper India. The signification of this word, and the way in which it is applied, has been given at page 620.
Mughal were under his orders, so that not one of them, without the permission of that youth, used to have the power of making use of anything belonging to that accursed one. At this time, all of them [the Mughals], with one accord, girded up their loins to despatch this youth, saying: 'The deceased [Mughal] used not to regard any one more than this youth: it is necessary to inter him along with him.' Their object was to destroy this youth, and take vengeance on him for the sway he had exercised; and, in this proceeding, all agreed. The Musalmān youth, in this state of affliction, was astounded, and resigned his heart to death, seeing that he had no asylum and no succour, save in the Lord, the Helper of the Helpless. He stretched out the hand of supplication to the promise of Him, "who hears the distressed when they pray unto Him," 4 and performed the ablation of purification, donned clean clothes, and placed his foot within that subterranean [chamber].

"When they had covered it up, in a corner of this chamber, that poor creature turned his face towards the kiblah, repeated a prayer of two genuflexions, and then occupied himself in repeating the Musalmān creed. Suddenly, a side of the chamber opened, and two persons, so majestic and awe-striking that the bile of a hundred thousand lions, at their aspect, would turn to water, entered. Each of them bore a fiery javelin, out of which issued flames of fire, and the flames encircled the couch of the [dead] Mughal all round; and a small spark from the fiery sparks [issuing from the names], about the size of a needle's point, fell upon the cheek of that youth, burnt it, and made it smart. One of these two persons said: 'There appears to be a Musalmān here;' and the other turned his face on the youth and asked: 'Who art thou?' The youth states that he answered: 'I am a poor and miserable captive, captured by the hands of that Mughal.' They demanded: 'From whence art thou?' 7 and I replied: 'From Tirmid.' They then struck one side of the chamber with the heads of their javelins, and it rent

4 Kur'ān, chap. xxvii., verse 63.
7 Strange that these supernatural beings did not know all about him, and that this never occurred to the narrator.
asunder to the extent of about [the size of] a doorway, and they said: 'Go out!' and I placed my foot without, and I found myself in the Tirmid country."

"From that place, namely, Karā-Kuram of the Mughals to Tirmid, is a distance of six months' journey and more; and, up to this time, that youth is dwelling upon his own property and possessions, on the confines of Tirmid; and whatever salve he continues to apply to the hurt occasioned by that spark of fire, it is ineffectual to heal it, and it continues open to the size of a needle's point, and to discharge as before." Glory to Him who contrives what He pleases!

May Almighty God long preserve the Sultan of the Sulṭāns of the age, Nāsir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, upon the throne of sovereignty!

VII. Mangu Khān,9 Son of Tūlī Khān, Son of the Chingiz Khān.

Trustworthy persons have stated that Tūlī was the

8 Here also, as at the beginning of this anecdote, two of the most modern copies of the text have Karā-Kūm for Karā-Kuram. See para. 6 of note, page 1140.

9 Like Ükdāe or Üktāe, Mangū is always styled Kāʾān.

Tūlī, or Tūlūe, as the name is also written, had ten sons, but the four named by our author were the most renowned among the Musalmāns: (1) Mangū Khān, (2) Kūbīlāe Khān, (3) Hulākū Khān, and (4) İrtuğ Būkā.

Our author has not devoted a separate heading to Tūlī Khān, although he was as much entitled to it as Üktāe, Chakhatae, or Jūjī, but the account of his life is contained in the reigns of his father and brother Üktāe. Tūlī was the youngest son, and most beloved by his father, and, when very young in years, his father married him to the daughter of the Jānkabil, Badāe, brother of the Awang Khān, named Sīr Kūkīfī Bīğī, and by that Karāyat wife, the chief of his Khātūns, he had the four sons named above. As his decease, which took place in 628 H., was a source of grief to Üktāe Kāʾān, care was taken that the word "Tūlī," which in their language signifies a mirror, should not be mentioned, and instead of using the word tūlī for mirror, after his decease, the word gūgū was had recourse to, bearing the same signification, and it became common in consequence. Command was also issued that the name Tūlī should not be given to any one again. The Jahān-Ārā says that Mangū, Tūlī’s son, commanded the use of the word gūgū.

Üktāe, when he used to have recourse to drink, and became inebriated, would say that he first took to it in order to divert his thoughts from dwelling on the bereavement he had sustained by the loss of his brother Tūlī.

The authority from which the author of "Mongols Proper" draws a version of this little episode, and a very erroneous version, must have been "in a fix"
youngest son of the Chingiz Khan; and it was he who destroyed the cities of Khurāsān, as has been previously recorded respecting him, in the account of the downfall of the city of Hirāt. He had four sons, the eldest being Mangū Khan, the second, Hulāʿū, the third, Irtuḵ Bukhār, and the fourth, Kublā.

When Kyuk went to hell, the sons of Chaghhatāe demanded the sovereignty; and they, having a great number of horsemen and dependents, did not consent to the sovereignty of Mangū Khan. The beginning of this matter was in this manner. When Kyuk departed from this world, all the great chiefs of the Mughal armies turned their faces towards Bātū [son of Tūshī] saying: "It behoveth that thou shouldst be our sovereign, since, of the race of the Chingiz Khan, there is no one greater than thou; and the throne and diadem, and the rulership, befit thee best." Bātū replied: "I and my brother, which is Barkā, possess [already] so great a sovereignty and empire in this part, that to rule over it, together with

to translate it, and has consequently made it ridiculous:—"Tului in Mongol means 'mirror,' and the Turkish synonym of the word, viz., guxugu, was eradicated from the language," etc. So guxugu was eradicated so that "Tului" might be perpetuated!

Tūšī Khan was known by the titles of the Yakah or the Unique Nū-yīn and the Ulugh or Great Nū-yīn, but certainly he was not referred to—at least, by Mughals—as the "Great Nūvan."

1 Our author forgets to say where. The Daḵt-i-Kīshāk, and the vast territories farther west, are referred to. See under the account of Bātū, page 1165.

On the death of Kyūk Khan, again disorder arose in the affairs of the empire. The Khātīn of the late Khan, Ūkul-Kūlmish, or Ūghul-Kīlmish, as the name is also written, according to previous usage, in concert with, and by the advice of, the ministers and Amīrs present in the great urdū, or yūrat, assumed the direction of affairs. The routes, too, had become closed, as each of the Shāh-zādahs, Nū-yīn, and Amīrs, with his followers, were on their way to the urdū, but, when they became aware of Kyūk’s decease, they halted then and there, and delayed in expectation of the accession of a Khan; and each of the Shāh-zādahs was beginning to plot sedition, and stir up dissension, particularly the sons of Īktā Khan, who entertained ideas of their rights to the succession, after the promise made to Kyūk by those present at his accession.

Bātū Khan, son of Jūfī, was the real head of the family of the Chingiz Khan, and of the Mughal Ī-māk, was acknowledged as such by the whole family, and all the different Mughal tribes, and was looked up to and held in great reverence in consequence. He had, however, in 639 H., been stricken with paralysis, in one or both legs, which the historians term dard-i-pād, literally
possession of, and sway over, the states of Chín, Turkistán,
signifying, "pain, ache, or affliction of the foot or leg," which some modern
translators interpret as gout; but gout is temporary, as far as moving about is
concerned, while Bátú's affliction was permanent, and precluded his undertaking
a long journey. He was, consequently, unable to proceed from the Dašht-i-
Khíchák to the ancient urdá and yúrat of the Chingiz Kháñ, as was usual on
such occasion, but he sent out envoys, by virtue of his position, to the different
Sháh-zádahs, and Amírs, saying: "Let each one get ready to come into
Khíchák, so that we may hold a kúrichtā of the different brothers, and brothers'
sons, and consult as to whom we shall choose to succeed to the Kháñ-ship,
since, on account of my paralysis, I am unable to proceed to Kalúr-án, which
is the original yúrat and the seat of sovereignty of the Chingiz Kháñ."

The agents of Bátú in due course delivered their message, but Kará Aqhúl,
son of Chaghátáé, and the sons of Kyúk, declined to obey, saying: "The
ancient yúrat and seat of sovereignty of the Chingiz Kháñ is Ú-ták or Ú-tágh
and Kalúr-án, and it is not at all necessary for us to go into Khíchák to hold a
kúrichtā;" and Khwajá, the Nú-yín, Kárikákúr, and the Nú-yín, Timúr, who
were the Amírs of Kará-Kurám, they therefore sent to act as their deputies,
and to sign anything that might be agreed upon among the Sháh-zádahs. Sírú
Kúktíú Bíg, the mother of Mangú, however, having heard that the sons of
Úktáé Káán, Chaghátáé Kháñ, and Kyúk Kháñ, refused to comply with
Bátú Kháñ's request, advised her sons, particularly Mangú, her eldest, to lose
no time in proceeding to the presence of their Aqá, and paying homage to
him; and Mangú and his brothers set out without loss of time. Having
reached the Dašht-i-Khíchák, and the presence of Bátú Kháñ, he received
them with great favour, and paid Mangú great attention. Bátú stated to the
other Sháh-zádahs present at the kúrichtā then assembled, that he had already
remarked Mangú's fitness for the Kháñ-ship, and, besides, reminded them that
he had already experienced the good and evil, the sweet and bitter, of life, and
the affairs of the world, had several times commanded armies, and had been
held in estimation by Úktáé Káán, the Sháh-zádahs and Amírs, and the
soldiery. Bátú added: "The Káán sent him along with me, and my brothers,
Urdáh, Sháhán, and Tingkut, and others of the family of Jújí, accompanied
by his brother Korkán [Búchák is mentioned as having gone. See note
page 1164], and Kyúk, into the territory of Khíchák, and other countries,
where he greatly distinguished himself. After that, when the Káán com-
manded that the Sháh-zádahs [that is, other than those of Jújí's family, whose
appanage was the territories of Khíchák, and other western countries] should
return, before they reached the Káán's presence he was dead. The Káán's
will was, that Shírámún, his grandson, should succeed him, but Túrá-Kínah
Kháín set aside his commands, and set up her own son, Kyúk, in the place
of his father, Úktáé. Now it is proper that Mangú Kháñ should succeed, and
he is worthy of succeeding; and there is none other so fitting and capable of
directing the affairs of the empire and of the army. More than this, Mangú is
the son of my uncle, Túlíé Kháñ, the youngest son of the Chingiz Kháñ, and
to whom appertained the charge of the great yúrat; and as, according to the
ordinances and usages of the Mughals, the dwelling-place of the father belongs
to the youngest son, therefore the sovereignty belongs to Mangú." The others
present acquiesced; and, the right of Mangú having been determined, Bátú
 Kháñ despatched envoys to the Kháíns and sons of Úktáé, and to Sírú
Kúktíú-Bíg, Mangú's mother, and the other Sháh-zádahs and great Amírs
and 'Ajam, would be impossible. It will be advisable of the Dast-i-Rāst, and Dast-i-Chap [i.e. who, in the assemblies of the Chingiz Khān, and his son, Üktāe, used to sit on the right and left, and who belonged to the Hazārah's of the right and left wings. See note at page 1093], saying, that "by the Shāh-zādahs who, with their eyes, had seen the Chingiz Khān, and who, with their ears, had heard his laws and ordinances, the Shāh-zādahs present in this kūrilītā, it was deemed advisable, on the part of the ulūs, the army, and the people generally, to raise Mangū to the sovereignty."

Having thus selected Mangū, Bātū Khān directed his brothers Ürdah, Shaibān, and Barkās, or Barkah, as he is also called, the Shāh-zādahs of the Dast-i-Rāst, the whole family of Jūjī, Ḵarā Hūlākū, and others of the sons of Chaghataī, and the Shāh-zādahs of the Ḵarā Bilād [38, 39], to prepare a great banquet in honour of the occasion, and to seat Mangū on the throne, but Mangū made some hesitation [for form's sake, probably?], when his brother, Mūkāe, or Mūkā Aghūl, got up, and said: "Have we not all stipulated and signed our hands that we would not act contrary to the command of the Sā-Īn Khān, Bātū, how therefore can Mangū hesitate to accede to his commands, and neglect to give ear to his words?" All present applauded this speech of Mūkāe's, and Mangū therefore signified his willingness. Then, as was customary, Bātū Khān arose, seated Mangū on the throne, and saluted him as Ḵārān, and all present, following his example, did the same. Bātū then held the goblet to him, and, followed by the others, bent the knee to him nine times, opened his girdle, doffed his cap, and acknowledged his fealty to him.

It was then determined that a great kūrilītā should be summoned to meet at Kalūr-ān to confirm this decision; and, accordingly, all those who attended this one departed for their own yūrats, and the accession of Mangū became noised abroad in all parts. Bātū then directed his brothers, Barkās and Būḵā Tīmūr—the Fanākatsī says Ürdah and Shaibān also went—to accompany Mangū, with a large army, to the khargāb of Kalūr-ān [referring to the urdū of the Chingiz Khān], and, in the presence of the Shāh-zādahs, to seat him on the throne there likewise. Mangū's mother used all her influence, which was very great, to induce the adverse party to attend; and most of the Shāh-zādahs and others signified their approval of the choice of Mangū, all save a number of the sons of Üktāe and Kyūk, and Yavēsi-Mangū, Ḵarā Aghūl, and Būrī, sons of Chaghataī, who were using all sorts of stratagems to prevent the installation of Mangū, and our author was wrong in supposing that only the sons of Chaghataī were plotting against him. They despatched an envoy to Bātū Khān, notifying their dissent from the succession of Mangū, and stated that it had been previously determined that the sovereignty should continue in Üktāe's family, and demanded why, such being the case, he had set up another. Bātū replied that he had done so by virtue of his position as head of the tribes and family, and because he and others deemed Mangū best fitted to rule a vast empire; and that no one else among them was capable of ruling it—a work which could not be entrusted to boys. He exhorited them to think better of the matter.

In this discussion the time prescribed by Bātū for the installation of Mangū on the throne in Kalūr-ān passed; and the next year [647 H.] came round, and still the affairs of the empire remained without order or splendour. All the efforts of Mangū and his mother to propitiate and persuade the hostile party were of no avail: the more she and others endeavoured to do so, the
that we should raise to the sovereignty Mangū Khan,

more obdurate the others became. This year coming to a close also, Mangū, in accord with Bātū’s brothers, sent envoys to all his kinmen, requesting them to assemble in Kalūr-ān; and despatched Shalāmūn, the Bitik-ḫī— a writer, or secretary, from the Turkish enslaved— to Ughūl Kūlmish, the chief Khatūn of Kyūk Kkān, and her sons, Naḵū and Khwājah, and another Bitik-ḫī to Yassū-Mangū [also written Mangū], saying: “Most of the members of the urūdū of the Chingiz Kkān have here assembled, and the hūrūltā is entirely delayed, through your non-attendance, for a long time. If you are of one mind, and desire to see the affairs of the empire disposed of, amicably and in accord, attend; but, understand, that nothing will be left in abeyance for you any longer.” They saw there was no help but to appear, and therefore Naḵū Aghūl set out, and the Nū-yīn, Kādāḵ, and several other Amīrs of Kyūk Kkān, and Yassū Mangū, and Būrī, sons of Chaghātāe Kkān, proceeded from their urūdūs, and went to the presence of Shīrāmūn, grandson of Ūktūe, and all these Shāh-zādahs met together at an appointed place. Afterwards, Khwājah, son of Kyūk, joined them; and, under the supposition that the hūrūltā would not, and could not, be held without them, they proceeded very leisurely. It so happened, however, that Barkā Kkān had previously written to his brother, Bātū, saying, that it was now two years since the sons of Ūktūe, Kyūk, and Chaghātāe, had been summoned to attend, and they would not, and were constantly occupied in their ambitious and seditious designs. In reply, Bātū gave orders, saying: “Place ye Mangū on the throne, and, if they or either of them do anything contrary to the yāsā of the Chingiz Kkān, let their heads pay the forfeit.”

On receipt of this command, Barkā and his brother assembled together all the Shāh-zādahs then present in the urūdū of Kalūr-ān, and the great Amīrs, among whom was Amīr Ḵarkāshūn, or Ḵarkasūn, and of the Shāh-zādahs of the Dast-i-Rāst, Kārā Hulāū or Hulāū; [the name is written both ways, and both are correct], son of Chaghātāe; of Ūktūe’s sons, Kādāḵ, and his grandsons, Mūngard and others; and the brothers of Mangū, Kūbfā, or Kūbfā, Hulāū, Mūkā, and Iruṭ Būkā. Of the Shāh-zādahs of the Dast-i-Chap, the sons of Jūḏi Ḵasār, Nako [?], and Yasū Mungā; Iljīdā or Iljīdā, son of Kājiūn, and Mājār, son of the Nu-yīn, Uljī, the sons of Mankūtū, and a few others of the family of lesser note.

Having chosen a propitious hour, approved by the augurs, they met together, confirmed the decision of the Ąkā, Bātū Kkān, and placed Mangū Kā’ān upon the throne with the usual ceremonials. One of the most auspicious signs of the glory of his reign, according to the pro-Mughal Historians, was, that for several days previously, the atmosphere of those parts became so overcast that the face of the sun was completely hidden, and incessant rain fell; but it so happened that, at the very moment chosen by the astrologers for Mangū’s seating himself on the throne, the world-enlighenting luminary burst forth from his veil of clouds, and filled the universe with his effulgent brightness. All present in that great assembly, Shāh-zādahs, Amīrs, and people, thereupon arose, doffed their caps, unloosed their girdles and cast them over their shoulders, and bent the knee nine times. I cannot here enter into farther details, which are highly interesting: space forbids. It took place at the ancient yūrat, within the limits of Kārā-Kūram, the urūdū of Kalūr-ān, in the year of the Hog, in the month of Zf-Kadah—the eleventh month—of the year 648 H., or February, 1251 A.D.
son of Tüli, the youngest of the Chingiz Khán’s sons, who was removed from the world in the day-time of youth, and never enjoyed dominion; and, whereas, I, Bātū, shall place him on the throne, in reality I shall be the sovereign.” All ratified this opinion.¹

When they were about to place Mangū Khán on the throne, Barkā, the Musalmān, said: “The empire of the infidels hath departed, and the dominion of every pagan monarch who ascends the throne of sovereignty will not endure. If ye desire that the rule of Mangū shall continue, and be prolonged, let him pronounce the [Musalmān] confession of faith, in order that his name may be inscribed in the register of the Islāmis, and then let him ascend the throne.” This was concurred in, and Mangū repeated the confession of faith.² Then Barkā, taking him

In 649 H., Mangū Kā’n lost his mother, Sīr-Kūkit Bīgi, by some written Sīr-Kūkit Bīgi—being, I believe, a mistake of ठ for ठ which often occurs in M/S. She was a Christian, but favoured the Musalmāns, and was exceedingly liberal towards them. She gave 1000 bālij of gold for the purpose of erecting a khanqah or monastery over the tomb of the Shāikh, Saif-ud-Dīn, the Bākhūrī, at Bukhārā, and ordered villages to be purchased wherewith she endowed it.

¹ Previous to Mangū’s having been raised to the throne of sovereignty, and during the four years his confirmation remained in abeyance, some events of importance happened in the countries, and to several persons, mentioned by our author.

In the year 643 H. Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, the Kurat, repeatedly mentioned by our author, the maternal grandfather of Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad [who is considered the first of the Kurat dynasty], died at Ḵaṭesār of Ghūr, a notice of whom will be found farther on.

On the 23rd of Muḥarram, 644 H., Sulṭan ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Masʿud Shāh, died, or, rather, was put to death, in prison at Dihlī, and was succeeded by his uncle, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, who, soon after, at the advice of his Ḥājib, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balban [subsequently raised to the office of Lieutenant of the kingdom, with the title of Ulugh Khān], advanced towards the Indus to expel the Mughals from the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah, where they had established themselves after the unsuccessful attempt upon Uqchah mentioned at page 1154.

In 645 H., the Amir, Arghūn Ākā, having obtained the government of Irân-Zamīn, entered upon his office. He had obtained it, by Kyūk Khān’s command after the I-ghūr Nū-yīn, Kūrkūz, had been put to death. Some say that Turā-Kināh Khāṭūn, Kyūk’s mother, had removed Kūrkūz, and appointed Arghūn Ākā, before Kyūk succeeded to the sovereignty, as has been previously mentioned, in note 7, page 1149.

² If so, how is it that other Musalmān writers do not say so? I fear “the wish” of our author “was parent to the thought.”

Barkā Khān had already become a Musalmān, because, at the great feast
by the arm, seated him on the throne; and all the Mughal rulers paid homage unto him, with the exception of the tribe and dependents and sons of Chaghatâe, who began to act in a contumacious manner, and showed a rebellious spirit. They were desirous of acting in a perfidious manner, and of falling unexpectedly upon the camp of Mangû Khân, to capture him, and put him to death.

They [the sons of Chaghatâe] despatched confidential persons to the presence of Mangû Khân, saying: "When thou ascendest the throne we propose to come to thy presence for the purpose of tendering our congratulations and observing the custom of felicitation." With this pretence they issued forth from their place of abode, with a host of horsemen well organized and armed; and their determination was to make a night attack upon Mangû Khân, slay him and Bâtû also, and overcome their adherents, and seize upon the sovereignty: "man proposes, but God disposes." It was the decree of Heaven that a camel-man, from the camp of Bâtû and Mangû Khân, who had lost his camel, set out towards the open country in search of it, and was roaming about in every direction, when, suddenly, he fell among the army of the sons of Chaghatâe. On becoming aware of the circumstances of this army, to every one who inquired of him to whose following or retinue he belonged—as the appearance and dialect of the camel-men of the army of Chaghatâe's sons was the same as his own—he made himself out to be a camel-man of one of their Amîrs, until night came, when, seizing the opportunity, the camel-man got away from among the forces of the sons of Chaghatâe, and returned to the camp of Bâtû and Mangû Khân, and made them acquainted with the matter.  

held on this occasion, sheep were allowed to be killed for him, according to the prescribed Musalmân usage, which was contrary to that of the Mughals. Kâdân Aghûl, and his brother's son, Malik Aghûl, and Karâ-Hûlû, tendered to the Khân their congratulations according to the custom of the Mughals.

While Mangû Khân, and the Shâh-zâdahs, or Princes, were engaged in these festivities just referred to, and the Bâdshâh was expecting the arrival of the other Shâh-zâdahs, who had delayed by the way instead of attending the kûrîltâe, as already stated, when no living soul expected that hostility, much less treachery, would break out in the family of the Chingiz Khân, and at a
When that information reached the hearing of Mangū

time when all was jubilee, and there was no suspicion of such treachery, and no precaution taken, Shhrāmūn, grandson of Úktāe, and son of Kochūe, Nākū or Nākū, son of Kyūk, and Kūnūkū, son of Karachār, son of Úktāe, combined together, and arrived near unto the urdū of Mangū Kāʾān. Along with them were a great number of carts full of arms, and in their hearts they meditated treachery and perfidy towards Mangū. It so happened, however, that a ẓaṭaḥ—thā—that is to say, a camel-man, whose name was Kāshāk, a Kāntūlī, in the immediate service of the Kāʾān—had lost one of his camels. In search of this animal he was wandering about the open country, when, suddenly, he found himself in the midst of an army, and saw a countless number of carts. As he proceeded onwards, pretending to take no notice, he came upon a boy seated before a broken cart. The boy, thinking he was one of the followers of the force, asked him to aid him in mending it. Kāshāk dismounted from his horse for the purpose, when, to his great astonishment, instead of drinkables and other necessaries for a banquet, he found implements of war and arms concealed in the cart, under other things. He inquired of the boy: “What are these?” He replied: “Only arms, such as are contained in all the other carts;” and, on further inquiry, Kāshāk discovered that this force consisted of the followers of Shhrāmūn, Nākū, and others, who were proceeding towards the Kāʾān’s urdū to offer their congratulations, and to hold a banquet. Being aware that banquets were not furnished from carts full of arms, nor congratulations offered, he, after helping to mend the cart, and obtaining other information, got out of the camp of Shhrāmūn and the other Shāh-zādahs, and performed a three days’ journey in one. Without waiting to ask permission, he rushed into the presence of Mangū Kāʾān, and before all those there assembled cried out: “Here are ye all occupied in amusement and mirth, while foes have arisen against ye, and are close at hand!” and he related what he had beheld and heard. Mangū would not believe it; and the Shāh-zādahs and Amīrs present thought Kāshāk must be exaggerating; nevertheless, the Nū-yīn, Mūngūsūr, or Mungūsūr, the principal of Mangū’s Nū-yīns, was despatched, with 2000 or 3000 horse, to gain information. When the next morning broke, Mūngūsūr pushed on, at the head of 500 chosen horse, nearer to the position where the camp of the rebels was situated, and while he was reconnoitring a large body of horsemen were observed approaching. It was Shhrāmūn and his party, issuing from their camp. Mūngūsūr was soon joined by the Shāh-zādah, Mūkā, and the Gūrgān, Jōkāl, the Karāyīt, and an additional force despatched by Mangū to his support, and they completely surrounded Shhrāmūn, Nākū, and Kūnūkū.

The Fanākātī says Mangū, on becoming aware of this, despatched the Nū-yīn, Mungūsūr, with 3000 men, to meet them, and that he met Shhrāmūn at the head of 500 horse, despatched by the conspirators in advance.

The Nū-yīn said to him: “They say ye are coming with evil designs in your hearts. If this is not true, pass on without fear or hesitation to the presence; otherwise I am directed to arrest thee and take thee prisoner thither.” Shhrāmūn denied all evil intentions, and asserted that they were all only attended by their usual retinues. As the others arrived, they and their followers were disarmed, as the party of Shhrāmūn had been already, and the Princes and their Amīrs were divided into nine—number venerated by the Mughals—and, in that manner were allowed to enter the audience-tent or khargah; and, soon after, the Amīrs with them were admitted to make their obeisances. An
Khān, after taking ample care and caution, he caused the entertainment to be given, which lasted three days, and nothing whatever was said to them, nor was a question asked.

On the fourth day, however, command was given that all the followers of the disaffected Princes and their partisans should depart each to their own yārāt, under pain of death if they should be found to remain after that order. A body of troops was detailed to guard the disaffected Princes and Amīrs, and Mangū, in concert with his chief Nū-yīn, Amīrs, and Ministers, on the sixth day, proceeded to inquire into their conduct. The Atā-Bak of Prince Shīrā-mūn was closely questioned about the plot. He at first denied all knowledge of it; but, on being bastinadoed, he confessed, and immediately stabbed himself; and Shīrāmūn also confessed. The seven Nū-yīns directed to try the Princes declared them guilty, and, moreover, the conspirators themselves now confessed their plot. Mangū is said to have been inclined to pardon them, but this his Nū-yīns and Amīrs strongly opposed. He therefore directed that they should all be imprisoned until he had time to consider what should be done with them. After a few days, Mangū again summoned his Counsellors, and asked their advice upon the matter. Some said one thing, some another, but in such wise as not to satisfy the Kā‘ān. Then his Wazīr, Maḥmūd, Yalwāj, related the anecdote respecting Aristotle's reply to Alexander, about rooting up all the old trees in the garden, and replacing them with young scions, which story has done duty in scores of instances, and is applied by Fīrishtah, the Dakhāf Historian, to the Turk chiefs in the Panjāb in the reign of Ghīyāsh-ud-Dīn, Balban—the Ulugh Khān of this History, the father-in-law of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, and his successor on the throne of Dīlū.

After hearing the anecdote, Mangū Kā‘ān understood the necessity there was for completely crushing this faction, and he gave command for them to be put to death.

As some of the conspirators had not yet been brought to justice, such as Ughul Kūlmīsh, the chief Khāțūn of Kyūk Khān, and Khwājah Aghūl, her son, Mangū Kā‘ān was not yet safe from their designs, and he therefore dispatched troops to compel the disaffected to submit. One army, said to have contained ten tomāns, probably two, was despatched to the Ulugh Tāk and to Tūlkāe and ḫūj, which lie between Bīgh-Bālīgh and Karā-Kurum, with orders to join the Nū-yīn Alghū, who was in the district of Kāţālīk, and to advance as far as the border of Utrār, and act in concert, and the Nū-yīn, Būkā, with two tomāns, was despatched to Kīrkīr or Kīrkīr and Kum-Kum-jūfū. The Chinese say that, in the year 1250 A.D. [commencing on the 4th of April, 648 H.], in the year of his accession to the throne, and “about the same time,” as he put down the rebellion, “Mengko ordered Holitay, one of his generals, to enter Tibbat, and to put to death all who refused to submit to the Mughals” [to himself?]. The Bītik-chī, Shālāmūn, was despatched to summon Ughūl Kūlmīsh Khāțūn, and her son, Khwājah. He proposed to put the envoy to death, but one of his Khāțūns persuaded him against committing such an act, and advised his presenting himself, without delay, in the presence of the Kā‘ān. Ughūl Kūlmīsh Khāțūn refused to obey the command of Mangū, and abused and upbraided him before his envoy. Mangū was much enraged when he heard of it, and commanded that she should be brought, with hands bound, to his mother's wūlū to be tried.

In due time Ughūl Kūlmīsh, the Khāțūn of Kyūk, and Kadākāj, the Khāțūn of Kočū, son of Uktāe, the mother of Shīrāmūn, and Tūkāshī, the Khāțūn
forces to be got ready, and moved out to meet and engage

of Yassū-Mungā, two sons of the Nū-yīn, Iḥīkdaē, and the Christian, Kadāk, the chief minister of Kyūk Khān, among others, were brought in, tried, and their guilt established. Shīrāmūn’s mother and other Khātūns were sent to the urdū of Sūr Kūhī Bīgī, Mangū’s mother, to be dealt with; and they were rolled up in felt, and drowned. The Shāh-zādahs, Nū-yīns, and Amīrs, were beaten on their mouths with stones until they died. That they “were choked by having earth or stones forced into their mouths,” as we are informed in the “Mongols Proper,” is merely a wrong translation from some “muddy stream.”

Persian author [or an incorrect translation from the foreign rendering of the Persian], in which the phrase has been mistaken for

Būl, and some others, were sent to the presence of Bātū Khān to be dealt with, and, their crime having been proved, they too were put to death. The Nū-yīn, Iḥīkdaē, the destroyer of Hirāt, and slayer of its inhabitants, was likewise seized at Bādghais, and subsequently put to death.

No less than seventy-seven or seventy-eight members altogether of the family of the Chingiz Khān, Nū-yīns, and Amīrs, perished on this occasion; and, in consequence of these executions, enmity arose among its members, which was never afterwards extinguished.

Rubruquis, who reached Mangū’s urdū in January, 1254 a.d.—the last month of 651 h.—and was present during these executions, says that three hundred lords, besides ladies, perished. He describes Mangū Khān as being of middle stature, flat-nosed, and about forty-five years old. “He sat on a bed [couch], and was clad with a robe of spotted fur, which shined like seal-skin. His wife [one of his wives], who was a little pretty woman, sat by him; and, on another couch near, sat one of his daughters [by his chief Khātūn], named Shīrīn, grown up, but exceedingly hard favoured, and several little children; for that being her [Shīrīn’s] mother’s urdū [a Christian lady whom the Khān was very fond of], she was mistress of it. On the 14th of January, the Khān’s chief wife Kotola Katen [the name of the Khān’s chief wife was Kanka Khātūn—لا لاق] attended the Christian chapel with her children.”

Mangū having now put down all sedition, the natural goodness of his heart disposed him to show kindness to his remaining kinsmen. He directed that Shīrāmūn, Nākū, and the Nū-yīn, Chaghān, should accompany his brother, Kūftā Khān, into Khīta, and Khwājah Aghūl, son of Kyūk Khān, received an appanage in the territory of Salingah, or Sāilingā, “which is near unto Karā-Kuram”; and, in the same manner, he assigned appanages to others of his kinsmen, wherein they might pass their days in affluence.

The loyal Shāh-zādahs were now also dismissed to their different urdūs, and also Bātū Khān’s brothers, Barkā, and Būkā Tīmūr, who had rendered such good service, and had the longest distance to go. They were dismissed with rich presents, and bore along with them befitting offerings for the Akā, Bātū, the Sa-in Khān. The sons of Kītān, Kadān [Kadhān?] Aghūl, and Malik Aghūl, were also rewarded, and allowed to depart to their stations; and on Karā-Hulakū, son of Miṭkākē, son of Chaghātā, his father’s appanage, which his uncle, Yassū-Mungā, had usurped, was conferred; but when he reached Ali—death overtook him.

Kashk, the ḵoṣṭ-chi, or camel-man, was rewarded, raised to high rank, and made a Tarḵān. The administration of the revenue affairs of the eastern part of the empire was conferred upon the Ṣāhib, Maḥmūd, Yalwāj, who had, of old, done such good service, and who had reached Mangū’s urdū previous
the army of the sons of Chaghatae, and repel them. Before they could reach the camp of Mangü Khan, he, with his own forces, and the troops of Bâtû, fell upon that array, wielded the sword among them, and despatched about ten thousand Mughals of rank and renown, leaders of armies [1], to hell; and extirpated all who belonged to the army or were dependents of Chaghataé’s sons; and set his mind at ease. Mangü Khan now became firmly established in the sovereignty, and ascended the throne of Chin and Upper Turkestan, and carried out his measures so that not a trace of the tribe of Chaghataé remained upon the face of the earth, with the exception of one or two of Chaghataé’s sons who proceeded towards Chin, to the presence of the Altan Khan of Tamghaj.

Subsequently to that, Mangü Khan despatched forces to his being raised to the throne. Turkistan and Mawara-un-Nahr were entrusted to his son, Mas‘ûd Bak; and the Amîr, Arghûn Akâ, who, on account of the immense distance he had to come, could only reach the Court after the Kuriltai, was confirmed in the administration of the revenue affairs of all the countries west of the Jihûn, as far as Halab, Arman, and Rûm. ‘Alî Malik was sent with him to make a new assessment in the countries of Iran-Zamin under the sway of the Mughals. Mangü also resumed all grants not conferred by the Chingiz Khan, Êktai Kä‘än, or Kyûk Khan. This was done because the Shâh-zâdahs had, for their own purposes, during the long interregnum, been bestowing fiefs upon their partisans in all directions. Mangü issued wise regulations on this, and many other subjects, for which I have no space here. A fresh assessment likewise was made in Khîfâ, and the only exemptions from taxation were made in favour of such persons as had been also exempt during the reigns of the Chingiz Khan and his son, Êktai Kä‘än, namely, Sâyîds, Shaikhâs, and Ulamâ, of the Musalmânûs, the priests, monks, and ascetics, of the Christians, the chief Tûnân of the Idol-worshippers, and such persons as, by reason of infirmity, sickness, or old age, were unable to work; and all outstanding claims for cesses were likewise remitted.

I must, however, briefly mention one especial good regulation instituted by Mangü Kä‘än. A number of scribes were employed at the Court, conversant with the Farsi, I¬ghûrî, Khîfâ-i, Tibbatî, Tingkût, and other languages, so that, whenever they might have occasion to write farmânûs, they might be able to do so in the language and character of the particular tribe or people to whom such farmân might be addressed. This contradicts the statement made, on the authority of Klaproth, quoted in the Journal Ro. As. Soc., vol. v. [new series], page 33.

It is curious to read of “Professor” Tatatonggo, “installed by Genghis as Professor of the Ouigour language and literature”—in the University of Ulugh Yûrât perhaps.

The final downfall of the Altan Khâns, the Kin of Chinese authors, could not have occurred as early as Êktai’s reign from this statement, which the Pro-Mughal writers do not even hint at.
to the Ḵuḥistān of the Mulāḥidahs; and, during several years, the Mughals overran that territory, pitched their camps therein, and took up their quarters in that country. The inhabitants of the Ḵuḥistān became thereby reduced to misery and wretchedness; and the Mughals gained possession of their fortresses and cities, and demolished their strongholds, and the Mulāḥidahs fell. The account of them is as follows.

ACCOUNT OF THE FALL OF THE MULĀḤIDAHs—ON THE WHOLE OF WHOM BE GOD'S CURSE!

The reason for despatching forces into the territory and against the fortresses of Mulāḥidistān was this. At the outset of the career and time of Ḥasan-i-Ṣabbāh—God's

6 Not intended to be understood otherwise than as a nick or by-name—Heretic-land, from Mulbid, heretic, etc.

7 The Printed Text turns this name into مغ-ṣabbāgh—which is the Arabic for a dyer!

It is very amusing to notice the errors made with regard to the name of this person, and the plunges made respecting it; and it is surely time such errors should be corrected. The latest notice of this kind occurs in a book lately published, by Major R. D. Osborn, of the Bengal S. C., entitled "Islam under the Khalifs of Baghdad," in which we are told [p. 345] that the "first Grand Master of the Assassins" was "Hasan ibn [i.e., son of, when, at the same time, his father's name is 'Alī] Saba," but, afterwards, a little farther on, he is styled "Hasan Saba" only. The author of the above work, however, merely follows in the beaten road of others who cannot read the original histories for themselves, and have to depend on translations often incorrect, and who call him by such incorrect names—it is merely error stereotyped, so to say—such as "the old man of the mountain" for example, another gross error. Yet such is the force of habit that there are editors of periodicals and reviews who, if they saw an attempt to correct such blunders, would probably say, "in the case of a journal intended for general readers, we are more or less forced to adopt the usual conventional spelling, partly because readers like it, and partly to secure uniformity," while others would consider the correction of such errors "want of taste," and "very offensive."

The first Da'im, the literal meaning of which is an apostle or missionary, one who invites or stimulates others—of the Ismā'īlīs or Mulāḥidahs of Almāt was 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan, son of 'Alī, son of Muhammad, son of Ja'far, son of Ḥusain, son of Muhammad, who claimed descent from Us-Ṣabbāh Al-Ḥamārī, mentioned at page 7 of this Translation; but by some he is considered to be descended from Ismā'īl, son of Ja'far-ṣ-Ṣādīk.

By 'Arab writers he was styled the Shaikh-ul-Jibāl—which some one, long ago, probably, translated without recollecting, or without knowing, that Shaikh has other meanings besides "an old or venerable old man,"
curse upon him!—who instituted the rules of the Mulla-
heidah sect, and founded the canons of that heresy, he
restored and strengthened the fortresses of Alamut which
he purchased, along with the fortress of Lanbah-Sar, which
was [afterwards became, and was at this time] the capital
of the chief Mulhid [heretic], whom that sect used to

and that jibal is the plural of jabal, "a mountain," and at once jumped at the
conclusion that his title was the "Old Man of the Mountain," more especially
as his stronghold was on a mountain likewise, and so he has continued to be
wrongly styled "The Old Man of the Mountain" down to the present day.

The terms Shaikh-ul-Jibal, however, signify, the Patriarch, Prelate, High-
Priest, etc., of, or dwelling in, the tract of country south of the Caspian, called
Jibal, the Mountains of Dilm in the Masalik wa Mamalik, and also
Kohistan, consisting of a belt of mountains running along the frontiers of
Gilan, Mazendaran, and Irak-i-'Ajam—ancient Parthia. It was from this
tract known as "the Jibal," that Hasan-i-Shabab, the first Shaikh of the
eastern Isma'ilis or Mulhidahs, received the name, because, in this tract, he
began his mission.

There is a Jibal of Ghur also, mentioned at pages 335 and 338, but that is a
mere local name, while "the Jibal" referred to is well known, and is called by
that name.

* Thus stated in the text, but Alamut was the capital of the Mulhidahs,
during the greater part of their rule, and hence they are sometimes styled
Alamutis.

A pretty jumble has been made, too, of the name of this well-known place,
in every copy of the text collated—but some other works are almost as bad—
through the carelessness or ignorance of the copyists. What European writers
make of it I shall presently show. Only one copy of the text has anything
approaching the correct name, but the various modes of writing cannot all be
rendered by Persian types. Some have لسنن - نلا - لام - لام - The Cal-
cutta "Official Text"—which is very defective at this particular part—has
in the page and in a note; and wherever this name occurs it is
vitiates in the way above mentioned.

Von Hammer styles it Lamsir, which is not very far wide of the mark; but,
when he styles Gird-koh by the impossible name of Kirikuh, it is not to be
wondered at that the other is not correct. D'Ohsson, to judge from the "Mongols
Lancer," appears to call it Lamsher and Lamhessar; Quatremere alone is
correct. This place is called Lambah-Sar—ملااب—Lambah—lanbah signifies anything round or circular, such
as an apple, an orange, or the like, and Sar means, summit, top, head,
etc. It is the name of a mountain in the territory of Mazendaran, near
Gird-Koh, which signifies the Round or Circular Hill or Mountain, also in
Mazendaran; and on each of these mountains the Mulhidahs had erected a
strong fortress. The latter place, which will be again referred to, lies a short
distance from Damghan, but neither place is to be found in the large map of
Persia lately published by the India Office, nor were they, apparently, known
to the most recent travellers in that part of the Persian empire; and I beg to
suggest that some of those who may travel that way in future should pay both
Lambah-Sar and Gird-Koh a visit, both sites being well known in those parts.
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style "The Maulänä"—God curse them all!—from the Diälamis for a large sum of money.

Having brought there a pregnant female slave of his own, he represented to people, saying: "She is pregnant by Mustanär, the Miśri, [the Isma'ili Khalifah of Egypt], and, flying from enemies, I have brought her to this place, for, from the lineage of this burden [which she bears] will spring the Imäm-i-Akhir-i-Zamän and Mahdi-i-Äwän,"* accompanied with vain and impotent words, the like of which no sensible person would allow to pass in his imagi-
nation, or enter his heart. God curse him!

After he purchased those fortresses, he repaired the fortress of Alamüt, and expended incalculable wealth in the restoration of, and providing that stronghold with stores and provisions. It is situated on a mountain in the vicinity of the city of Kazwin. The inhabitants of that city are all orthodox Sunnis, of pure faith, and unsullied belief; and, through the Bātiníah and Muláhidah heresy, continual fighting and contention used to go on between them [and those heretics].

Trustworthy persons have narrated that all the people and inhabitants of the city of Kazwin had entire sets of arms ready, and implements of warfare in preparation, to such degree, that all the bāsār people were used to come completely armed to their shops; and conflicts used to take place daily between the Kazwínís and the Muláhidahs of Alamüt, up to the period when the outbreak of the Chingiz Khán took place, and the domination of the Mughals over Irân and the Jibal. Kāzī Shams-ud-Din, the Kazwini, who was a sincere Imâm and truly learned man, upon several occasions, travelled from Kazwin towards Khitā, and suffered the distress of separation from country and home, until this time, during the sovereignty of Mangü Khán, when he again set out, and proceeded to his presence. In such manner as was feasible he endeavoured to obtain aid, and gave an account of the

* The Director or Guide, the last of the twelve Imãms, Muḥammad-i-Abü-I Kāsim, the son of Hasan-al-Askari, the eleventh of the Imãms, born in 255 H., whom the Shi'ahs believe to be still alive, and whose manifestation, according to the Kur'än, is one of the signs of the Judgment Day.
wickedness of the Mālahidah and their sedition in the Muḥammadan states.\(^1\)

1 In the year 654 H., but Ḥāfīz Abrū, and some others, say in 653 H., 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Ḥasan, son of Muḥammad, the seventh Dā'ī or Apostle, or Missionary, of the Mulāhidahs, died at the end of the month of Shawwal. He was the only son of the Nau Musalmān [referred to in note \(^4\), page 265—nau, in the Persian of the East, signifies “new,” “fresh,” etc., but Von Hammer’s “Nov” is very nau indeed], and, when he grew up, his brain, it is said, was affected, and he refused, in consequence, to attend to any instructions brought by his own envoys from the Mughal sovereigns, so the Pro-Mughal writers say; but the correct reason was that he thought himself strong enough to preserve his independence, but he was mistaken. In his reign, the Muḥtaṣīm [Preceptor], Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, who held the chief authority over the Kūhstān, which tract of country has been repeatedly mentioned before, seized the Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī—the celebrated Sūfī poet—and compelled him to proceed along with him to the presence of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad; and the Khwājah continued with him, in his stronghold of Mālūn [dujz], until the arrival of Hulākū in I-rān-Zamīn. There he composed his celebrated work, the Akhīāk-i-Nāṣīrī, which, the Rauṣat-us-Safā says, was dedicated to the Muḥtaṣīm Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, who nevertheless threw him into prison, at the instigation of the traitor Wazīr of the Khalfah, mentioned farther on. There are other versions of this, however, and the Khwājah is said to have gone thither of his own free will and accord, and to satisfy his feelings of revenge, as will be subsequently mentioned.

After Mangū Kā’ān had determined upon sending forces into I-rān-Zamīn, to guard the Mughal conquests therein, he despatched the Nū-yīn, Tānjū [jīb. It is sometimes written jīb—but incorrectly so] thither. Soon after his arrival there he became so much grieved—disinterested creature!—at the conduct of the Ismā‘īlī heretics, and the Khalfah of Baghdudd, towards the people generally, that he despatched an agent to the presence of the Kā’ān to complain of them both. How history repeats itself! We might read Bulghar for I-rān, and the ‘Uṣmānī Sultan for the ‘Abbāsī Khalifah.

At this juncture, likewise, the great Kāzī, Shams-ud-Dīn, from I-rān-Zamīn, presented himself in Mangū Kā’ān’s urdū, and was graciously received. As the Kāzī, out of terror of the Ismā‘īlīs, was in the habit of wearing mail under his clothes, one day Mangū Kā’ān, having observed it, asked him the reason of such an unusual dress for an ecclesiastic. He replied: “It is now several years since I, out of fear of the Ismā‘īlī Fidā-īs, who like unto ‘Azrā-ī—the Angel of Death—however much a person may guard himself, still contrive to reach and destroy him, began to wear this mail as a protection.” Von Hammer makes a muddle of this matter also, and says that “the judge of Kaswin, who was at the Khan’s court, went in armour to the audience, fearing the daggers of the assassins,” as though they were there. The Ḥabīb-us-Siyar says the Kāzī, through fear of the Ismā‘īlīs’ daggers, used to wander about the country in the scales of his armour, like a shell-fish in its shell, and by his importunities at last impelled Mangū to send a numerous army into I-rān-Zamīn. The author of the “Mongols Proper,” however, who appears to have taken the story from D’Ohsson, puts a piece upon it, and states, that such was the terror of the “fedawīs,” that “the chief officers and more prominent men of its [Western Asia’s] various courts” wore coats of mail under their clothes as a precaution, etc.
They [the trustworthy persons] also related in this wise,

To return to Mangū and the Kāzī. He related to the Kā'ān— or manufactured for him—such atrocities on the part of the heretics—as might be expected from one so orthodox as himself—that Mangū was amazed; and he resolved in his mind that he would utterly destroy that sect. Having observed indications of capacity and fitness for sovereignty on the brow of his brother, Hulākū, he determined to nominate him to carry out his intention, and at the same time to take possession of, and secure, the territories to the west of I-rān-Zamīn—the real object in view, of course—namely, Shām, Rūm, and Arman. Hulākū having been nominated, he was informed that the forces along with the Nūyīn, Tānjū, and those lately under Jūrmāghūn, which had been previously despatched into I-rān Zamīn, all appertained to him; and likewise, in the same way, those which had been sent into Hindūstān under the Bahādur, Tā-īr, after his death, came under the command of the Tāṭār Nūyīn, Sālīf. Sālīf, according to the Pro-Mughal writers, had subdued the country of Kāshmir, and several thousand Kāshmirī captives had been sent by him to the Kā'ān's urdu. There is still a Sālīf kī Sarāe on the route from Rāval Pindī to Kānpūr, an old place, and formerly of some importance. See page 844, where Sālīf is mentioned, and page 1135 for Tā-īr's death.

Vast preparations were made for Hulākū's movement, and, besides the armies already in the countries of I-rān-Zamīn, Mangū commanded that, out of all the forces of the Chingiz Kāhān, that is, the various kādārāhs already mentioned at page 1093, which he had assigned to and divided among his brothers, his sons, and brothers' sons, out of every ten persons two should be selected [they had vastly increased, too, since the time of the Chingiz Kāhān] and sent to serve under Hulākū. The numbers are variously mentioned at from 120,000 to 180,000 horse. Besides these, a thousand families of Khiṭā-ī Manjanīk-chīs [catapult workers], Naft-Andāz [naphtha-throwers], and Charkh-Andāz [shooters of fiery arrows worked by a wheel] were to accompany him, and they brought along with them such a vast amount of missiles and stores appertaining to their peculiar branch of the forces as cannot be enumerated. They had with them also Charkhī Kāmāns [wheeled arbalists], worked by a wheel in such wise that one bow-string would pull three bows, each of which would discharge an arrow of three or four ells in length. These arrows or bolts, from the notch for the bow-string to near the head, were covered with feathers of the vulture and eagle, and the bolts were short and strong. These machines would also throw naphtha. The bolts [sic—n] of the catapults were made of ash, very tough and strong, and covered with the hides of horses and bullocks [to prevent their being burnt], like as a dagger in its sheath; and each catapult was so constructed as to be capable of being separated into five or seven parts, and easily put together again. These catapults and mangonels were brought from Khiṭā-e on carts into Turkiştān, under the direction of skilful engineers and mechanists, but there is no evidence whatever to show that they had any knowledge of gunpowder, but quite the contrary.

As soon as the expedition had been determined on, agents were despatched in order that wheresoever the passage of the great host should be, from Kārā-Kūram to the Âmūfah, all the available pasture-lands and grazing tracts should be laid under embargo [the word used is kūrûk, the same that is used with reference to the site of the subterranean chamber in which the Chingiz Kāhān was buried, but signifies enclosed as well as prohibited. The word is quite
that, in the presence of Mangū Khān, the Kāzī, according
common in our district Law Courts in India] for the use of the forces. Strong
bridges were also constructed over the different rivers by the way to enable
the great host to cross with ease and facility. Throughout the whole empire
[east of the Shāhūn probably] orders were sent so that, for the use of the army,
at the ratio of a taghār [an earthen vessel of capacity; also a saddle-bag for
holding corn or meal, which is probably meant here, and, of course, filled.
Some authors state that a taghār is equivalent to 100 manns of Tabriz, others
to 10 manns of Tabriz, equal to one kharvār] of meal, and a khīg [a skin or
leather bottle of liquor—hūmis] for each man, should be collected.
The Nū-yīn, Tānjū, and his army, together with the troops which had previously
been sent into Īrān-Zamān under Jūrmāghūn, now received orders to
move towards the frontiers of Rūm.
All things being prepared, and the different Shāh-zādahs and Nū-yīns, and
the Hazārahās, and Šadīhās [leaders of thousands, and hundreds], having been
nominated, the Nū-yīn, Kaibūkā, the Nāmān, was sent at the head of
12,000 horse, as the advance or van of Hulākū’s forces, in Jamāḏ-ul-Aḥrīr,
650 H. Kaibūkā—“Kitubuka” is not correct—crossed the Āmūlah in the
beginning of Muḥarram, 651 H. [early in March, 1253 A.D.], entered Khurāsān,
which he reached in Raḥī-ul-Awwal, and occupied himself in the reduction of
the Kūhistān.
His first attempt, with 5000 horse and 5000 foot [Ṭāzhīk levies from the
conquered states], was against the strong fortress of Gird-Khāh, already referred
to, but he found it a much more difficult matter than he expected. He sur-
rounded it with a wall, furnished with a ditch inside, towards the fortress, and
raised another wall, with a ditch outside, and between these two walls placed
his forces, more like one besieged than a besieger, to guard his force from the
sallies of the Fidā-īs. All his efforts were useless, so he left a force there
under Būfī, to watch that fortress, and moved himself towards Mihrīn-dujīz—
another stronghold of the sect. He invested that likewise, placed catapults in
position against it, left several Amīrs with troops to carry on the siege, and
proceeded himself, with the rest of his forces, which, no doubt, had been
greatly increased in point of numbers by the levies and contingents of those
places in Khurāsān under the Mughal yoke, against the fort of Shāh-dujīz,
which he reached on the 8th of Jamāḏ-ul-Awwal, and slew a number of
people outside, and then made towards the districts of Tārām and Rūd-bār,
between Gīlān and Kāzwīn. He then appeared with his forces before the
fortresses of Manṣūrfah and Alah-Bašhīn, and for eighteen days tried his
utmost to take them, but all his efforts were of no effect. He then faced about
and moved into the Kūhistān again, drove off the flocks and herds of the
people of Ţūn, Turṣhīz, and Zar-Khā, slaughtered a vast number of people,
and carried away a great number of captives. On the 10th of Jamāḏ-ul-
Aḥrīr, he gained possession of Ţūn and Turṣhīz, these being the first places
that fell into his hands. On the 1st of Shā'bān he took Mihrīn-dujīz, and, on
the 27th of Ramāzān, the Dujī-ī-Kamālī also fell.
On the 9th of Shawwāl, the Fidā-īs of Gird-Khāh made a sally at night upon
the Mughals, destroyed their circumvallation, and slew the greater number of
them, including their leader, Būfī. At this time a pestilence had broken out
within Gird-Khāh, and, as soon as ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Maulānā of
the Mulkishahs, had intimation of it, he at once dispatched Muḥāriz-ud-Dīn,
‘Alī, Sarābānī, and Shujā’-ud-Dīn, Hasan, Tūrānī, with 110 picked men, to
to the practice of Musalmān dignity and religion, used

Gird-Koh, with directions that each man should carry with him one *mann* of ḥinnā and two *mann* of salt [in all, about 21 or 24 lbs.]—the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīḵ says two of ḥinnā and three of salt—because ḥinnā had lately been discovered, accidentally, to be the antidote for the pestilence.

The author of the "Mongols Proper" has, or his authorities, perhaps, have, made a very amusing story out of the above—for the source is evidently the same. He says, p. 194: "One of the garrison of Girdūk—i.e., "the Round Mountain"—so "kjuک" is a mountain, perhaps—the same which Von Hammer turns into "Kirdkūh"] escaped, and sent to Alaeddin, the Grand Vizier, to ask for help. He sent two leaders, each with 110 troopers; one to escort three mens of salt, the other three mens of heuna," etc.—equal to about one ounce of salt and ḥinnā each, even if only 400 people were within the walls.

At this place, in Alīf, an anecdote is related respecting the discovery of ḥinnā as a remedy for the disease which affected the defenders of several great fortresses, as our author relates, and which, from his account at page 1124, appears to have been scurvy or something very much like it. It is that the daughter of the Amīr of that fortress was going to be married, and, on the night of the consummation of the marriage, the custom was to dye the bride's hands and feet with ḥinnā. This was done; and, those who applied the dye having afterwards washed their hands, some of the pestilence-stricken people, on account of the scarcity of water, drank that water, and recovered in a wonderfully short time. This seems but another version of our author's account of the cure wrought by ḥinnā in his description of the investment of Ük of Sīstān, at the page above mentioned.

I must now return to the movements of Hulākū. Before setting out for Ī-rān-Zamīn, he took leave of his brother Mangū, and his nephews, in order to return to his own urdūs, where his wives and children were. Mangū Kā'ān, before parting with him, gave him much wise counsel for his guidance. He enjoined him to observe the laws and ordinances of the Chingiz Khān; and, from the Jibūn of Āmūjah, to the extreme frontier of Miṣr, and Maghrib, to protect and cherish all who submitted to him, but to exterminate all those who did not, and to trample them into the dust of destruction, women, children, and all [in "the true Circassian style"], and to commence with the fortresses of the Mulāḥidahs in the Kuhistān. He was then to march into 'Irāk, and remove off the face of the earth the Lūs—a tribe of nomads so-called—and the Kurds, whose misdeeds [in not submitting to the ameliorating Mughals, and which hardy race have, in these days, given offence, in the same way, to another "ameliorator," and are to be exterminated as early as practicable] never ceased; then to call upon the Khalifah of Bashīdād to submit; and, if he should do so, not to molest him in the least; but, if he showed arrogance, and refused, to send him to join the others. He was further advised to make judgment and sense his guide and model; to be prudent and watchful; to be mindful of the deceit and treachery of enemies; to give tranquility to the people generally, and make them happy [by killing them!] to cause ruined places to be restored; to subdue the contumacious, so that he might have plenty of places wherein to make his summer and his winter quarters; and always, in all things, to consult and advise with Dūkūz Khāṭūn. This name is also written Tūkūz, d and t being interchangeable. She was a Karīyat and a Christian, the daughter of Aīgū or Aīkū—written Ā-yāghū—she—in Alīf—a son of the Āwang Khān. Hulākū greatly favoured the Christians on her.
stern language, in such manner that the wrath of sove-
account; and throughout his dominions churches were allowed to be built. At the entrance of theurdū of this Khātūn, a kalīla—church or chapel [felt tent]—was always pitched; and they used to sound the nākūs—a thin oblong piece of wood, so called, suspended by two strings, and struck with a flexible rod, called wābīl, used by Eastern Christians to summon the congregation for divine service.

Mangū Kā‘ān assumed that his brother Hulākū would take up his residence, permanently, in Ī-rān-Zamīn; nevertheless, he told him that, after he had accomplished all these things, he should return to his urdū.

Mangū now dismissed him, along with two of his wives, his sons, and Amīrs; and sent along with them his brother, Tursūtā Aghūl, and some of their nephews to serve under him. Mangū, it is said, was greatly affected at parting with Hulākū, for he considered him the jewel in the diadem of the empire, and that both shed copious tears. He reached his own urdūs at the end of the year 650 H. The Tāriḵh-i-Jahān-gīr and the Rauẓat-uṣ-Ṣafā say that he returned to his urdūs in the third month of 651 H., to make his preparations, but the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīḵh says in Zi-Ḥijjah, 650 H.

He set out from his urdūs for Ī-rān-Zamīn on the 24th of Sha’bān, 651 H.—the Rauẓat-uṣ-Ṣafā says he began his march in Ramaẓān, while the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīḵh says it was in Zi-Ḥijjah, 651 H.—having made his son, Balghā Aghūl, his representative there during his absence, as that son’s mother was the greatest in rank among his wives, two of whom, and two sons, went with him. The Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīḵh, in one place, says Jūmkōr, or Jūmgūr, was left in charge, and, in another place, that it was Ajāe who was left.

A vast army accompanied him; and in due time he reached Āmālīfgh, where the Khātūn Urghānah, one of Chaghatāe’s widows, received and entertained him. Having moved from thence, on the frontier of Turkistān and Māwarān-Nahr, the Šāhib, Mas’ūd Bak, and several other Amīrs, received him. He passed some months of 652 H. in those parts; and, in Sha’bān, 653 H.—about October, 1253 A.D.—reached Samrākand, having been just two years on the road. He encamped in the mead of Kān-i-Gul, where Mas’ūd Bak had a great tent pitched for him of nasīch—a species of silken fabric woven with gold—and passed forty days there, happily, but for the death of his brother, Tursūtā Aghūl, who had been long ailing, and who was there buried. Hulākū, after this stay, marched to Kash, afterwards known as Shahr-i-Sabz, at which place he remained a month; and there the Amīr, Arghūn Aḵā, the administrator of Ī-rān-Zamīn, from Tūs [in the previous year, when Rubruqīs returned to Europe, the Amīr, Arghūn Aḵā was at Tauris, who, as he remarks, collected the tribute], as in duty bound, waited on him to give up charge of that region, after which he was to return to the presence of the Kā‘ān, and there, also, came Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Kurat from Hirāt—some say he presented himself to Hulākū at Samrākand.

Whilst at Kash, Hulākū issued afarmān to the Sulṭāns and Rulers of Ī-rān-Zamīn, pretending that the object of his coming was to destroy the strongholds of the Mūlāhidahs for the sake of the people of those parts, “who,” he said, “have sought the protection of the Kā‘ān, and made complaint unto him;” “the people,” in this case, being one Kāżī! The object stated was as specious and illusive as an invasion of the same nature in these days—it was to appropriate the territories of the weak. “If ye present yourselves in person,” he said, “and render assistance, your services will be
reignty overcame Mangū Khan; for the Kazī applied the
appreciated, and your territories, forces, dwellings, and property will be spared
to you; but if ye show negligence or indifference to the purport of this farma'n,
when, with God's help [history repeats itself again], we shall have finished
with the Ismā'īls, we shall turn our face towards you; and the same will
befall you as befalls them.”

When the news of Hulākū’s arrival became spread abroad, “the Sultāns
and Malikūs” are said to have poured in, among whom was Sultān Rukn-ud-
Dīn of Rūm—he, however, was not Sultān of Rūm at all, but merely the
enov of his brother, Sultān Kai-Kā-ūs, and acted treacherously towards him
for his own ambitious ends; see page 164—and ’Izz-ud-Dīn, the son of the
Atā-Bak, Muẓaffar-ud-Dīn, and others from ’Irāk, Āṣarbājān, Ārān, Scher-
wān, Gūrjīstān, and various Malikūs, Šāhīs, and other great men. On reaching
the Jīhūn of Amūlāh, orders were given to lay all the vessels and boats on the
river under embargo. With these a strong bridge was constructed; and, on
the 1st of Zi’-Ḥijjah [the Tārīkh-i-Jahān-gīr says Shawwāl, two months
before], 653 H.—31st December, 1255 A.D., but see under—Hulākū crossed
with his army, at what point is not stated, but at the Tirmid ferry, in all
probability; and, for the first time, set foot in Ḫūrāsān. As a reward to
the boatmen for their services, he remitted the collection of tolls from them,
and that tax afterwards entirely ceased. Next day, “several lions were seen—
the word shukr is applied to the tiger also, but, considering the high latitude,
we may assume that some other less formidable animals are referred to, since
a real lion hunt on two-humped camels, as stated, would be a sight indeed—and,
they having been enclosed by a circle of men, Hulākū mounted, and two of
them were “caught in the toils.” The next day’s march brought him to
Shiwarqān, or Shiwarqān [vul. Shibbergan].

His intention was to stay but one day there, but it so happened that, on
the following day, which was the ’Īd-i-Aṣ̄hā—the 10th of Zi’-Ḥijjah—[such being
the case, he must have crossed on the 8th, or remained from the 1st to the
8th] the snow and sleet began to fall, and continued for seven consecutive
days and nights, and a great number of cattle perished through the excessive
cold. He had no choice but to winter there. Our author’s statement, that
he made the territory of Bāḏghais his headquarter is much more probable,
or rather the whole tract between Shiwarqān and Bāḏghais, considering the
number of his troops. See note 1, p. 1226. In the spring, Arghūn Aḵā set up
a vast audience-tent of silk and gold, fitted with furniture and utensils befitting,
of gold and silver studded with precious stones, and worthy of a mighty monarch.
It was pitched at an auspicious hour by Hulākū’s command; and, at a felicitous
conjunction of the stars, he mounted the throne set up therein, and received
the congratulations of all the Khāns, Schāh-zādahs, Amirūs, Malikūs, and Ḥākimūs
of all parts around then assembled there. After the ceremonial, the Amir,
Arghūn Aḵā, set out for the presence of the Kā’ān, as commanded by him,
leaving his son, Girā‘ Malīk, with Aḥmad, the Bitik-chī [Secretary], and the
Ṣahib [Wazīr], ’Alā-ud-Dīn, ’Atā Malīk, for the administration of the civil and
revenue affairs, with which Hulākū had nought to do, at that time. The latter
moved to Khūwāf and Zāwāh, where he was taken ill, and consequently he
despatched Kābūkā and Kūkā-yal-kā, at the head of a force, to complete the
conquest of the Khūstān.

Early in 654 H., Hulākū sent Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Kurat,
to the Muṣṭaghim, Nāsir-ud-Dīn, one of the chief Dā’īs of the Ismā’īlīs, who
words feebleness and infirmity to his government and power. Mangū Khān said: “What weakness hath the Kāzi observed in our kingdom that he gives utterance to such like alarming words as these?” Kāzi Shams-ud-Dīn replied: “What greater feebleness can there be than that the sect of Mulāhidah has made several forts its asylum, notwithstanding that the creed of that sect is contrary to the Musalmān faith, and also to the Christian and Mughal belief? They parade their riches and they wait in expectation of this, that, if your power should sustain any decline or reverse, the sect will rise in the midst of those mountains and in those fortresses, and overthrow the remainder of the people of Islām, and not leave the trace of a Musalmān.”

This reality influenced and roused the mind of Mangū Khān to the reduction of the fortresses and territories of Mulhidistān, and the Kuhistān of Alamūt. A mandate was accordingly issued so that the forces which were in the countries of I-rān and 'Ajam, from Khuršān and 'Irāk, turned their faces to the territory of the Kuhistān and the tract of Alamūt; and, during a period of ten years or more, they took the whole of the cities and fortresses, and put the whole of the Mulāhidah to the sword, with the exception of the women and children, all the remainder had grown old and feeble, and called upon him to submit. He appears to have ruled the district of Tūn and its dependencies, in which was the fortress, apparently that mentioned by our author above—Sar-i-Takhī. Nāṣir-ud-Dīn came on the 17th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, bringing presents; and Hulākū demanded why he had not brought the garrison of the fortress along with him, and was told that they would obey no orders but those of their Bādshāh, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Khūr Shāh. This appears to have satisfied Hulākū, who conferred upon him the government of Tūn and its districts, and sent him thither; but he died soon after. Hulākū now advanced to Ṭūs, the seat of government of the Amir, Arghūn Ākā, and then moved to Rādakān, where he stayed some time, and Khābūshān [there is no place called “Kabushan”], which the Mughals call Kūchān. He directed that this kāshāh [town] should be restored, and that the means should be furnished from the treasury. The kāhrene-subterranean aqueducts—were repaired [he “ordered” no “canals to be dug”], and the Wāzīr and Secretary of the province, Saif-ud-Dīn, Ākā, used his utmost endeavours, as a Musalmān, to bring the works to completion, especially the Jāmī’ Masjīd, which he himself endowed. Workshops were erected, and gardens laid out; and Amirs and prominent men were directed to build dwellings for themselves, which they subsequently did.

* He possibly means, not even exceptin the women and children, for even the Pro-Mughal writers say that all were exterminated.
being sent to hell; and the potency of the verse—"Thus do we cause one oppressor to overcome another"—was made manifest.

This votary, who is Minhâj-i-Sarâj, the writer of this Ṭabaḵāt, and author of this history, upon three different times, had occasion to travel into that part [the Kuhistân] on a mission. The first occasion was in the year 621 H., from the fortress of Tūlak, after Khurâsân had become cleared of the Mughal forces, on account of the scarcity of clothing, and dearth of some requisites, which had run out in consequence of the irruption of the infidels; and people were distressed for necessaries of life. At the request of Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Ḥasan-i-Sâlîr, Khar-post, the author proceeded from the fortress of Tūlak to Isfârār, in order to open the route for kârwâns. From thence he proceeded towards Kâ-în, and from that place to the fort of Sar-i-Takht, and Jowârshar, and Farmân-dîh of the territory of the Kuhistân. At that time the Muhtashîm [of the Mulâhidah] was Shihâb-i-Manṣûr, Abû-l-Fath. I [the author] found him a person of infinite learning, with wisdom, science, and philosophy, in such wise, that a philosopher and sage like unto him there was not in the territory of Khurâsân. He used greatly to cherish poor strangers and travellers; and such Musalmâns of Khurâsân as had come into proximity with him he was wont to take under his guardianship and protection. On this account his assemblies contained some of the most distinguished of the 'Ulamâ of Khurâsân, such as that Imâm of the Age, Afzal-ud-Dîn, the Bâmiâni, and Imâm Shams-ud-Dîn, Khusrau-Shâhî, and other 'Ulamâ of Khurâsân, who had come to him; and he had treated all of them with honour and reverence, and showed them much kindness. They stated to this effect, that,

---

8 Written مرکب with slight variation in two of the oldest, and two other good MSS. Subsequent writers mention a stronghold of the Mulâhidahs in the Kuhistân, in the district of Tun, under that name. Three of the most modern copies of the text, the best Paris MS., and the Calcutta Printed Text, have مرکب which may be read Marikhât, Marbakht, or Maranjat, and in a note to the Printed Text what may be read Rîkt or Zîkt. It lay in one of the common caravan routes. The same place, in the Rausût-uṣ-Ṣafâ, is written مرکب or مرکب.

9 Most copies of the text are deficient here.
during those first two or three years of anarchy in Khurāsān, one thousand honorary dresses, and seven hundred horses, with trappings, had been received from his treasury and stables by Ḫulāmā and poor strangers.

As the kindness and benefactions towards, and association and intercourse of this Muḥtašīm, Shihāb, with the Musalmāns became frequent, the Mulāhidah sect sent accounts to Alamūt saying: "Very soon the Muḥtašīm, Shihāb, will give the whole of the property of the Daʿwat-Khānah [General Bounty Fund] to the Musalmāns;" and, from Alamūt, a mandate came for him to proceed thither; and the government of the Khuistān was conferred upon the Muḥtašīm, Shams [ud-Dīn], Ḥasan-i-Ḵ ihtiyār.

When this servant of the victorious government returned from the presence of the Muḥtašīm, Shihāb, he proceeded, for the purpose of purchasing the necessary clothing, to the city of Tūn, and from thence returned to Kā-in, Isfīrār, and Tūlak again. After some time, it happened that, in 622 H., the author chanced to proceed from Tūlak to the presence of Malik Rūk-n-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-ʿUsmān, the Maraghāni,—may he rest in peace!—at Khwāsār of

1 The Printed Text is lamentably out here, and has مدت for فرن but the former makes the sentence totally unintelligible. The second word, fitrat, refers to the Mughal invasion and distraction prevailing in those parts consequent on their being without a sovereign or settled government.

2 This shows that the power of the sect was still very great; and that the Mughal domination was but nominal at this period.

3 At this period Kā-in was noted for the manufacture of very fine linen, hair-cloth, and similar fabrics.

4 This Malik, so often mentioned by our author, was the founder of the Kurut [This word, which is said to signify greatness, magnificence, grandeur, and the like, is written by some, Kart—and by others Kurt—and Kurut—and this last mode is apparently the most correct] dynasty, respecting which European writers generally, and some Musalmān writers of Hindūstān likewise, appear to entertain very erroneous ideas.

Their descent is traced to Sulṭān Sanjar, the Saljūk, on the father's, and to the Ghūr Sulṭāns on the mother's side, according to several authors; while some say that he was the son of one of the uncles of the Sulṭāns of Ghūr and Ghazīn—the brothers, Ḥiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām. A sister of those Sulṭāns certainly did marry a Saljūk—Malik Kızıl-Arsalān, nephew of Sulṭān Sanjar, and Kızıl-Arsalān's son, Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Alb-i-Ghāzī, received the investiture of the fiṭ of Hīrāt early in 599 H. When the Khwāṣmī Sulṭān invested Hīrāt the second time, he was its ruler, and had to surrender it. See note, page 257. What relationship existed, or whether any, between him and the
Ghūr, and, at the request of that august Malik, consented
preceding feudatory of Hirāt, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, 'Umr, the Maraghanī, who is styled
Malik of Khurāsān at page 193, is not, I fear, to be discovered, but the
Ghūrī Sultāns were certainly related in some way to the Maraghanī Maliks.
Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Usmān-i-Ḥarab, ruler of Sijistān and Nimroz, son of Malik
Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab, married Ayisah Khātūn, daughter of this 'Umr-i-
Maraghanī. Much respecting Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Usmān’s descendants, by that
lady, will be found at pages 193—202. See also note 3, page 967.
Guzīdah says 'Izz-ud-Dīn, 'Umr, was Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-
i-Sām’s Wazīr, and held in great estimation. The Maraghanīs are said, by
our author, to be Gharijaha, that is, natives of Gharjistān. 'Izz-ud-Dīn, 'Umr
the Maraghanī, held the sief of Hirāt when Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm
Shāh, invested it in 598 H. [see note 7, page 257], and had to surrender
that stronghold to him at the close of the year.

While holding the sief of Hirāt, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, 'Umr, had entrusted his two
brothers with the senechal-ship of two important fortresses, under his govern-
ment—Rukn-ud-Dīn [his Musalmān name is not given, but it was, probably,
Muḥammad-i-Abī-Bikr, from what follows] with that of Nīgāristān, according
to Alī, which name is doubtful, and is never once mentioned by our author, but
one of the great fortresses of Gharjistān is evidently meant; and Tāj-ud-Dīn,
'Usmān, with that of Khwāsār of Ghūr. Tāj-ud-Dīn was Sar-i-Jandār to
Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn’s son, Sultān Maḥmūd, and played an important part
during the investment of Firuz-kh by the Khwārazmīs. See page 410.
Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Usmān, having died—the date is not given, but it must have
been subsequent to 607 H.—'Umr gave Khwāsār, and a portion of Ghūr, to his
other brother, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad[-i-Abī-Bikr ?], who, some say, “was
the maternal grandfather of Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad,” the founder
of the Kurāt dynasty, to whom Mangū Ka‘ān gave the sief of Hirāt and its
dependencies, with some other territory.

Now, as 'Umr’s brother, Rukn-ud-Dīn, had already been provided for, it is
evident to me that instead of reading, as in some copies of the original, that
'Umr gave Khwāsār of Ghūr, and some other territory, to his brādār—brother,
we should read brādār-zādah—brother’s son, for it is certain, from the names
given by our author above, that 'Usmān is the name of the father of the chief
of Khwāsār of Ghūr to whom he refers, and whose agent our author was, and
that the chief was himself called Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, as was his father’s
brother; and, moreover, the period named—622 H.—makes this view the
more certain, because the Chingiz Khān died in 624 H., and Rukn-ud-Dīn,
Muḥammad-i-'Usmān, during the Mughal troubles, made interest with the
Nū-yīn, Ilbikhādā—and, from what our author says, this Malik appears to
have been unmolested while all other parts of Ghūr, and territories around,
were invaded by the Mughals—and the Chingiz Khān confirmed him in the
possession of his territory.

The similarity of names has apparently caused confusion in some of the
accounts of the Kurāt dynasty, and I think I can show how. Malik 'Izz-ud-
Dīn, 'Umr, the Maraghanī, had two brothers, as already stated—one Tūlī-
Dīn, 'Usmān, the other Rukn-ud-Dīn, Abī-Bikr. When Tūlī Khān obtained
possession of Hirāt, he left there, it is said, as nominal governor, under the
Mughals, along with the Mughal Shāhīn, Mangatān, “Abī-Bikr, the Marag-
hanī,” without giving his title; and this person is, according to my theory,
the same who tendered submission to the Mughals, and the brother of 'Izz-ud-
to go on a mission towards the territory of the Kuhistân a

Disc, 'Umr, and of Tâj–ud-Dîn, 'Uşmân. Abî–Bikr,—that is Rukn–ud-Dîn, Muḥammad–i–Abî–Bikr—the Maraghânî, was put to death soon after, along with Mangûtâ, the Mughal Shâhânâh, when the Hirâtîs threw off the yoke, leaving, as I suppose, among other children probably, a daughter, who was given in marriage to Rukn–ud-Dîn, Muḥammad, son of Tâj–ud-Dîn, 'Uşmân, our author's chief of Khâ’esâr of Gâhîr, who thus married his cousin. The Malik Shâms–ud-Dîn, Muḥammad, the first of the dynasty, is the son of the said Rukn–ud-Dîn, Muḥammad–i–'Uşmân, our author's patron, who died in 643 H.

Most of the works which give an account of the Kurât dynasty, including Alfî, state that "Malik Rukn–ud–Dîn was the maternal grandfather of Malik Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, while Faṣîh–i states distinctly, in several places, that Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, was Rukn–ud–Dîn's son, and Rukn–ud–Dîn, Abî–Bikr's son. Both statements, according to what I have mentioned above, would be quite correct—Rukn–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad–i–Abî–Bikr, would be the maternal grandfather, and Rukn–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad–i–'Uşmân, of our author, would be Shâms–ud–Dîn's father, and, at the same time, nephew and son-in-law of the first–mentioned Rukn–ud–Dîn; but even then the Saltûkî descent does not appear. It is said that, "when Malik Rukn–ud–Dîn used to attend the camp of the Chingiz Khâân, and Üktâe Kâân, and the Mughal Nû–yâns, he used to take Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, along with him, so that he became acquainted with the Mughal usages and regulations." This too is not incompatible. When taken to the Chingiz Khâân's camp, he went with his maternal grandfather, Rukn–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad–i–Abî–Bikr, and, when he attended at Üktâe's, he accompanied his father, Rukn–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad–i–'Uşmân.

A member, apparently, of the same family, Amîr Muḥammad, the Maraghânî, was killed in the fortress of Ashiyâr of Ghârjistân. He had done good service against the Mughals [see page 1077]. In 643 H., Malik Rukn–ud–Dîn [Uşmân] died; and he, previous to his death, nominated his son, Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, heir and successor to his sief. In 646 H., Malik Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, proceeded into Turkistân, to the urdâ of the Kâân, for the purpose of being confirmed in the sief; and, during one of the affairs in which the Kâân was engaged against his enemies, Mangût's notice was drawn to Malik Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, who was greatly distinguishing himself. The Kâân inquired who he was; and, when he was informed, he caused a yarlîgâh to be issued confirming him in his father's sief of Ghūr, and added thereto that of Hirât, Ghârjistân, Sâwâh, Farâh, and Sijistân, subject, of course, to the Mughal authorities in Írân–Zamîn.

In that same year, previous to proceeding to the urdâ of the Kâân, Malik Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, is said to have slain Malik Nuṣrât–ud–Dîn, 'Alî, the Sûfârî, son of Bahrân Shâhî, ruler of Nîmroz, whose maternal grandfather was 'Izz–ud–Dîn, 'Umr, the Maraghânî, and Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad's great uncle on both the father's and mother's side, but our author was unacquainted, seemingly, with the facts respecting Malik Nuṣrât–ud–Dîn, 'Alî's death. See pages 193 and 197. When Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, appeared before Mangût Kâân, he inquired of him: "Wherefore didst thou slay Malik 'Alî?" He replied: "I slew him for this reason that the Kâân might make the inquiry of me, 'Wherefore didst thou kill him?' and not inquire of him why he had killed me." Shâms–ud–Dîn, Muḥammad, likewise obtained possession of the fortress of Bakar—K—which, from the time of Nûghîrwân, no one
second time, in order that the route for karwâns might be
had been able to possess himself of by force. It is the name of a fortress of
Sijistân.
Subsequently, in 647 H., he slew the Malik of Gharjistân, Saif-ud-Dîn—who
he was is doubtful, but a kinsman probably—within the territory of Hirât.
The reason is obvious. After his return from the urdî of the Kâlân, with the
investiture of these different tracts, in which were situated several of the great
fortresses mentioned previously by our author, he had to gain possession of them
if he could; and the chiefs in possession of them were not inclined to give them
up, and submit to the Kurât, like as the Hâkims of Tâl-kân, Sâwah, and Tûlak,
had done. No further particulars are given of these events.
Our author probably may not have known from personal observation that
Malik Rukn-ud-Dîn, Muhammad-i-'Ugmân, had become a feudatory of the
Mughals, for he left his native country and retired into Hind in 623 H., but he
could scarcely have failed to hear of it afterwards. However, he does not say
the Malik was not a feudatory: he is only silent on the subject. There is no
mention of Khâesâr being a strong fortress, although it is most probable that
it was such. Yet we cannot fail noticing, that, when all other places were
assailed by the Mughals, captured, or compelled to submit, Khâesâr of Ghûr
was left un molested. The reason is palpable—Rukn-ud-Dîn, Muhammad-i-
'Ugmân, had made his submission to the Mughals through the Nû-yîn,
Iîchîkdâe, who was a nephew of the Chingiz Khân to boot.
We are told, at page 1006, that the Chingiz Khân conferred upon Malik
Tâj-ud-Dîn, Habâghî-i-'Abd-ul-Malik, Sar-i-Zarrâd, the territory of Ghûr,
with the title of Khusrau of Ghûr. In this case Rukn-ud-Dîn, Muhammad-
i-'Ugmân, must have been subordinate to him, or the territory of Khâesâr must
have been distinct, by virtue of its Malik being also subject to the Mughal yoke,
but he soon threw it off, and, fighting against them, was killed.
Nine years after the Nû-yîn, Mangitâh [Mr. Dowson's "Mangû Khân." See
page 809], abandoned the siege of Üchchah, as has been recorded, and at whose
appearance on the Sind or Indus in the year 644 H., Malik Saif-ud-Dîn, Hassan,
the Kârlûgh, had fled from Multân, Malik Shams-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, the Kurat,
son of Rukn-ud-Dîn, Muhammad-i-'Ugmân, accompanied the Nû-yîn, Sâlî, into
Hind. Having entered it, "Sâlî despatched Malik Shams-ud-Dîn, Muhammad,
to Multân, in 654 H., on a mission to that Shâhâkh of Shâhâkh, Bahâ-ud-Dîn,
Zakarîâ—commonly styled, at this day, Bahâ-ul-Haḳḳ, whose tomb we had to
batter so much during the siege of Multân in 1848-9—and an accommodation
was agreed upon. The sum of 100,000 dinârs was paid to secure this accom-
modation, and probably to save Multân from being sacked; and a Mamlûk of
Shams-ud-Dîn, Muhammad's, named the Chingiz Khân, was [made?] Hâkim
at Multân." See pages 711, 784, 792, and 844.
"From the once the Nû-yîn, Sâlî, with Shams-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, the
Kurat, proceeded towards Luhâwûr—Lâhor—where, at that time, was Kurit
or Kurât Khwân—[sic. كَرْفَانْ There was a Kuret Khân among the Malikâs
of Dihlî, No. XV., but he was never feudatory of Lâhor, and was dead
before this period]. He was probably no subject of the Dihlî kingdom,
for, at this time, Lâhor had been lost to it, and the Khokhars are said to have
occupied the ruins of Lâhor after its sack by the Mughals in 639 H. "Sâlî
entered into an accommodation with this person," whoever he might have
been, "on the payment of 30,000 dinârs, 30 kharîwârs—loads sufficient to load
an ass with—of soft fabrics, and 100 captives."
THE TABAKAT-I-NASIRI.

reopened. From Khāesār he [the author] proceeded

"After this, the subordinates of the Nū-yīn, Sālīf, plotted against Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, upon which he retired from Hind, and set out to return to Ghūr. On the way he was arrested and detained by Malik 'Imād-ud-Dīn, the Ghūrī. Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, on this, despatched a trusty agent to the Bahādūr, Tā-īr, then commanding the troops in those parts [and, consequently, if this be true, this Tā-īr could not have been killed at Lāhor in 639 H., as our author states at page 1135], telling him of his seizure and detention while on his way to his, Tā-īr's, presence. Tā-īr directed his release, and he came to Tā-īr's urdū, and, after that, he retained Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, near his own person."

In a book published at the commencement of this Afghān crisis, entitled "History of Afghānistān from the Earliest Period," by Colonel G. B. Malleson, C.S.I., we are told, at page 114, with reference to the year 1249, that:—

"In that year, Shīr Khān, the governor of the Panjāb for the King of Dehlī, Nāsir-ud-Dīn Mahmūd, invaded Afghānistān, seized upon Ghaznī and Kābul, and annexed them to the Dehlī monarchy. It is probable that they were speedily recovered, for not only, in subsequent years, do we find the Moghols making repeated incursions into India, but in the year 1336 traces appear of a new Afghān dynasty seated on the throne of Ghaznī, owning subordination to, and acknowledging the suzerainty of, the Moghols of Central Asia."

Now the text above translated—The Tabakat-i-Nāsirī—was dedicated to, and named after the Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd Shāh, who is referred to in the above extract, and in no work extant will such details be found respecting that reign in particular, and also the history of the Ghūrīs. Indeed all later historians obtain their information from this Tabakāt, for there was no other contemporary writer but its author, that we know of, who gives such details. Sher Khān, i.e. the Lion Khān—Sher signifying Lion, but "Shīr," as in the work above referred to, signifies "Milk"—The Milk [and Water?] Khān—is no other than the great Malik, the cousin of Ulugh Khān-i-A'sām, a memoir of whom is given at page 791, and who was living when our author finished his work, and was personally known to him.

Nothing of the above romantic statements as to "the throne of Ghaznī" and "Kābul" will be found recorded in the text, for the reason that they never happened; and nowhere will such be found save in Dow, Briggs, and Firishtah. See notes 1, page 690, and 1, page 794, para. 7.

The events of the year 647 H.—1249 A.D.—will be found at pages 685 and 820. The following year, Sher Khān-i-Sunkar re-took Multān from the Mughals, and, in the year in question, ousted a rival Malik of the Dihlī Court, who was disaffected, and intriguing with the Mughals, from Üchchah; and, soon after, he actually had himself to retire to the urdū of Māngū Khān, while his rival went to Ūlākū. The reason of this will be found fully explained by our author respecting the disorders in the Dihlī kingdom. This re-capture of Multān and seizure of Üchchah is what the Dakhani compiler, Firishtah, made Ghaznī of, but even he and his translators only make "Shere, the emperor's nephew [which he was not], take Ghirni," not Kābul too.

Col. Malleson then adds:—

"This Afghān dynasty, like that which preceded it, came from Ghor. Probably [1] it was the chief of the Afghān tribe [sic. tribe only] in the Ghor mountains to whom the Moghul suzerain delegated his authority. They
towards Farāh, and from thence to the Ḳala’i-[fort of] Kāh of Sistān, then on to the Ḩiṣār [fortified or walled town] of Karah, and to Ṭabas and the fort of Mūmin-ābād, and thence to Ḳā’in. At Ḳā’in the author saw the Muḥtaṣhim, Shams, who was a man of the military profession. From this latter place the author returned to Khāesār.

When the year 623 H. came round, the writer of this, who is Minhāj-i-Sarāj, determined to undertake a journey into Hindūstān; and, as a requirement for the journey into that country, with the permission of Malik ṫukn-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-’Uṣmān, the Maraghanī, of Khāesār [of Ghūr], he proceeded to Farāh, in order that a little silk might be purchased. On his arriving in the neighbourhood of Farāh, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tigīn, the Khwārazmī, mention of whom has already been made in the Section containing the account of the Mālik of Nimroz, was ruling the country of Sistān. Hostility had arisen between him and the Mulāhidahs on account of the fort ruled from 1336 to 1383. The first sovereign, Shams-u-Dīn Ghorī, and his two immediate successors, ṫukh-u-Dīn [sic], and Fakhrī-dīn [sic] Ghorī,” etc., etc.

I beg to differ entirely from Col. Malleson with regard to this latter statement, as well as the former ones. These errors all emanate from the same source, of Dow and Briggs making Tājīk Ghūrīs the “Afghān dynasty of Ghor,” and turning the people of Ghūr into Afghāns, who at that period, and up to comparatively modern times, were settled in Afghānīstān, that is, east of Ghāznī, and not in Ghūr. The “first sovereign, Shams-u-Dīn,” of this so-called “Afghān dynasty”—this “chief of the Afghān tribe in the Ghor mountains,” is, of course, no other than Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the founder of the Kurāt dynasty, referred to above. On the father’s side he was of Saljūq Turk-mān descent, and on the mother’s, of Ghūrī, and also Maraghanī, that is of Ghārjī descent; and if this mixtureCompose an “Afghān of the Ghor mountains.” I need not say anything more. See note 1, page 508.

His capital and that of his successors in their siefs, for they were merely feudatories, was Hirā, and Ghāznī never belonged to them.

It is a pity that such statements should be disseminated, because they mislead. I do not for one moment suppose but that Col. Malleson imagined that what he was writing was strictly correct, or that he was aware what errors he was putting his name to. These he would have avoided had he been able to consult the original historians; and he would have saved himself from falling into terrible errors had he consulted even that small portion of this Tabakat which is contained in Vol. II. of Elliott’s Historians, in which the events of the year 1249 A.D. will be found, as well as a portion of the history of the Ghūrī dynasties.
of Shāhan-Shāhī, which is adjacent to the town of Neh; and he had retired defeated before them, and came to Farāh. Fear [of them] had overcome him; and, of the men of note who were along with him, among those on whom he was relying to proceed into the Kuhistān to effect an accommodation, and make terms between him and the ruler of the Kuhistān, the Muḥtashim, Shams, not one of them, the notables of his Court, was equal to undertake the journey, until they acquainted him [Bināl-Tigīn] with the news of the arrival of this votary, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in the vicinity of Farāh.

Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Bināl-Tigīn, despatched a led horse, and a deputation of persons of note to receive him, and call him. When the author reached his presence, the Malik made a request, saying: “It behoveth thee to do the favour of effecting a peace, and to proceed into the Kuhistān. The son of Malik Rukn-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Uşmān, will accompany thee in this important enterprise—thou [wilt go] under the designation of an envoy, and he, under the name of a mediator.” In conformity with this solicitation, the author proceeded towards the Kuhistān. The Mulāḥidahs were then before the town of Neh; and, after having reached the confines of the Kuhistān, it was necessary to come back again; and the author proceeded to Neh, and the accommodation between Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Bināl-Tigīn, and the Mulāḥidah Muḥtashim, Shams, was effected.

When the author had returned from that journey, and had again reached the presence of Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Bināl-Tigīn, the latter said: “It is necessary for thee to go a second time, and demand war from the Mulāḥidah;” but this servant of the state did not consent to set out on a second journey, as he had determined upon undertaking a journey into Hindūstān, and entertained a very great predilection for this journey. This refusal on the part of this votary did not meet with the approval of Malik Tāj-ud-

---

9 The Calcutta Printed Text, as usual, makes a pretty hash of this well-known name.
1 See the account of the Rulers of Sijistān and Nimroz, pages 196 to 201.
2 The son here referred to is, doubtless, Shams-ud-Din, Muḥammad, referred to in the previous note 4.
Din, Binâl-Tigîn, and he commanded so that they detained him [the author] for forty-three days in the fort of Ṣafhed of Slstân, and prohibited his going beyond the walls, until Malik Rukn-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-ʿUṣmân, of Khâesâr—may he rest in peace!—despatched letters from Ghûr to Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Binâl-Tigîn. The author, likewise, composed a poem conformable with the case of his confinement; and, by the favour of the Most High God, he obtained his liberation from that fortress. Five verses of that poem are here given that they may come under the august observation of the Sultân of the Sultâns of Islâm, whose sovereignty be long prolonged! Āmin.

"How long shall my crystal tears on the amber [like] face,
To the emerald spheres the coral hue impart?
Since like unto smoke from Kumâr wood⁴ are my sighs,
It would not be astonishing were ye distilling rose-water, O tears!
In disposition, neither am I vicious, nor is evil found in me;
Why then am I a captive on the Ṣafhed mount?
I am not the Sâl-ḥâr,⁵ nor is this the mountain of Kâf—
For ever pleasing to the parrot captivity will not be.
Minhâj—The Straight Road⁶—is best on the open highway:
The straight road he findeth not, through restraint the fortress within."

The intermediate [portion of the] poem, and the entire copy of it, is not in existence, and hence it is thus abridged.⁷
May the Almighty preserve the Nâsirî dominion to the utmost bounds of possibility!
I now return to the subject of the history.
In the territory of the Mulâhidah there are one hundred and five forts—seventy forts in the Kûhistân territory;⁸

---

⁴ The Calcutta Printed Text, which is "so much to be depended on," merely turns this into the fort of Ṣaf of Hindûstân—قلله صف هندوستان instead of فلله صف هندوستان.
⁵ Wood brought from Kumâr or Kumârûn [Anglicized Comorin] used for fumigation, also aloes, and gum benzoin.
⁶ The fabulous bird of eastern romance—the ṣunḥâ or griffin. Its home is the Koh-i-Kâf, which is supposed to surround the world.
⁷ Which Minhâj signifies—a play on his name.
⁸ In Khurâsân west of Hirât. The word comes from Kohistân, signifying a mountainous tract of country. Our author has plainly indicated its whereabouts: Kâ-In was, and is, its chief town. Respecting Alamût see note ⁸, page 363. In the Masâlik wa Mamâlik it is said there is not any river water throughout that tract, but this assertion is not quite correct, unless a great change has taken place since that work was written: it is scarce,
and thirty-five in the hilly tract of 'Irāk, which they call Alamūt. After the Mughal forces had occupied their territory some time, and a great number of captives of that sect had been slaughtered, the Maulānā⁹ of the Mulāhidah, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan-i-Nau Musalmān, was assassinated by one among his personal slaves,¹ in the fortress of Lanbah-Sar;² and the son of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, came out of that stronghold and proceeded to the Mughal camp. They despatched him, along with his dependents and followers, to the presence of Mangū Khān, and command was given to put him to death on the way. All the forts of Mulḥistān were destroyed, and the Mughals took their cities and towns and demolished them, with the exception of the fort of Gird-Koh⁴ which

certainly. These parts were, at the period in question, very populous and flourishing.

⁹ The head of the sect who held both the temporal and spiritual power over the Mulāhidah, as previously mentioned at page 1189.
¹ Ḥasan, the Māzanderānī, at the end of Shawwāl, in the year 653 H. 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd's son, was the Khudāwānd, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Khūr Shāh, who was quite a youth, mention of whom will be found in another note. Our author is quite wrong here, and has, in his brevity, confused events. Lanbah-sar was not taken possession of until long after Khūr Shāh came out of Maimūn-dujāz, and went to Hulākū's camp, the details of which will be found farther on.
² Here the Printed Text turns this name into بَرَ، for رَبَّ.
³ A few miles west of Damghan. Having marched from Kūshān [Khabūshān], Hulākū turned his face towards 'Irāk, and moved to Busām and Khurḵān, and reached Busṭām on the 10th of Sha'ban. The Korchī, Bak-timish, the Būtik-chī, Zaḥīr-ud-Dīn, and Shāh Mīr, who had been sent on a mission to Rukn-ud-Dīn, Khūr Shāh—with a copy of the farmān, probably, issued at Kaš—rejoined him on the 29th of Jamādī-ul-ʿĀṣīr, on which same day some of the fortresses were reached, and raids made upon the country round. From Busṭām, the Shaḥnāh or Intendant of Hirāt, Margatāne, along with Bak-timish [the Bak-Tīmūr of Alīf, Takalmish of the Fanākāt, and Mankalmish of the Jamī-ut-Tawārīkh and the Raṣū̄l-uss-Safā] were again despatched to Khūr Shāh with promises, stipulations, and menaces.

At this time, the Maulānā-i-Saʿīd, the Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, and several other learned doctors, such as the Raʿīs-ud-Daulah, and the Muaṭṭik-ul-ʿAdal [-ud-Daulah ?], and their sons, were detained by Khūr Shāh, against their will, according to the Shiʿahs, but the Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, was with Khūr Shāh for his own seditious purposes, as will be hereafter plainly manifested; and, influenced by him, the Khudāwānd, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Khūr Shāh, who was quite a boy, and had only recently succeeded his father, and had been advised by those traitors to submit, treated the envoys well; and, on dismissing them, sent with them his younger brother, Shīhān-Shāh, with the Khwājah, Aṣḥāb-ud-Dīn, the Zauzānī, and other great men of his
lies between Khurāsān and 'Irāk. Up to this time, now

kingdom, to tender his submission, and to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Mughal Ḳā'ān. Hulākū received them, and treated them with honour, but despatched Zāḥr-ud-Dīn, the Bitik-ḥif, and two other men of note, to intimate to Khūr Shāh that, if he, Khūr Shāh, spoke truly with respect to his obedience and subjection, it behoved him to demolish his fortresses, and present himself in the audience tent of Hulākū. Khūr Shāh's reply, on dismissing them, was, that, whatever opposition his father may have displayed with regard to the Mughal Court, he had himself evinced naught save servitude and obedience; and he gave orders, in the presence of the agents, to dismantle several fortresses, such as Humāyūn-dużg, Alamūt, Lanbah-Sar, and others, to throw down the battlements, carry away the gates to a distance, and begin to tear down the walls; but, for himself, he requested a delay of one year, after which he would present himself.

Hulākū perceived it was useless to send envoys again, and he therefore directed all the Mughal troops that were in 'Irāk and other parts to advance, and close in upon the Mulāḥidah territory. Those on the right [Busṭām being the centre], in Māzandarān, were under Būkā Tīmūr and the Nū-yīn, Kūkā I-yalka, while those on the left, under Nikūdar Ḵāfīl, and the Nū-yīn, Kalībāḵā, were to advance by way of Khwār—the name of a district or tract of country in the neighbourhood of Rai—which signifies low or sloping ground, but not necessarily "sait"—and Simnān, while Hulākū himself, with one tomdān of picked troops, advanced from Busṭām on the 10th of Sha'bān, 654 H. I would here remark, for geographical accuracy, that the name of this place is written سماح—signifying "a flower garden," under which name this place, famous in Persian history, appears in Colonel J. T. Walker's map and Major O. B. St. John's, is not correct.

Hulākū, notwithstanding ne had said he would send no more envoys, again had recourse to negotiation, but, with the treachery inherent in the Mughal, and in some other northern barbarians, sent to Khūr Shāh saying: "Although our standards have advanced, and notwithstanding all the misdeeds he has been guilty of, if Khūr Shāh presents himself, he will be received, the past will be forgotten, and he will be exalted." After the Mughals had passed Fīrūz-koh, the envoys again returned, accompanied by Khūr Shāh's Wazīr-i-Khāṣ—Prime Minister—Kāi-Kūbād, to intimate that his master had agreed to demolish all the fortresses. Khūr Shāh made, however, a special request, that Alamūt and Lanbah-Sar should be left to his offspring, since they were the ancient homes of his family, and that he should be allowed a year's grace, to prepare certain presents and offerings worthy of the Mughal sovereign's acceptance, that the Muḥtaṣīms of Gird-Koh and the Kūhīān had been directed to present themselves, and that, in the mean time, all the other fortresses should be demolished. This temporizing was no match for the duplicity and wiles of the Mughal barbarian, who was aware what a difficult task he would have in order to capture the chief strongholds. Hulākū, still moving forward towards Lār and Damawand, passed, by the way, Shāh-dużg, which was captured in two days; and, once more, he despatched his envoys. Khūr Shāh still refused to appear, but he notified that he would send his son, with a body of 300 militia [as a contingent?] and demolish all the fortresses. His son came—a child of seven years old, whose mother was a concubine; but Hulākū, who waited at 'Abbās-ābād of Rai to receive him, would not allow
that the year 658 H. has drawn to its close, it will be a
an infant to remain in his camp, and sent him back. Then, to carry out his
proposed treachery, Hulâkû, in reply to Khûr Shâh, intimated that, in case
there should be further delay in appearing himself, he had better send another
of his brothers to relieve Shâhan-Shâh, who had been so long in the Mughal
camp. Khûr Shâh then despatched another brother, Shahrân-Shâh—some
call him Sherwân Shâh—along with the Khwâjah, Asîf-ud-Dîn, the Zauzant,
and 300 soldiers ; and, on the 5th of Shawwâl, 654 H., they reached his camp
within the limits of Rai. On the 9th, they were sent back bearing a safe-conduct
for Khûr Shâh himself, with a message to the effect that, in consequence of
the submission, and show of obedience of Khûr Shâh, the misdeeds of his
father had been forgiven, and, as no improper conduct had been shown by
himself, since he had succeeded his father, if he destroyed the fortresses as
promised, he might expect the royal favour. After sending off this—the
bearers filled with delight at the terms—Hulâkû issued orders for the Mughal
troops to form a cordon round about Maimûn-dujah, the residence of Khûr
Shâh, which was carried out. particularly on the part of Bûkâ Tîmûr and
Kûkâ I-yalkâ, who approached it very closely, from the side of Astadâr—or
Astadârah—the same place as is mentioned in Jabah [Yamak] and Sahûdah's
[Swîdâ's] raid.
As soon as Khûr Shâh became cognizant of this suspicious proceeding, he
sent a person to the Mughals, saying: "Since we have submitted, and are
occupied in demolishing our fortresses, what is the object of your advancing
into these parts?" By way of mockery they replied: "Because we are friends
now, and there is no disagreement between us, we have come into your grazing
lands, in order that our horses may enjoy a few days' rest, after which we
again depart." On the 10th of Shawwâl, the Mughals entered the Rûd-bârât
or Rûd-bârân [a district and town, between Gilân and Kazvîn : it is the
plural of rûd-bâr, and signifies a tract of many streams] by the Yashâkal or Bash-
gal Dara'h or Pass, on the road to Tâl-kân, and commenced plundering and
devastating the country round. On the 18th, the audience tent of Hulâkû was
pitched facing Maimûn-dujah on the northern side; and, the next day, he
reconnoitred the place preparatory to an attack ; and, the following day, the
troops completely encircled it, although the mountain, on which it is situated,
is six farsaks in circuit. Hulâkû, however, when he beheld that impregnable
fortress, saw that, to take it by storm, was utterly impossible, and that nothing
else than reduction by famine was possible, and that that might not be effected
for many years. He therefore held counsel with the Shâh-zâdahs and Amîrs
whether to invest it, or retire, and return next year, as the season was far
advanced. Most of them were for retiring, as winter was come—it was
Shawwâl, 654 H.—November, 1256 A.D.—the horses were emaciated, and forage
was scarcely obtainable, and would have to be brought from the frontier dis-
tricts of Kirmân or Arman; but Bûkâ-Tîmûr, the Bitik-chî, Saîf-ud-Dîn,
and Amîr Kaîbûkî, the Nâemân, on the contrary, urged, that to retire now
would be a show of weakness, and that, as a matter of necessity, they ought to
remain until the affair assumed some tangible shape or other. So Hulâkû
again had recourse to duplicity, while traitors in the stronghold of the in-
experienced Khûr Shâh helped its success: he despatched another envoy to
Khûr Shâh, with a message tending to seduce him, by hopes of favour, to
come down. The envoy said: "O Khûr Shâh! if, like a man, you come
down and present yourself, you not only preserve your own life, but also the
period of ten years that the investment of that fortress has
lives of all who are in this place with you. If, in the course of five days, you
do not come, then make your fortress strong, and expect an assault; for this
is the last time that any one will come to you." Rukn-ud-Din, Khūr Shāh,
seeing the state of affairs, held counsel with his chief men; and no way
appeared left open to him other than to surrender. On the same day that
this was determined on, he despatched, in advance of himself, another brother,
Shāh Kiyā, along with the traitor—as I shall presently show—the Khwājah,
Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, and other officials and leaders of his forces, to the
presence of Hulākū, bearing presents and offerings befitting. On Friday, the
27th of Shawwāl, they reached his camp; and, on Sunday, 1st of Zī-Ka'dah,
654 H.—1256 A.D.—the Khudāwand, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Khūr Shāh,
having taken a last farewell of his ancestral home of two hundred years,
accompanied by Aṣfīl-ud-Dīn, Zauzanī, Mu'ayyid-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr, and
the sons of the Ra'īs-ud-Daulah, and Muaffik-ud-Daulah, the same day presented
himself in the camp of Hulākū, the Mughal. So, "the strongly fortified town
of Meimundiz" was neither besieged, nor was "the attack prosecuted with
vigour," because no attack was ever made, neither did "Rukn-ud-din pro-
pose terms to Khulagū," as we are informed in the "Mongols Proper," but
quite the contrary.
The traitor, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, composed a verse on this event, the
first half of which, not quite correctly rendered, is given by Von Hammer,
who, in his account of the Ismā'ilīn, makes sad havoc among the names of
persons and places. The verse is as follows, literally rendered:—

"When the 'Arab year six hundred, fifty, and four, came round,
On Sunday, the first of the month Zī-Ka'dah, at morning dawn,
Khūr Shāh, Bādshāh of the Mulāhidah, from his throne arose,
And, in front of the throne of Hulākū [Khān], stood up."

When Khūr Shāh presented himself, Hulākū beheld a mere youth of in-
experience and indiscretion, and, therefore, according to the pro-Mughal
accounts, he treated him kindly, and gave him hopes of the Ḫān's favour.
Khūr Shāh, at Hulākū's request, despatched one of his chief men, entitled
Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, in order that all the fortresses which his father and forefathers
had obtained possession of, in the ʿUḫistān, the Rūḍ-bārāt, and Ḫūmis—a
district, or rather province, between Ḫūrāsān and 'Irāq-l-'Ajam—full of
military stores, magazines of provisions, and other valuable property, might
be delivered up to the Mughal officials; and, by Hulākū's command, they are
said to have been levelled with the ground—subsequently perhaps, as this
would be a work of time only: Ḥāfīz Abru says they amounted to some three
hundred; all but Labāh-Sar and Gird-Koh—but the number was only a little
over a hundred—which the governors refused to give up, and which held out,
particularly the latter, for twenty years after, as already mentioned. Pestilence
at last broke out in Labāh-Sar, and most of its people perished. The rest
abandoned it, and the Mughals destroyed it.

The day after Khūr Shāh reached the Mughal camp, he gave orders to his
dependants to leave Maimūn-dujīg; and his ancestral treasures, other valuable
property, and library, he presented [perforce] to Hulākū as a pēš-kāsh,
the whole of which Hulākū is said to have distributed among his officers. After
this the latter turned his face towards Alamūt. On reaching the foot of the
stronghold, Khūr Shāh was sent forward to request the seneschal to come
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been going on.\* Within it about 100 or 200 men have

\* Not in "the third year of the siege," as Von Hammer states: it held out for nearly twenty years, and only then fell because pestilence had destroyed nearly all of its defenders.

down and give it up, but that Sipah-Sâlîr refused to listen to his words, and gave him a rough and stern reply. Hulâkû left a numerous force there to invest it, but, after holding out for three or four days, the Sipah-Sâlîr agreed to surrender it, on the lives and property of all within being guaranteed. On Monday, the 26th of Zî-Ka'dah, 634 H., it was given up. The people asked, according to the terms of surrender, for three days' grace to enable them to remove their effects; and, on the fourth day, the Mughals poured in, and commenced to sack the fortress. The catapults on the walls were thrown down and destroyed, the gates removed to a distance, and they began to demolish the defences. On the following day Hulâkû came up to inspect the place, and much was he astonished at beholding that fortress and the mountain on which it stands. "Alamût is a mountain, which they have likened unto a camel kneeling, with its neck stretched out upon the ground [between a camel—א— and a lion—א—there is, in MSS., but the difference of a couple of points over and under, but there is a very material difference in their significations, whatever Von Hammer may have said, for he must have read it incorrectly or from a poor MS.]. On the summit thereof, which has but one path leading to it, a fortress was built of such prodigious strength that the like of it has never yet been described. Within had been excavated several reservoirs for storing vinegar, honey, and other drinkables—the word sharáb, in the original, does not necessarily mean wine or intoxicating drinks—so that, after obtaining possession of that stronghold, the Mughals were diving into them—and must have come out in a very 'sweet' state from the reservoirs of honey—and finding various articles of property, which the people, in their first alarm, had thrown into them," but the Mughals "in the subterranean chambers and cellars, searching for treasure, did not fall into the wine and honey," without knowing what was there, as erroneously stated by Von Hammer, from a wrong reading probably. The greater part of the contents of these magazines, which had been laid in during the time of Hasan-i-Šabbâh, remained unchanged; and his followers, the Ismâ'îlîs, attribute this to the sanctity of his blessing.

The subsequent fate of Khûr Shâh may be related in a few words. By the early part of 655 H., all the Mulkhdad strongholds in the Kuhistân and 'Irâk-i-'Ajam, with the exception of Lanbah-Sar and Gird-Koh, were in the hands of the Mughals, but those in Shâm had yet to be gained possession of. Hulâkû, consequently, continued to treat Khûr Shâh well, and induced him to send his messengers along with Mughal officials into Shâm, to request the governors to give them up, whereby they would obtain favour, or otherwise bring down ruin upon the whole of the sect. Khûr Shâh had also become enamoured, it is said by the orthodox Musalmân, the enemies of the sect, of a base-born Mughal's daughter, and, the matter becoming notorious. Hulâkû, on the occasion of the great Sh'ah festival of the 'Ashûrâ, bestowed favours upon Khûr Shâh on the last day of the festival, the 10th of Muḥarram, 655 H., and, among these favours, made him a present of the Mughal damsel. The idea that "Khalâjuw" would not have scrupled to have put him to death:
taken refuge, but, up to this time, it has not fallen into the hands of the Mughals. 1

1 The I. O. L. MS., No. 1951, the Ro. As. Soc. MS., and the Bodleian MS.—all three—have an interpolation here relating to the death of Mangū Khān in Čhin, the same as occurs at page 1123, thus showing that they are copies of the same original, or that the two last are copies of the first MS.

"because he had lately married a Mongol woman of low extraction," is absurd, and also that a "solemn marriage was ordered." The round-faced, ugly wench was bestowed upon him in the same way as a horse or a slave would be given; but some say that Khūr Shāh actually asked Hulakū for her.

Hulakū had solemnly promised not to harm Khūr Shāh, hence he was well pleased when the latter, who found his promises of favour were all empty ones, asked to be sent to the presence of Mangū Khān; still, as the fortresses of Shām had not yet been secured, he would have kept him in play a little longer. However, as Khūr Shāh was desirous of going, he despatched him, but took care to detain his offspring, females, and dependants, at Kazwīn, and only the Mughal concubine was allowed to accompany him. He was desired to obtain the surrender of Gird-Koh by the way; and, although Khūr Shāh, outwardly, in the presence of his Mughal guardians, did request its commander to surrender, he had before sent secretly to tell him on no account to give it up, as it had been prophesied that in, or by means of, that fortress, their sect would again flourish. The commandant, consequently, refused to surrender, and gave a fierce answer, so the Mughals had to proceed on their road unsuccessful. Khūr Shāh is said to have quarrelled with his conductors after passing the Āmūlah, and it is added that they came to fist cuffs; and this want of dignity on his part made him very contemptible in the sight of the Mughals. His death is differently related. Some say he reached Mangū’s presence, but the Fānākaf and Hāfiz Abrū say that the truth is that, when he had arrived in the vicinity of Kārā-Kuram, Mangū Khān commanded that he should be put to death. This, the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārifk states is the truth, but Rashīd-ud-Dīn does not say that Mangū was at Kārā-Kuram. These writers, however, appear to have forgotten that the Khān was in Čhin at this time, and never returned to Kārā-Kuram again.

Mangū’s instructions to his brother were, not even to spare a child of a year old of the race of Kiyā-i-Buzurg-Umīd; so, during the absence of that unfortunate Prince, Hulakū gave orders to slay the whole of them, and “neither young nor old were spared; and, of a family, which, for one hundred and seventy odd years, had reigned in I-rān-Zamīn, not a vestige or trace remained.”

In Alfī, however, it is stated that a number of Khūr Shāh’s offspring and relations were made over to Salghān Khātūn, Chaghātāe Khān’s daughter, that she might, according to the law of retaliation, shed their blood, in order to avenge her father who had been killed by Ismā’īlī Fidā-īs. See note 1, page 1148.

After this Hulakū—with the treachery inherent in the Mughal race—issued commands to the Amirs in Khurāsān to assemble together, by stratagem, the whole of the Kuhistānī Ismā’īls, and extirpate them, so that not a trace of them might be left. Under pretence of a general levy of fighting men, for the purpose of invading Hindūstān, numbers came in from all the towns and
AN ACCOUNT OF THE MISFORTUNE WHICH HAPPENED TO THE MUḤTASHIM, SHAMS-UD-DĪN.

This account is derived from a recluse among the recluses of Islām, who is worthy of credit, and is here recorded in order that it may come under the observation of the Sulṭān of Islām.

This servant of the victorious empire, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, who is the author of this Ṭabaḵāt, on the first occasion that he chanced to undertake a journey into the Kuhistān, and saw the Muḥtashim, Shihāb, the Ḥakīm, the friend of the Musalmāns, saw, in his presence, a recluse, an aged mān of Nishāpūr, who was one among the esteemed of Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and his mother, the Malikah-i-Jahān—on whom be the Almighty’s mercy!—and, during the time of that monarch and his mother, he enjoyed their intimacy and esteem. This recluse used clandestinely to take care of the interests of the Muḥtashīn, Shihāb, before the Sulṭān’s throne, and was wont to show honour towards his emissaries; and, such of their important affairs as used to be before the Court, he would get brought to a successful termination.

When the misfortunes [attending the irruption] of the Chingiz Khān arose, and the people of Khwārazm, of the

6 The later Mulāḥīdah were tributary to the Sulṭāns of this dynasty, and had been for some time. See note 4, page 254.

villages of that territory; and the Mughals thus succeeded in trapping 12,000 Isma‘īlīs, the whole of whom were massacred. Towāshīs [Pursuivants or Tipstaffs] were also sent out into every part of the Kuhistān with instructions to kill the heretics wherever they could be found, and all who might aid or shelter them; and they are said to have been “wholly exterminated.”

They were not however, for, in 674 H., twenty years after Khūr Shāh surrendered, in the reign of Hulākū’s successor, a body of Mulāḥīdah, having combined with a son of the late Khūr Shāh, and assigned him the title of “the Nau Daulah,” seized the fortress of Alamūt; and their outbreak assumed a serious aspect. Abāqāe Khān sent an army against them, which overthrew them; and the fortress of Alamūt was razed to the ground.

In the present day we hear of a claimant to the spiritual office of this sect, as a descendant of the last of the Mulāḥīdah, and, I believe, Magazine articles have even been written on the subject.

Hulākū’s mind being now entirely set at rest respecting the Mulāḥīdah, he turned his attention to further “ameliorations”—the capture of Baghdād, our author’s account of which will be found farther on.
capital, and of Khurāsān, became dispersed, this recluse, for those reasons [above referred to], threw himself into the Ḵuhistān; and, on account of previous obligations, the Muḥtashīm, Shihāb, the Ḥakīm, was under towards him, this recluse obtained great favour with him, and received abundant honour and reverence. On the Muḥtashīm, Shihāb, being removed from the government of the Ḵuhistān, and his proceeding to Alamūt, when the Muḥtashīm, Shams, arrived, this recluse did not obtain the same respect from him; and, as he was not on terms of intimacy with the Muḥtashīm, Shams, the absence of Shihāb greatly affected the heart of the recluse. He desired, in order to perform the debt of gratitude [he owed] to the Muḥtashīm, Shihāb, to take vengeance upon this Muḥtashīm, Shams, who was the displacer of the former, and thereby attain, for himself, the felicity of martyrdom, and also perform an act of holy warfare [upon an infidel].

One day he entered the place of audience of the Muḥtashīm, Shams, and represented, saying: “It is necessary to give me a private audience. I have important business, which I will communicate in private.” The Muḥtashīm, Shams, had his audience hall cleared, but the recluse said: “I am not satisfied to proceed lest it should so happen that I might be in the middle of my statement and an interloper might enter, and the matter be interrupted. If the Muḥtashīm will direct that I may fasten the door of the audience hall on the inside, my heart will be freed from that fear.” The Muḥtashīm replied: “It will be well: it is necessary to put the chain across the door of the audience hall on the inside.” The honest [!] recluse got up, and fastened the door on the inside, and came and seated himself down in front of the Muḥtashīm. It was an habitual custom with that Muḥtashīm constantly to have a finely-tempered palārāk⁷ poniard in his hand. Sometimes he would place it at his side, sometimes before him, and sometimes he would take it in his hand.

The recluse turned his face towards the Muḥtashīm, and said: “I suffer tyranny in thy city and territory. Why

⁷ A species of Damascened steel held in great estimation; also the damasked water of a sword.
have they placed this poniard in thy hand? [Is it not] for this purpose that thou shouldst ward off tyranny and violence from the weak and oppressed? Give the weapon into my hand that I may see whether it be sharp or not.”

The Muḥtašim, inadvertently, the recluse being an infirm old man, and thinking that from him no mischief would arise, gave the poniard into the Darwesh’s hand. The latter seized it, struck at the Muḥtašim, and inflicted upon him several severe wounds, in such a manner that his body was wounded in several places. It was the winter season, and the Muḥtašim wore two garments of hair [cloth], one over the other; and, the recluse being old and infirm, the wounds proved not so very deep. Had the recluse been young, and had it been the summer season, without doubt, the Muḥtašim would have gone to hell. Notwithstanding he was wounded, he got up, seized the wound-inflicting recluse, and cried out for assistance. A number of Mulāḥidahs were in the vestibule of the place of audience, and they burst open the door, and came in, and martyred the recluse—the Almighty reward him!

A cry now arose in the city of Tūn;⁸ and the Mulāḥidahs conspired against the Musalmāns to put those poor unfortunates to death, but the Muḥtašim promptly directed so that they issued a proclamation, to the effect that no Musalmān should be hurt in the least, since it would not be right to slay all the Musalmāns through the act of one individual. During that short period of tumult, however, an eminent Imām, and learned man, whom they used to call Imām Najm-ud-Din-i-Sarbāri, the Rūmī, attained martyrdom, because a Mulḥid was at enmity with him, but of the rest of the Musalmāns not one suffered any molestation. Subsequently, command was given so that they impaled the Mulḥid who had killed the Imām.

The object in [relating] this incident was this, that it is essential that sovereigns should ever be circumspect and vigilant, and should never leave [their] arms out of their own possession, and should not place confidence in any one.

⁸ At page 1197, he says he saw him at Kā-īn, which was the seat of government, but this, it appears, took place at Tūn. It is not contained in all copies: only in the best ones.
I now return to the thread of this History.

When they placed Mangū Khān upon the throne, he conferred the dominion of İrān and 'Ajam upon his younger brother, Hulāḵū; and another younger brother, named Kubilān, after he had returned from the conquest of İrāk, he installed over the tribes of Turkistān, and a third brother, Artuk Būkāh, he placed as his deputy over the kingdoms of Tamghāj. He [Mangū] then assembled a numerous army, and marched into the country of Chin, and reached a place where the horses of his forces,

---

9 At page 1177, our author styles him Kubilā—کبیلہ—and here Kubilā—کبیلہ—as above, the letter 'n,' apparently, being nasal, as in many other words. The Calcutta Printed Text here turns him into Kilān—کیلان. The name is written rather differently by other authors, as with many other names, particularly with the addition of a final у often found in these words—کبیلہ. The letter 'k'—ک—which is the first in his name, is turned into 'Kh' in the book so often referred to herein, which is equivalent to ک or چ but any one who understands a single letter of Oriental tongues knows that "Khubilai" is as impossible as "Khulagu" for Hulāḵū; and is incorrect, whatever the "Mongol" Professors may say. The Chinese, who spoil all foreign proper names, style him “Hū-pli-lay.”

1 This is a great mistake: we should read Khiṭā for Iraḵ. Kubilāe was never sent into Iraḵ on any expedition, and was never in that country in his life. He is said to have been in Kilghāk in Uktāe’s reign. The services on which he was sent in Mangū’s reign have been already mentioned.

8 Tamghāj has already been referred to in a previous note.

4 As I have briefly referred to the principal events in the lives of the preceding Mughal sovereigns, I will here relate, even at the risk of being considered rather too diffuse, the other chief events in Mangū Қān’s reign, in order to complete the notice of him, and will compare it with the Chinese accounts, as the names of countries, places, and persons, are so widely different, and as, in other matters, considerable discrepancy occurs, and numerous errors exist.

In the year 651 H., which commenced on the 2nd of March, 1253 A.D., Mangū, being well established on the throne, determined upon making fresh conquests in the east and west, or rather, to speak more correctly than the Oriental chronicles of these events, to secure possession of the countries which had been but partially subdued. Accordingly, in this, the second year of his accession, Mangū made a great feast or banquet at the ancient yirat of the Chingiz Қān. After it was over he nominated his youngest brother, Hulāḵū, to march into İrān-Zamfn, some of whose proceedings have been already described, and his middle brother, Kubilāe, into the countries of the east; and the Ko-yang, Mūφal, the Jalā-ır, was despatched along with him [as his guide and preceptor]. This well-known leader’s title is not “Guyaneg.” Ko-yang, the name the Khiṭā-is called him by, signifies great and trustworthy.

After they had set out from Karā-ı-Kuram, with the army, by the direct route,
through the insalubrity of the climate, and want of forage,
apparently, they found grain and forage excessively scarce. They accordingly
despatched information to the Khān, stating that it would be impossible to
proceed by that route, and asked permission to march by another road into
Karā-Jāng [کرایجان]. This is the tract of country which Rashīd-ud-Dīn,
quoting Al-Birūnī, mentions. After noticing Dīw-gīr and the Maʿabar in the
Dakhan of Hind, he says: "There is also another large territory which is
Gandhār, and called by the Mughals Karā-Jāng or Hamil [حماي], and its
people are descended from Hindī and Khitā-i [parents]. In the reign of Kubilāi
Khān it was subdued by the Mughals. On one side it joins Tibbat, on
another, the frontier of Khitāi, and on the third, Hind. Learned men have
said that the people of three different countries are particularly celebrated for
three different things: Hind for its numerous armies, the territory of Gandhār
for its elephants beyond computation, and the Turks for horses."

I have previously narrated the Fanūkātī’s account of the geography of some
of these parts [see note 1, page 912], and the names of various countries of
Khitāi, Chīn, and Mahā-Chīn, but it will be well to mention what refers to
this very tract under discussion again, as great discrepancy exists with regard
to the mode of writing the name of it. The Fanūkātī says: "To the S.W. of
Khitāi is another country, which they—the people of it—style Dā-e-līn [دايلىن]
in one MS. written 'Dā-kū—[داكو] and the Mughals call it Gandhar [گندھار]
—another MS. has Gandah-har—[گنھار]. This country with us—the writer’s
native country, Mawārā-un-Nahr, and Turkistan—is known as Kandhār [کندھار].
It lies between Hind and Tibbat, and in one half of it the people are black
[dark], and in the other half, white [fair]. The Mughals call all this white
half Chaghān-Jāng [چاغانجان], and the other Karā-Jāng.

It is doubtful what the meaning of Jāng is, in fact it is very doubtful what is
the correct word, for it is written خان—پاکان—پاکان—پاکان—and which
may be read in various ways, but if one take the first form—پاکان—in which per-
haps it is chiefly written, it may be read, in the absence of vowel points, Jānak,
Jāng, Jānk, or Jāng; and from its being used with chaghān and Karā, which
are Turkish words for white and black, it must, without doubt, be Turkish
likewise. I am doubtful, however, whether the last form given above—پاکان—
Jānak, is not, after all, the correct word. I have taken some trouble to
search it out in several works, and am sorry that there should still remain any
doubt upon it.

But, from comparison, we arrive at some other facts. The Fanūkātī and
some others say, that, east of Khitāi, the Chīn of the Hindus, and Jākūt of the
Mughals, inclining south-east, is an extensive country called Manzil [مانزي—it is
also written in some MSS. مانزي—and sometimes, by the Fanūkātī
also, or نيا] by the Chinese, Mahā-Chīn by the Hindus, and
Tīnghāsh by the Mughals.

This latter name too, as I have previously remarked, is written in so many
different ways that it is difficult to determine which is the most correct. It is
written—Tīnghāsh—in several very correctly and carefully written
MSS., also Tīnghāsh, تیئغاش, Tīnghāsh, بیکتاش, Tīnghāsh—Tīnghāsh,
Tīnghāsh, and the like, but I believe, after all, that the way in which it is
written in the "Nuhṣat-ul-Kulūb" is the correct one, namely, Tīnkās—Tīnkās,
or Tīnkās—Tīnkās. This country is said, by the Fanūkātī and others, to be
separated from Khitāi or Chīn by the Karā Mūrān or Black River, that its
capital was Khūnsāe [خوئنساي] or Khunsāe [خوئنساي], that it is also called Karā-
were perishing. He despatched swift messengers into Tur-

Jäng by the Mughals, and Dae-Ili in the language of Khiθæ—that is, by the Chinese. Consequently, from these various statements, Ningalḥ or Tingnåh is the Karä and Chaghān Jān and the Gandhär of the Mughals, which constitute the Manf and Dae-Ili of the Chinese, the Mahā-Chin of the Hindūs, and Ḫandhär of the Musalmāns of Turkistān and Māwarā-un-Nahr.

I now return, after this necessary digression, to the request of the Ko-yang, Mūkalf, to enter this territory of Karä-Jān, or whatever it may be. His request was complied with, and he entered that territory with his forces, plundered it, and obtained what his troops were in want of. I notice, in Elliot, vol. 1, page 63, that "Waihind, capital of Kandahār, west of the Sind," is said to be called "Karā-jān" by the "Moghals." This is a little out of the way, and must be an error certainly.

This army under Kubīfā and Mukalf was "to enter Khiθæ [which nearly all historians say was finally subdued in Üktæ's reign, and that the Altän Khān disappeared or hung himself. See note at page 1139], Karä-Jān, Tibbat [Atual—doubtful: the word is written [Albă—Kurū—Kerī—and [Kāšū—Tingākī, Solīkā or Sulīkā, Kof [Kurī], and parts of Hind which adjoin Chīn and Mahā-Chīn."

The Chinese say that "Mengko," as they style Mangū, made his brother Hū-pi-lay, governor of all the territories south of the great Kolf or Desert, that is, Tartary bordering on the Great Wall of China, Lyan-tong, and the conquered provinces of China. In Decr., 1552 A.D. [Shawwall, the tenth month of 650 H.], Hū-pi-lay was directed to attack Tai-li-fa in Yun-nan, and took along with him the general Hū-lyang-hotay [Mūkalf?], and Yanshī [Maḥmūd, Yalwāi?].

About the same time envoys arrived at the urdu from Intū or Hintūs [Hind], to render homage. This was about the very time that Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, the cousin of Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam, left his chief of Tabarhindah, withdrew from Hind, and proceeded to the presence of Mangū Kā'ān. See pages 695, 784, 792, 798, and note 4, page 1223.

In the same year—650 H.—Mangū Kā'ān began to consider in what direction he should himself lead an army, and, therefore, he held another great feast at which the Shab-zidabs and Amfrs appeared. This was held at a place called Kortūk Jīwan [חסיר קורטב]—the Jīdan [חסיר קורטב] doubtless, referred to in note 8, page 912, para. 4—which is situated in the middle of Mughalistan. This is the place where, according to tradition, Kūblah Khān, the eighth of the Bu-
zanjah dynasty [see the note on the descent of the Turks, Tattārs, and Mughals, page 896, para. 6], and his followers, danced so much in the hollow of a tree, after he had obtained success over the Tattārs, and the Altān Khān's forces, when he avenged his brother, Ükīn-Barāk's death.

At this feast, Mangū was advised by Dārkāe, the Gurgān [one of the sons-in-law of the Chingiz Khān], an Amir of the tribe of Angīras-Kungkūr-āt Mughals, to invade Tingnāh or Biktāsh [Ningalḥ]. Dārkāe added, as a reason for invading it, that it was near by, was bāghī, that is to say here, unre-
duced and independent, and that it had hitherto been disregarded by them. This was not correct, however, if, as previously mentioned, the Mughals call this Tingnāh or Biktāsh by the name of Karā-Jān, for that was invaded and plundered by the Mughal troops under Kubīfā and Mukalf, the Ko-yang, just before.

Mangū Kā'ān, in reply to this advice, remarked, that each of his uncles and
kistān and Māwarā-un-Nahr, and called for horses for his
brothers had subdued some country or other, and he would do the same [he
had already done so in the campaigns in the west under Bātū Khān, but before
he succeeded to the throne], so, in the sixth year of his reign, in Muḥarram,
652 H.—February, 1254 A.D.—he determined to go to war with Tehukan
[possibly, Tehūkang], the Faghūr—the particular title given by Muḥammadan
writers to the ruler of Chīn, but what language it is, is not said. Mangū
accordingly left Artūk—or Artūgh—sometimes written Irīṭūx and Irīṭūgh—
Būkah, his next younger brother, in charge of the silāsāt and urdūs, and asso-
ciated with him his eldest son, whose name is written in many ways equally un-
certain—Aormaktāsh, Aorantāsh, Aorangīs, Aorangfās, and
As, but, as he makes no figure whatever in history, it is immaterial.

Respecting these events, the Chinese say that, in February, 1253 A.D. [the
last month of the year 650 H. The year 651 H. commenced on the 2nd March,
1253 A.D.], “Mengko” assembled the Princes and Grandees at the river
Onon, and determined upon sending armies to make further foreign conquests,
“one into India and Kašmīr, another into Korea, and a third against the
Khalfīfāh,” which was to be the most numerous, under his brother “Hyu-
le hū” [Hulākū]. Among the generals was “Kakan [the Manjanfī-kẖīf],
son of Ko-chey, son of Ko-pān-yū,” who were generals of the Chingiz Khān,
a native of Ching, dependent on Wha-chew, in the district of Si-gan-Fū, the
capital of Shen-sī, a very learned man.

“Hū-pī-lay” [Kubīlāc] had assembled his forces the previous year [1252
A.D.—649-50 H.], at Lin-tau-Fū, in Shen-sī, entered Sew-chwen, and, by
difficult roads, through mountains and by precipices, reached the river Kin-sha
or Kyang. At this period, great part of Yun-nan was ruled by Princes inde-
dependent of China. Tali had a king of its own, and he was taken, with that
city, in December of that year. “Hū-pī-lay” subdued several neighbouring
Princes, and reached Tibbat, where several others submitted to him. After
this he returned to his government, leaving Hū-lyang-hotay [the Ko-yān,
Mūkālī?] in command.

Again, in 1254 A.D. [652 H., which commenced on the 20th Feby., 1254],
the Chinese writers state that “Mengko” again assembled the Princes and
Grandees at the source of the river Onon, made many new regulations, and
ordered the commanders of troops in China to lay in great magazines of pro-
visions in such parts of Ho-nan as had walled cities. Hitherto the Mughals
had only made incursions into Sew-chwen to pillage, and had often to retreat,
and, many times with loss, for want of subsistence [as in Kubīlāc’s case, to
which this evidently refers], and “Mengko” directed the general Wang-te-
ching, son of Wang-shī-hyen, to inclose several towns, and lay in stores of
provision.

In June, 1256 A.D. [this would be the beginning of Rajab, the seventh month
of the year 654 H.], another great feast was held, and “Mengko” received the
homage of several Princes of Yun-nan, as well as of neighbouring Princes
and Sulṯāns of the west.

Then it is related that “Mengko considered the urdūs at or near Karā-Kuram
was inconvenient for holding kūrīlās and keeping his Court; and so he
directed a Chinese Bonza, named Lyew-ping-chong, to select a place in Tartary,
which might henceforth be the capital of his dominions. Ping-chong, who was
a man of great learning and of scientific attainments, made choice of a place,
to the east of the city of Whan-chew, called Long-kang; and there a city was
army. Trustworthy persons related, on this wise, that his
built, which was called Kay-ping-Fu, and, afterwards, Shang-tu: yet Kar-a-
Kuram [although neither a city nor town] still continued to enjoy a jurisdiction of
greater extent”—it was still the ast yirat of the Chingiz Khan.
The foundation of this place therefore has been wrongly ascribed to Kubilai,
who founded Khan-Baligh, instead of to “Mengko,” but that it was more
convenient, as to position, than the vicinity of Kar-a-Kuram, and Kalur-an, is
absurd, unless for the convenience of his eastern subjects and dominions alone.
There may have been another reason, and an important one. Kar-a-Kuram
depended a great deal on provisions brought from a long distance, and, should
supplies, by any chance, have been cut off, famine would have arisen, as was
subsequently proved.
This new capital, “Kay-ping-Fu,” afterwards “Shang-tu,” is apparently the
Shandu, and Ciandu of Polo, “Xandu” in Ramusio, and “Ions” of Hayton.
“It stood,” it is stated, “in the country of Karchin on the river “Shan-tu,”
N.N.E. of Pekin, and “seems to be,” says a writer in Astley’s “Collection,”
“Chu-rayman-muna, which is one of three ruins marked in the Missioners’
map, on the river Shangtu.” Hayton calls it Ions. “Passing out of the
gate, Hi-fong-kew in Pe-che-li, you find yourself in Karchin, Ohan, Naman
[Nasman], and Karchin. It is divided into ten standards; and the country of
the Mughals of Karchin extends to the Sira Mür-an—the great river Sira.
Mür-an in the Mughal language signifies a great river, and Pirah a smaller one.”
To continue the Chinese accounts before returning to the Mughal records
quoted by the Musalmān writers, in whose time the Mughals had to a consi-
dderable extent become Musalmāns likewise, they say that, in 1257 A.D. [the
year 655 H. began on 18th January, 1257 A.D.], “Mengko” sent orders
to his generals in Se-chwen, Hu-quang, and Kyang-nan, to prepare to attack
the Song [empire] on all sides, resolving to begin himself with the first, that is
to say, Se-chwen, which therefore is equivalent with Tingnāsh [Ningāsh]
of the Musalmān writers, Mahā-Chin of the Hindūs, and Manz of the Chinese,
as described by the Fanakatf and others. After the month of July [the seventh
month of 655 H.] he appointed his brother, Alipū-ko [Irūk or Irīgh Būkāh],
in charge at Kar-a-Kuram.” There is some discrepancy between the Musalmān
and Chinese dates, because he was appointed in the first month of 652 H., as
before mentioned. “In the same month, Mengko” set out, reached the moun-
tain of “Lewpan in Shen-si,” where the Chingiz Khan died [which place, as
stated before at page 1087, was situated on the frontier of Tingnāsh, or
Ningāsh, and Khūrijah]. He was scarcely arrived there when he understood
his brother Hū-pi-lay, with his family, and without any attendance, in the
manner of a criminal, had come, in order to submit himself to the Kā’in. This
news so affected “Mengko” that the suspicions he entertained against him
were removed and he was completely forgiven.” I shall refer to this matter
presently.
“Hū-pi-lay” was directed by “Mengko” to return to his government, and
prepare for the siege of Vu-chang-Fu, the capital of Hū-quang, then to march
to Hang-chew, the metropolis of Che-kyang, and the empire of the Song; and
the general Chang-jau was nominated to command under him.
I will now return to the Mughal accounts from where I left off, when, early
in 652 H.—about March or April, 1254 A.D.—Mangū appointed Irīgh Būkāh
to remain in charge of the great urdūs and ulūis, along with his eldest son,
but some say his son Serkī.
lieutenants and governors, who were in Turkistān and Mā-

to enumerate all the names, and give all the details, respecting those Shāh-
zādahs, Amīrs, and troops, which accompanied him, and the preparations
made, would occupy far more space than can be afforded here: at some future
time I hope to do so. Sufficient it is to say that they included a great number of
Shāh-zādahs, Amīrs, and forces; both of the Dast-i-Chap—the left hand—and
Dast-i-Rāst—the right hand—which latter they style [i.e. the territory they
occupy] Jāṅkūt or Jāṅkūt, which signifies the forces of Khātē, Tingkūt,
Khūrjāh, and Sūkānakā [سُؤُکَانُکَ], because the Mughals, in their dialect, used
to call those parts Jāṅkūt or Jāṅkūt. The army of Mangū Kā’ān amounted, it
is said, to the immense number of 600,000, one half of which belonged to the
Dast-i-Chap, and whose leader was the Shāh-zādah, Taṅghāchār [there is no
such name as “Thugatshur”], son of Ü-Tigīn, the younger brother of the
Chingiz Khān.

As Mangū issued forth on his way, he received the news of the death of the
Nū-yīn, Belkūtāe, half brother of the Chingiz Khān, who had attained the age
of 110 years, and who had done good service in the latter’s time. Mangū also
received an account of his brother Kūblāī’s movements with his forces; and
that, as Kūblāī, at this time, was indisposed—he was afflicted with gout, or
dard-i-pāe—if he were allowed to take repose for a time, it would be well.
Kūblāī was permitted, accordingly, to return to his urdūs, as a temporary
measure, to get better.

This evidently is what the Chinese histories refer to as a disagreement between
the brothers, and Kūblāī’s being suspected, and forgiven, but the Musalmān
writers never so much as hint at anything of the kind, and the two accounts
are wholly contrary to each other. Although Kūblāī had permission to retire
to his urdūs he did not do so, but again returned to his post. It was at this
time likewise, that Shīrāmūn, who was not to be trusted, was put to death
before Kūblāī departed. Perhaps it is this incident that the Chinese writers
got hold of.

Having set out, in the summer of 653 ᴨ.—about June, 1255 A.D.—Mangū
reached the boundaries of the territories of Tingkūt and Tingnāsh or Biktāsh
[Ningāsh], at the place named Afwān or Afūān, Shān [أَفْوَانْ غَايَةَ]—it was Lewak
Shān—before. See note, page 1088, within the confines of Tingnāsh
or Biktāsh [Ningāsh], which is the place where the Chingiz Khān
died.

Towards the latter part of the year he moved forward for the purpose of
attacking the Mūsūl [مسول] Kahlukāh or Pass, and forced it. With little
effort he subsequently captured twenty fortresses, and subdued a territory known
as Khān-Sindān [خان سندان]—in one copy of Alfī the first word is Jān—[ژان]
and, having taken possession of the whole of it, turned his face towards a great
fortress [a fortified city] called Mūlī Sāng [مُلِى سَانُهُ]

There is considerable discrepancy with regard to the name of this place,
caused by the careless copying of scribes, and the facilities which the Arabic
characters offer for making mistakes when carelessly written. In the best
written copies of Alfī and the Fanākātī, respectively, it is Mūlī-Sāng, as above,
and Dolf-Shāng [دوبل شانغ], while in other copies of the former, and in other
works, it is Moli Sānd—بَغلْي سَانْهُ—Moli Sānd and Moli Sānd—بَغلْي سَانْهُ—without points. The place in
question is the Ho-chew of the Chinese historians, and Ho-chew or Ko-chew of the Jesuits’ map.

Before setting out into those parts, he had despatched the Nū-yīn, Taṅghāchār,
with a numerous army, by way of the great river called Kā’ān Ling [کاْن لین]]
warā-un-Nahr, in a very short space of time—less than

that he might reduce to submission the fortified cities of Fang-ch'ing [方城] —the words are without points, and may be meant for Măng[芒]-ch'ing—and Măng-Fün[莽unken]. Taghāchār reached the foot of that fortress [the last mentioned place], and invested it for a week, but, during that time, having obtained no sign of success, he marched away, and returned to his own urdūs. Mangū Kā'ān was excessively wroth at this proceeding, and vowed he would punish Taghāchār in such a way that others should take example therefrom, but he did not live to do so.

The place before which Mangū Kā'ān sat down in 654 H., was, according to the Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, “a fortified mountain of prodigious height and circuit, and furnished with all things necessary to withstand an enemy. Winter came and passed, and spring set in, and the summer of 655 H. arrived [the summer of 1257 A.D.]. The excessive heat brought on a pestilence among the troops, and most of his army perished. Mangū, who, for a long period, had been investing this strong place, took to drinking deeply, in order to ward off the danger of catching the disease, but his health gave way in consequence, and he was taken ill, and died eight days after, in Muḥarram—the first month—of 656 H. [about the middle of January, 1258 A.D.] on the banks of the Kūbfghā Mūrūn [科尔沁木鲁思], after a reign of eight years.” The circumstances related by our author, although very brief, contain some interesting particulars respecting these events, which no authors I have been quoting mention.

There is considerable discrepancy, too, and some doubt, concerning the date of Mangū’s death.

Alīf, and its authorities, the Raṣṣat-uṣ-Ṣafā, the Fanākīf, and the Muntakhab-ul-Tawārīkh, say it happened in 655 H. The Ḥabīb-us-Siyar says it took place in 654 H., while Gūzīdah and Faṣīhū say it was in 657 H., and that he reigned nine years, and was forty-eight—some say forty-six—when he died. The Fanākīf says his reign was six years and two months.

The last of these dates—657 H.—is undoubtedly correct, because his brother, Hūlākū, in Rabī’-ul-Awwal, 655 H., sent Khūr Shāh, Bāḏghāh of the Mūḏahdah, to his camp, after obtaining possession of Alamūt; and, by Mangū Kā’ān’s command, he was put to death by the way. Mangū, therefore, could not possibly have died in 654 H., nor in the first month of 655 H. Another proof is that Hūlākū sent the news to Mangū of the capture of Baghdād, and the murder of the last Khālifah, together with an account of events which had happened in ‘Irāk in 656 H., and which news reached him. Therefore, allowing for the immense distance which separated the brothers, the first month of 657 H.—January, 1259 A.D.—is, evidently, the more correct date. Our author, who finished his history in the fifth month of 658 H.—about the end of February, 1260 A.D.—appears to have very recently become aware of his death by report.

I must now give the Chinese version of these events for the sake of comparison. “Hū-lyang-hotay” having made conquests in the countries bordering on “Yun-nan,” subsequent to his subjugation of Tibbat in 1255 A.D. —653 H.—penetrated as far as “Tong-king,” and “Kochin-China,” then comprehended under the name of “Gan-nan,” ruined its capital, and plundered the country. He was returning to “Tali,” when “Mengko” ordered him to join “Hū-pi-lay” in the siege of Vū-chang-Fū [capital of the province of Hū-quang].

“Mengko’s” forces entered “Se-chwen” in three bodies, each in a different direction. As soon as the army passed the mountain of “Lū-pan” [this is
one week—purchased 80,000 horses from Samarkand and
the Chinese name for the place where the Chingiz Khân died], "Po-li-cha," a
great Tartar [Mughal] lord, was appointed to command the first body, Mu-ko,
the Kâ'an's brother, the second, while "Mengko" commanded the third, and
took the route of Han-chong-Fû in Shen-si. He was vigorously opposed by
the troops of the Song in Se-chwen. "Mengko" now sent on, in advance,
Nyew-lyen of the Chanchu tribe, whose father and grandfather were greatly
renowned in the army, in the beginning of the year 1250–656 H.—to obtain
information. He learnt that Ata-hû, the Mughal general in Ching-tû-Fû, was
in great extremity, being invested on all sides by the Song. He, Nyew-lyen,
having reached Ho-chew, resolved to succour Ata-hû, but his efforts were of
no avail, for the Song took it, and Ata-hû died. Nyew-lyen, now grown
desperate from want of success, posted himself between the Song army and
Ching-tû, to which he immediately marched, and soon after succeeded in
gaining possession of it. Finding that the Kâ'an had reached Kang-chong-Fû,
he left the city in charge of another officer, moved to Mahû, and sent forces to
facilitate "Mengko's" passage of the river Kyan-lin by a bridge of boats.
The other two bodies of troops having rejoined him, Long-gan-Fû was
captured, and Lan-chew [now Pau-ning-Fû] surrendered. The general Hû-
lyang-hotay entered China, on his return from Gan-nan, by Tung-quin, moved
forward to Quang-si, and setazed Quey-lin-Fû, the capital of that province.
The Chinese were surprised to find him penetrate as far as Chang-sha, a city of
Hu-quang, which he invested in the beginning of 1259 A.D., equivalent to the
first month of 657 H., which ended on December 16th of that year, and which
completely agrees with the year given in Guizdah.

On the first day of the same year, 1259 A.D.—the 28th of December began
the year 657 H.—"Mengko" reached the mountain Chong-quey, where the
Chalar [Jalâ-îrî], To-whan, affirmed that the war in Se-chwen would turn out
unfortunate from heat and moisture, which would destroy the troops, and
advised a retreat. Pa-li-che, the Orla [Arlât], said that To-whan spoke thus
through fear, and advised the Kâ'an to continue the campaign; so "Mengko"
determined to continue the war, and to invest Ho-chew, which he accordingly
did in February. Nyew-lyen advanced to co-operate with him, and constructed
a bridge of boats near Fû-cheu-Fû, while another leader went and took up a
position near Quey-chew, on the borders of Hû-quang. An attack was
repulsed on Ho-chew in February, another in March, while, in April, there
was thunder and rain for twenty days. One day, however, the Mughals
succeeded in scaling the walls, and made great slaughter among the defenders,
but they were finally repulsed. A Chinese general attacked the raft bridge,
at Fû-cheu-Fû, and got to Kon-chin-Fû, eight leagues S.S.E. of Ho-chew,
collected 1000 barques to ascend to Kya-ling [Kyan-lin?], but was attacked by
a Mughal force, and pursued to Chong-king. The Mughals were, however,
still much harassed by disease, want, and sallies. In July "Mengko" resolved
to assault it with his best troops, and carry it at any cost. On the 10th of
August the Kâ'an visited the works, and gave orders for scaling the walls the
following night. The Mughals gained the top of the walls, but were repulsed
with great slaughter, and even pursued. "Mengko," in desperation, now
ordered a general assault, and went in person to direct it. A storm arose at
the time, and during the attack several ladders were blown down. On this, a
fearful carnage ensued; vast numbers of the Mughals perished, and among
them was the. Kâ'an, whose body was found pierced with many wounds.
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Buḵhārā, and, adding them to those which they had purchased in Upper Turkistān, despatched them [to Mangū Khān’s army].

They also related, that, after some time, the king of Chin brought such an immense army, as cannot come within the compass of number or computation, and, in the end, Mangū Khān, and his army, were overthrown, and reached a mountain [range] round about [nearly] the whole of which range was the sea, and morass; and, in that mountain [range], Mangū Khān, with the whole of the Mughal army, perished from famine.

The reign of Mangū Khān was nine years.6

Thus fell “Mengko,” at the age of fifty-two, after a reign of nine years. Such is the Chinese account, which is very different from that of the Mughals.

To return to the Mughal accounts. Mangū’s son, Asūtāe Aqūil, leaving the Nū-yīn, Kand-ḵāe— in command of the troops, took up the coffin of his father, and conveyed it to his urduis [the urduis of his four wives]; and, for four days successively, they made mourning for the late Khān. The first day in the urduis of Kūnḵāe [قونکی], Kḥāṭūn, who was also called Kūldīf [کولادیف], and Kūlīf [کولیدیف], the daughter of the Gurghān or son-in-law of the Chingiz Khān, Uldāe, son of Bartū, of the Angirās tribe. This Khāṭūn had born Mangū two sons, the eldest, Bāltū, and the youngest [he is said previously to have been Mangū’s eldest] Aormaktāsh, Aorangtāsh, or Aorangīs, and one daughter, Mayālūn by name.

The second day, the corpse was removed to the urduis of Tuwāw-chīn [توانچین], who is also called Tānāw-chīn [تنانچین], and Tūrā-chīn [تورانچین], but all these names are more or less doubtful, of the tribe of Bāyāūt. She bore him a son, Sercī, also written Sherbī, previously alluded to.

On the third day it was conveyed to the urduis of Uḡūl-Kūlmisī Khāṭūn, the Ufīr-āt, who had accompanied him on this expedition. She was of the family of his mother, Sīr-Kūḵbī Bigī, and was a woman of strong mind and force of character. At first she had been betrothed to Mangū’s father. She used to style Kūbīlāe and Hulākū, her husband’s brothers, “fārunḍīs,” or sons, and they paid her great respect. She bore no son, but had two daughters.

On the fourth day the corpse was taken to the urduis of Kasā [کس] Khāṭūn. She was of the tribe of Ilijīkāh or Ilijīkān, an offshoot of the Kungkūr-āt, and bore him a son named Asūtāe, previously mentioned.

The first and third Khāṭūns were free born: the two others were handmaids, but there were many others of lesser note. On each day, in each urduis, the coffin was placed upon a throne, and they made lamentation over the corpse. After the mourning ceremonies, the body of the Khān was buried at the place called Būlkān or Būrkān—’I’ and ‘r’ being interchangeable—Kāldūn, which is styled the Yakāh Kurūk, that is to say, “the exclusively prohibited [spot],” at the side of the Chingiz Khān, and Tūlū or Tūl Khān, his grandfather and father.

6 Our author has forgotten to notice, or would not notice, a remarkable
May Almighty God prolong the reign of the present

matter concerning the Dihl kingdom, which happened in the reign of his
patron, and during the reign of Mangū Kā'ān.

Early in 646 H., Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, the elder brother, it must
be remembered, of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, who had hitherto
been feudatory of Kinnauj, was made feudatory of Sanbhāl and Budā'ūn, this
last being one of the most important sieges of the Dihl empire, but, without
proceeding thither, he became frightened at something which our author
conceals, and fled, by way of Sihnur, towards Lohor [see pages 684 and 818].
His flight may have been caused through fear or suspicion of Ulugh Khān, in
whose hands the whole power now centred, and who very shortly after
married his daughter to the Sultān. What Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh,
subsequently did, or whither he went, is also made a profound mystery of.
Lohor, too, is mentioned at this period in connexion with him, after its never
being once mentioned since its capture and sack by the Mughals, in 639 H.,
when it was lost to Dihl.

A few months after this Prince's flight, in the eighth month of the same
year, we find the Sultān moving with his forces as far as the river Biāh—which
then flowed in its old bed—and his marching back again, but why he marched,
and what his army did, is not mentioned anywhere by our author, but it was,
without doubt, connected, in some way, with his brother's flight.

Again, in 650 H., the Sultān set out, intending to march to Uchchah and
Multān [pages 692 and 825], but only reached the banks of the Biāh when
the Rayḥāni plot broke out [pages 693 and 826]. and Ulugh Khān was
banished to his siefs. This was in 651 H. Nothing more is mentioned about
Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, until 652 H., when we find him, in com-

bination, with Ulugh Khān, and other Maliks, advancing towards the capital,
in order, it would seem, merely to upset the Rayḥāni faction; and then our
author says [page 830], that the Sultān's brother "came from the side of
Lohor," but where he had been all this time, from 646 to 652 H., is not
allowed to transpire. In another place [page 793], however, it seems that
more than the upsetting of the Rayḥāni faction was intended, for we are told
that "a party of Amirs now interposed between the two personages"—the
Sultān and his brother—and after, that "Lohor became the sief—not that the
Sultān conferred it—of Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh." In another place
[page 793], we are told that Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, who had left Hind
and gone into Turkistān, to the urdū of Mangū Kā'ān [see note 8, page 1198],
returned with honour from thence, and went to Lohor, and joined the Prince
[Jalāl-ud-Dīn] there, but that disagreements arose between them, and the
Prince "retired in disappointment, and his dependents and followers fell into
the hands of Malik Sher Khān's train." From this time Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd
Shāh, disappears from the scene, and is heard of no more.

Fortunately a few others throw some light on what our author keeps so dark.
Among them the Fanākat says, that several of the great Mamluks of the late
Sultān, I-yal-timīsh, rebelled against his son, Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd
Shāh, and set up another in his place, as though he had been actually reigning.
He says, in fact, that Raşiyyat was set up by Ulugh Khān, but the date he,
afterswards gives, which is quite correct, shows that he has confused the names
a little, and refers to Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, whom he afterwards men-
tions as having been set up by Ulugh Khān. Then he continues:—"Malik
Jalāl-ud-Dīn fled from Hind, and, in 651 H., presented himself in the urdū of
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Sultān of Islām to the end of the existence of mankind, and preserve the Khān-i-A’ẓam, Ulugh Khān, in power and authority, to the end of the world! Āmin. 4

VIII.—HULĀKŪ, SON OF TŪLĪ, SON OF THE CHINGIZ KHĀN.

Hulākū 7 is the brother of Mangū Khān, and Tūlī [his
Mangū Khān, and Kutlugh Khān [this may be Sultān Nasīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh’s step-father who afterwards caused such trouble, as he was in Hind up to near the close of 655 H.], and Sunkār [Sher Khān-i-Sunkār. He did leave his fief and retire into Turkistān at this very time, in 649—650 H. See pages 695 and 792], out of fear of Ulugh Khān, followed Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn. Mangū Khān commanded that a befitting grant should be assigned to the latter, and a yetlīgh was issued to the Nū-yīn, Sālīf, then in those parts [in the tract on the Indus, and as far east as the Bīāb—the present Panjāb], to aid him with his troops. Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn returned therefore, and he was permitted to take possession of the districts of Luhāwūr [Lahor], Kūchah [also written Kujah—کوچھ—and always mentioned in connexion with Banfān. See pages 627 and 750], and Sūdharah, which parts were then subject to the Mughals, and thus he contented himself with a little out of much.”

Rubruquys, curiously enough, confirms the above. He says that about the 15th of June, 1254 A.D.—about the fourth month of 652 H.—when the Khān held a great assembly at Karī-Kuram, at which a number of ambassadors attended, he noticed the ambassador from the Sultān of India. This could be no other than Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, and his party, or Sher Khān-i-Sunkār, for it is quite certain that no ambassador was ever sent from India by Nasīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh. They brought with them, as a present, eight leopards, and ten hounds for coursing, which were taught to sit on the horses’ buttocks. The same traveller also says he returned for six weeks the same road westward, along with this very ambassador, and then he struck off to the left—the east. It is a pity he has not mentioned the ambassador’s name.

That this account is correct is without doubt, from what our author allows to escape him. Well might he say that Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, “advanced from the side of Lohor,” that “some of the Amīrs interposed between the two personages,” and that “Lohor became his fief,” The early history of the kingdom of Dihlī has yet to be written. The history of a country is not to be rendered correctly from the accounts of a single author, or single extracts from two or three authors merely. See also pages 793, 862, and 863.

4 I hope this is a sufficient proof to show that this work was written in Sultān Nasīr-ud-Dīn’s reign, and not in that of his successor, although, like much more, it is not contained in the Calcutta Printed Text.

7 I need not tell the Oriental scholar, who can read the letters of the Persian alphabet for himself, that the first letter of this name is simple ہ—هـلاکہ—Hulākū, the only variations of which are—موہلکہ—Maulakū, and ہـلاکہ—Hulākū, as our author sometimes writes it; but, for the information of those who cannot read the original for themselves, and have to trust to translations, second-hand, or mere compilations from the works of foreign translators.
father] was the youngest of the Chingiz Khan's sons. When the Chingiz Khan crossed the Jihun into Khurassan, he despatched Tülüf towards Nishapür, Hirat, and Marw; and Tülüf took all those cities, and destroyed them. Trustworthy persons related, that Tülüf was a good-looking youth; and, when he returned from Khurassan to Turkistan, he died, leaving four sons, as has been previously recorded.

When Mangü Khan, son of Tülüf, ascended the throne, he despatched Hulakü into the countries of I-ran and 'Ajam, and assigned those territories to him; and the armies which were in 'Irak, and the troops which were in Turkistan, Khatlan, Taa-kän, and Kunduz, and the forces which were in the territories of Ghur, Khurassan, Hirat, and the Garmisir, were all directed to obey the command of Hulakü. On Hulakü's entering Khurassan he chose Bädgahis as his head-quarters; and the Maliks of the different parts of 'Ajam presented themselves before him.

The Mughal army of Jurmağhun, which was in 'Irak, was continually fighting and carrying on hostilities with the troops of the Lord of the Faithful, but, on no occasion, and in no wise, was it able to gain the superiority over the forces of the Khalifah's capital; and the infidels used continually to be defeated, more particularly in their attempts to take the city of Safahän [Iṣfahän]. It occupied the infidels fifteen years before they were able to gain possession of that city. If the Kāzi of Safahän had not attained

of various nationalities, whose meanings and words too may have been misunderstood, I must remark [for some one to explain to them] that to produce "Khulagu" the word must be written خالگو or خالاغو or خالکو or خالگو or خلکو or خلکو or خلکو خلکو Khulagu, which no one has ever yet seen written—not even a Schiefner in "Mongol." Quartremère spells it Houlagu, and Von Hammer, Hulaku. How D'Ohsson may spell it I am unaware, as I have not seen his work, but, however it may be, the first two letters are ku, and not kh. See also "Mongols Proper," page 193.

He left eight sons, but Mangü, Kubiläe, Hulakü, and Artuk Bükä, were the best known among them.  

\[ Taa-kän of Tukharistan is undoubtedly meant here, which is in the same territory as Kunduz. \]

\[ The Pro-Mughal writers say—as previously mentioned—that he was obliged to remain all the winter of 652 H. in the district or territory of Shiwaraghän, a tract of country then in a much more flourishing condition than now. Bädgahis too was a flourishing district, and within a short distance of Hirat and its fruitful and formerly populous, but recently devastated, territory, of which it was, and is, a dependency. Our author's statement here is the more likely of the two. \]
martyrdom, the infidels would not have found it possible to take that place, for the army of Jurmāghūn, and the Nū-yīn, Khainā, for a period of fifteen years, continued to carry on hostilities, and to wage war before the gate of that city and its environs. During this entire period of time, the people of Ṣafahān kept the city gates open, so that, night and day, the gates used not to be closed; and, through the great valour and spirit of the holy warriors of Ṣafahān, the Mughals did not have the power of entering the city, until a party of powerful renegades seduced an individual from the right path to assassinate the Ḍāzī, saying: “It is necessary to kill the Ḍāzī because the trouble and annoyance of defending the city is caused by him.” After they had martyred the Ḍāzī the city was taken.

When, in the year 655 H., the Amīr-i-'Alam [Lord of the Standard] of the rightful Khalīfah, Al-Muṣtaʿṣim ʿBʾillah, the Lord of the Faithful—God reward him!—whose name was Sulīmān Shāh, the Aiyūbī Turk-mān—on whom be the mercy of the Almighty!—entered 'Irāk with the troops of the Khilāfāt, he defeated the Mughal forces which were in the territory of ʿĀzarbājījān, and in 'Irāk, and sent great numbers of Mughals to hell, so that the Mughal troops were unable to stand before Sulīmān Shāh, and the forces of the Khalīfah’s dominions. They [the Mughals]

---

3 This name does not occur in the other works I have been quoting. It is written in several different ways—خيا—خاون—خانون—خانون—خاني—خاني نوون—and even ا The doings of Jurmāghūn are not given in any detail by the Pro-Mughal writers, because there were no successes to record; and ʿIṣfahān is never once mentioned from the time of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, up to this period, an interval of twenty-seven years, which is significant.

4 Lord of the Standard, equivalent to the Gonfaloner under the Popes, in the middle ages. The Amīr-i-'Alam commanded the troops of the Khilāfāt.

5 The text, in every instance, has Al-Muṣṭaṣim—and in several other works, including the Raṣūq-ʿṣl-Ṣafā, the name is thus written, but the majority of others have Al-Muṣṭaṣim as above, which is correct.

6 After Ḥulākū had finished with the Ismāʿīlīs in the ʿUlūmān and Alamūt, he set out towards Lānbaḥ-Sar, but, finding it was not likely to be soon taken, left a considerable force to invest it, under Ṭāʿ-ir Būḵā, and marched towards ʿAsk̲w̲īn, whither his and other families had been sent, and encamped within seven leagues of it, on the 27th of Ẓīr-Hijjah, 654 H. Subsequently, in Rabiʿ- ul-Awwal, 655 H., he moved from the vicinity of ʿAsk̲w̲īn, and marched to Ḥamādān, where the Nū-yīn, Tānjū, the Baisūt, from ʿĀzarbājījān, presented
despatched swift messengers to Hulakū, in Khurāsān, and sought aid from him. Hulakū got ready the forces of Khurāsān, both Mughal and others, and determined to march into 'Irāk, and set out towards it.

ACCOUNT OF THE FALL OF THE CAPITAL OF THE KHILĀFAT.

When Hulakū set out towards 'Irāk, the Malik of Maušil, whom they were wont to style Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Lūlū—on whom be the Almighty’s curse!—had consented to receive a Mughal Shāhnah [Intendant]. The Atābak, Abū-Bikr,7 son of Sa’d, ruler of Fārs, likewise had a Shāhnah, and had agreed to pay tribute to the Mughals; himself. Hulakū was not well disposed towards that great leader, on account of some reflection he had made, and he had therefore summoned Tānjū to his presence. He said to him: “Since thou hast been occupying the place of Jurmāghān, what hast thou done? what ranks hast thou broken? what rebel hast thou reduced to submission? and what enemy hast thou made a friend?” Tānjū bent the knee, and replied: “During this period of time I have committed no fault, and what was in the power of my hand to do, in that I have not been sparing of myself. Among other things I have taken a certain fortress and a certain town, and cleared all the tracts between Rai and Rūm and Shām; but, in consequence of the difficulty of the road to Baghdād, and the great number of the troops of the Khilāfat, in the neighbourhood of that city, the Mughal troops have been guarded from disaster; and now the sovereign has the option and power of commanding whatever he may please.” The fire of Hulakū’s ire cooled on his hearing these words, and he said to Tānjū: “It behoveth thee to proceed towards the frontiers of Shām and Rūm, and that thou shouldst subdue them, as far even as the sea of Magrib [some say, to the sea of Yūnān].” Tānjū accepted this task; and, the very same day, set out towards Rūm, into which he carried slaughter and devastation. Farther on it is stated that he was recalled, and, while on the march, directed to move against Baghdād. Early in Rabī’ul-Awwal, 655 H.—April, 1257 A.D.—Hulakū prepared to invade 'Irāk-i-'Arab, and attack Baghdād. He first turned towards Tabriz, and reached it on the 12th of Rajab. Having remained there one month and a half, during which the Mughals carried fire and sword into Kurdistan, he again turned towards Hamadan, which—the neighbourhood of which—he reached on the 10th of Ramaṣān. His camp was formed in the open country about Hamadan, near to Khānahābād, “which is a verdant plain of Kurdistan,” and there he began to get ready his forces for the coming struggle. It was from this place that he despatched his envoys with an insolent message to the Khilīfah, which will be referred to farther on.

6 Amīr Badr-ud-Dīn, Abū-1-Faṣā’il-i-Lūlū, who was originally an Armenian slave.
7 See page 180.
and from both of these rulers bodies of cavalry arrived to the assistance of the infidel army. The infidel forces gathered around Hulâkû in 'Irâf, and turned their faces towards Baghâdâd.

The Lord of the Faithful, Al-Musta'sîm B'ilâh, had a Wazîr, a râfisî [a shî'ah heretic] of bad religion, and his name was A'hmad, the 'Alkami. Between him, the Wazîr, and the eldest son of the Lord of the Faithful, who

'Alkamah is the name of a city in Afrîkah, or Mauritania, and the name of a man. It is also the coloquintida, and is used to signify anything very bitter. 'Alkami here refers to a native of 'Alkamah.

Mu'ayyid-ud-Dîn, Mu'hammâd, son of 'Abd-ul-Malik, the 'Alkami, at the time of Al-Musta'sîm's accession to the Khilafah, held the office of Ustâd-i-Dâr, and was suspected, by many, but not by the Khalfah himself, of being much against his accession, and of wishing to have set up the Khalfah's brother instead. In 642 H., the Wazîr, Nâqir-ud-Dîn, Mu'hammâd, a very aged man, was removed from office, and Ibn 'Alkami was installed as his successor, a most unfortunate act, and the chief cause of the downfall of the Khilafah.

The new Wazîr was an eloquent man, of vast attainments, and who, in the composition of poetry and prose, had no equal. He was generous and liberal, and clever in the administration of state affairs. In this office he had no partner or associate, and the government was under his entire control; but he was a Shi'ah in faith, and thus an enemy to the house of 'Abbâs. He did not consider that the other officials of the Court paid him that respect and attention which he thought he was entitled to; and, by innuendo, they were wont to reproach and rail at him as a heretic. The Khalfah was cognizant of all this, and used to prohibit them from behaving in such a way towards the Wazîr; nevertheless, he nourished in his heart hatred towards the Khalfah, his family, and the rest of his Court; but he took good care to conceal it so that not a soul suspected what was contained within his heart. Matters went on in this manner until the eldest son [by some writers, the brother] of the Khalfah, the Amîr, Abû-Bikr, who, through his father's weakness of character, had been permitted to assume to himself the protectorship of the orthodox Sunnis, with more zeal than was perhaps advisable, despatched a body of troops to the suburb of Karkh of Baghâdâd, which was known as the mahallah of the Shi'ah's of the Ahl-i-Bait, to quell a serious disturbance which had broken out there between the Shi'ahs and Sunnis, the Shi'ahs having killed a number of the Banî Hâshîm dwelling in the same suburb. In doing this, the Amîr, Abû-Bikr, was severe, and allowed his men to treat the Shi'ah women as though they were the women of infidels captured in war, carrying them seated before them on their horses, through the bâzârs of Baghâdâd, bare-headed and bare-footed. When the Wazîr became aware of this, the bridle of his heart's secret nearly escaped his grasp, and, in his rage, he vowed within himself, that, even if he perished in the attempt, he would wreak revenge upon all Sunnis for this act of the Khalfah's son.

Day and night he pondered the matter in his mind, and communed within himself, and deliberated how best he could bring about the destruction of his benefactor, his family, and the Sunni people. At this time he discovered that
was named Amīr Abū-Bikr, enmity had arisen on account

Hulākū Khān, after having completed the downfall of the Mūlāhidahs, had been commissioned to invade ʻIrāk-i-ʻArab, and reduce the Khalīfah. Considering this a great piece of good luck, the Wazīr resolved to profit by it. He forthwith set to work to render the design of the Mughals successful, and enable them to gain possession of Baghdād without trouble and without delay, by opening communication with Hulākū, and giving him all the information he could.

He accordingly represented to the Khalīfah saying: "Thank God, the Lord of the Faithful this day is at peace with all the different rulers. All of them are loyal and subservient to him; and, at all times, they pray for his prosperity and security, and in no way desire to encounter the forces of the Khilāfah. In truth, the Khalīfah is without rival and without adversary. Now it seems contrary to forethought and prudence, under these circumstances, that such an expenditure should go on every year from the treasury for the payment of so many troops; and, if the Lord of the Faithful will permit, I will despatch the various officers of the troops to different localities in the Khalīfah's dominions on civil duties, and the troops may be disbanded, whereby a great advantage will accrue to the finances, and a vast deal of treasure be saved." This sounds like modern stump-atory.

At this time, 124,000 efficient cavalry were kept up by the Khalīfah, and paid out of his treasury, without counting the contingents of the vassals of the Khilāfah; and the unfortunate Khalīfah, in his love of wealth, considering all this was for his advantage, permitted the traitor to carry out his scheme. After a short time this was completed, and the capital almost denuded of troops. The traitor now communicated again with Hulākū, and despatched an agent secretly, expressing his sincerity and loyalty, and urging upon him that he should, on no account, give up the attempt to subdue ʻIrāk-i-ʻArab, and capture Baghdād, which could easily be accomplished, and that his services were at his entire disposal. Notwithstanding the proofs and arguments he gave in his communication, Hulākū, for some time, did not place much faith in the traitor's words, but, when Ibn ʻAlkāmī continued to send communications, and to importune him on the subject, Hulākū consulted with another traitor—the Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, who had, by this time, gained complete ascendancy over him, and a high position in Hulākū's confidence and service. He, being one of the great ʻUlamā of the Șiʻah sect, and having his own private revenge to satisfy by the downfall of the ʻAbbāsīs, entered into the conspiracy with zeal, especially after Ibn ʻAlkāmī had communicated direct with himself also. The Khwājah pretended that it was necessary to consult the aspect of the stars before determining on the campaign, and this he was directed by Hulākū to do. His report may be imagined: he stated that he had carefully carried out his observations, that the result was favourable, and that it was predicted that the time was at hand for the Khalīfah, Mustaʻṣīm, to be made captive, and that Baghdād and ʻIrāk-i-ʻArab would be subdued by his servants, without much trouble or difficulty.

Hulākū's first move was to despatch his envoys to the Court of the Khalīfah with an insolent and arrogant message, on the 10th of Ramaḍān, 655 H., upbraiding him for not having rendered aid, which he accused the Khalīfah of having promised, in the operations against the Mūlāhidahs, and of falsehood in consequence. His insolence was, no doubt, the greater, knowing that the Khalīfah's own Wazīr was his friend and ally. The threats of the barbarian
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of the despoiling of the rāṣīls who inhabited Karkh, and
and his demands were, among other matters, that the Khalīfah should beware
of manifesting impotent rage, and should neither strike his fist against an iron
spike, nor attempt to plaster over the sun with mud mortar, otherwise he would
deeply regret it, and sovereignty would turn away its face from him. "Our
advice is," he said, "that thou shouldst demolish the defences of Baghdād,
fill up the ditch, make over the direction of state affairs to thy son, and present
thyself before us, in order that thou mayest dwell in safety from the wrath of
God. If thou art not coming thyself, send thy Waṣīr, the Sar Dīwat-Dīr, and
Sulfān Shāh—the two latter, especially the last, were the mainstay of the
state, and chief obstacle in the traitor's way—in order that our messages,
without detriment or addition, may reach thee; for, if thou dost not give thine
ear to our friendly exhortations and advice, get thy forces ready, and prepare
for war; for we have girded up our loins to fight with thee, and are ready.
Further understand, that, when we shall reach Baghdād, whether thou art in
the heavens above or in the earth beneath, they will bring to thee our
preremptory command, which is like unto fate's."

The Khalīfah's reply, transmitted through his own envoys, a mixture of
admonition, boasting, and defiance, concluded: "Listen, young man, there-
fore, to the admonition we have given thee, and retain it in thy mind; and go
back again whence thou camest, otherwise prepare for war and come." The
Mughal envoys, on their return, were met outside the city by a great mob, who
insulted and reviled them, and even spat upon them, in hopes that the Mughal
envoys might do or say something which they might turn into a pretext for
laying violent hands upon them. Here again was an opportunity for the Waṣīr: hearing of the disturbance, he, at once, despatched a body of his
household slaves to guard the envoys, and conduct them safely out of the
danger; and they, on their return to Hulākū's camp, related all the good
offices of the Waṣīr on the occasion.

The Khalīfah's envoys, on the other hand, were angrily dismissed, with
fresh threats, from the halting-place of Panj-Angūsht; and their report of
what they had seen and heard made the Khalīfah feel anxious and downhearted.
He consulted with his Waṣīr, whose traitorous conduct was, of course, wholly
unknown to him. He advised that the Khalīfah should make use of the
great wealth he possessed, and endeavour, by means of it, to ward off this
calamity, and that liberal presents should be sent. For the Khān, a thousand
bales of the finest fabrics, such as silk, fine linen, cloth, and other valuable
wares and commodities, a thousand bakkīs [hairy, double-humped] camels,
and a thousand fine 'Arab horses, caparisoned befittingly; and, for the Mughal
Shāh-zādahs and great Amīrs, presents suitable to their rank and degrees.

The Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīkh puts a piece upon this, in order to flatter his Mughal
patron no doubt, and says that the Waṣīr—who, according to his account,
was an innocent lamb—advised that the Khalīfah, his master, "should make
apologies" to the barbarian, Hulākū, "insert his name in the Khūṭbah, and
stamp the coin with his name;" that the Khalīfah was willing to do this, but
that Muḥājīd-ud-Dīn, and others, with whom the author of that work associates
all the knaves and vagabonds of Baghdād, "out of animosity to the Waṣīr,
prevented it." That city, however, is not the only place where traitors have
taxed patriots, who would not sacrifice "their countries' interests," with owing
their influence to the support of knaves and villains, which terms were, at the
same time, alone applicable to themselves.
the Mašh-had⁹ of Mūsā-i-Ja'far—God reward him!—and the son of the Lord of the Faithful, the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, had slain some of them, and despoiled them. Out of revenge for this, the Wazīr of the Khalīfah's Court, who was a rāfīsī of bad religion, showed hostility towards the Lord of the Faithful; and, in secret, and clandestinely, he wrote a letter to Hulākū, and entered into collusion with him, and besought the infidels to advance. The Kurd troops, and forces of 'Irāk,¹ by way of dismissing them, he [the Wazīr] sent away from Baghādād, in different directions, and represented on this wise to the Lord of the Faithful, saying:—"A peace has been entered into with the infidels, and we have no need of troops." After Baghādād became denuded of troops, suddenly, the infidel Mughals arrived in its environs.

They had taken forcible possession of a bridge [of boats] from the Malik of Mauṣīl, and fixed it so as to command Baghādād, and then passed the Dijlah [Tigris]. The fortress [fortified town] of Takrit [above Baghādād] was an

At first, the Khalīfah was inclined to follow the Wazīr's advice, and gave him instructions to prepare the presents, but, had they been sent, no good result would have arisen. The Sar Dāwat-Dār [Head or Chief Ink-bearer, or Chief Secretary, as he may be called, and, by some writers, styled the Dāwat-Dār-i-Kū̄ghak, or Under-Ink-bearer, or Secretary], Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was hostile to the Wazīr, Ibn 'Alḵāfī—he knew the Wazīr was a traitor—and represented to the Khalīfah, saying: "Between the Wazīr and the Khwājah, Našīr-ud-Dīn, Tūsī, the chief adviser of Hulākū, the most perfect understanding exists; and he, in consequence of identity of religious belief, always desired the ruin of the house of 'Abbās. Now the Wazīr wishes, for his own purposes, to make it appear to Hulākū that he is, personally, loyally inclined towards him, and so he gives this advice, and also in order to cast the other Amīrs, and the soldiers of the Khilāfat, into trouble and calamity." A number of other officials, who were not well inclined towards Ibn 'Alḵāfī, also supported the Sar Dāwat-Dār in this view; and they influenced the Khalīfah against adopting the Wazīr's advice. The Sar Dāwat-Dār further advised that the disbanded troops should be forthwith recalled and concentrated, and the defences of the city made secure. It was now too late, however; and the weak and unfortunate Khalīfah was still unconvinced of the diabolic wickedness of the Wazīr.

⁹ Mašh-had—a tomb, a place of martyrdom. The city in Khurāsān, which appears in the maps under the meaningless name of Mešhād, is the Mašh-had of another of the Muḥammadan saints.

¹ The Calcutta Printed Text invariably turns the Kurds into ș and here, instead of the Kurd troops and forces of 'Irāk, we have "lakhkar-hāī gird bar [which is redundant] gird-i-'Irāk—the forces which were round about 'Irāk."
excessively strong place; and the holy-warriors of Takrīt issued forth, and set fire to the bridge of boats, but, the following day, the Mughals again repaired the bridge, and martyred the Musalmāns.²

The son of the Lord of the Faithful, Amīr Abū-Bikr, and the Amīr-i-'Alam [Lord of the Standard] of the Khilāfāt, Sulīmān Shāh, the Ayyūbī Turk-mān—who for a period of thirty years had wielded the sword against the Mughal infidels, and had achieved many holy expeditions [against them], as by the canons of the faith enjoined—these two [personages], in concert, on several occasions, had attacked the infidels, and overthrew the Mughal troops.³

On the first occasion, they drove the Mughals from the environs of Baghdad, and pursued them as far as Ṣafahān [Iṣfahān], and despatched many of the infidel army to hell. This Amīr-i-'Alam of the Khilāfāt, Sulīmān Shāh,

---

² Part of the garrison of Takrīt: the fighting men of the city and fortress. This affair is again referred to farther on.

³ This is quite true, notwithstanding the note by the learned Sub-Editors of the Calcutta Printed Text, noticed at page 711. On this subject the Tārīkh-i-Ilīf, Rauṣat-ut-Ṣalāḥ, and others, say that it is quite correct, for, in the beginning of the reign of Ūktān Kān, Jurmāghūn, who was one of the Mughal Shaitāns [Devils], twice attempted to push on to Baghdad, and, on both occasions, was defeated, and his Mughals fled before the 'Arab, Kurd, and Turk, troops of the Khilāfāt. On this account the Mughal soldiery did not evince much alacrity or valour in fighting against the Baghdadīs, and were really afraid of them—in truth, it appears that, on all occasions, when energetically opposed by the Musalmāns, and sedition did not help them, and where their stratagems and treachery were not successful, the Mughals were beaten by anything like equal numbers; but the Musalmāns, unfortunately for them, were a divided people; and, when the people of one religion, or of one country, are divided in their counsels, nothing but evil and ruin can ensue.

The fact that the Mughals did not, at the period in question, very eagerly desire to encounter the Khalīfah’s forces, may be gathered from the reply of the Nū-yin, Tānjū, to Hulākū, when he demanded of him what he had effected since he had succeeded Jurmāghūn in his command, previously narrated. At that time, the Khalīfah used to keep up a large force of efficient cavalry, at, and around his capital, and these the traitor Wazīr managed to disband and disperse to their homes.

It was on account of the success hitherto of the Baghdad troops that Hulākū found it was necessary, for Mughal prestige, or even for their safety, to attempt the conquest of ‘Irāk-i-'Arab, but it is probable he would not have attempted it so soon, had not the traitor entered into secret communication with him, and made known his plans; for, previous to these communications, Hulākū is said to have been in some anxiety respecting the upshot of a campaign in that quarter.
the Aiyūbī, was a Malik of the tribes of the Anboh, and they are a sept of the Turk-māns, and exceedingly spirited and warlike; and the left wing of the Khalifah’s forces was their post. During a period of thirty years, from the time of Jurmāghūn’s [first] entering ‘Irāk, up to this period, he [Sūlīmān Shāh] was wont to engage in conflict like as Rustam-i-Dastān had done in the age of ignorance—the Almighty be gracious to him!—and ‘Alī-i-Murtažā in the [early?] days of the true faith—May God reward him!

Hulākū, having been overthrown the first time, on the second occasion gathered together troops from all Khorāsān and ‘Irāk, both horse and foot, consisting of infidels, renegade Amīrs, and captives; and, at the solicitation of the rāfī‘ī Wazir—God’s curse upon him!—turned his face towards Baghdād. That accursed rāfī‘ī minister, since he entertained in his heart and disposition treason and apostacy, had dispensed with the Kurd forces which were in the Madīnat-ul-Islām, Baghdād; and the Christians likewise, in secret, having taken measures with Hulākū, had written letters to him, and had solicited the

---

4 The best copies of the text have as above, others There is a dašlah of the first name, on the top of a mountain range, a dependence of Dīlam, in Glān. It is probable that the Anboh tribe of Turk-māns were in some way connected with the Usmanī Turks, and then, as now, a stumbling-block in the path of hordes of northern barbarians.

5 In the year 628 H. See page 1115, and note, para. 5.

6 See note 7, page 422.

7 This is a mistake: Hulākū had not been overthrown, because he had never encountered the Baghdād forces, but the other Mughal leaders had, Jurmāghūn in particular, as already noticed. He may mean some portion of Hulākū’s force.

8 Infidels refer to the Mughals, but there were contingents in Hulākū’s army which the Muḥammadan subject states had to furnish—contingents from Kirmān, from Abū-Bikr, the Atā-Bak of Fārs, from Mauṣīl—Badr-ud-Dīn, Lūlū, its ruler, is said by some to have joined his camp at this time—and the troops of other subordinate rulers. Captives refer to those prisoners pressed into the Mughal service.

9 Our author uses the word Tarsū, which is generally applied to the Christians, but it likewise signifies an unbeliever, an infidel, a Gabr, a worshipper of fire, a pagan. None of the authors I have been quoting accuse the Christians of any hand in the treason, and the only time in which they are indirectly mentioned by a few of them is, when the Patriarch of the Nestorians, as one of the Khalifah’s envoys, proceeded to the Mughal camp to seek for peace.
appearance of the infidel hosts. The Malikhs and slaves of the Khalifah, who have been [styled] Sultāns, had become aware of the Wazir's machinations, and once had shown to the Khalifah a letter which the Wazir had written to Hulākū, and they denounced the nature of his designs. The reason was this, that between the Wazir and the Sar Dawāt-dār [Chief Secretary], Sultān Mujāhid-ud-Din, I-bak, there was dissension and enmity, and he [the Sar Dawāt-dār] was cognizant of the hospitality of the Wazir towards the Khalifah's son, Amir Abū-Bikr, on account of his slaying the rāfīzis [previously mentioned]; and this fact he was wont to bring to the blessed hearing of the Khalifah. When the Wazir became aware of the purpose of the Sar Dawāt-dār, he represented to the Khalifah in this way, saying: "The Sar Dawāt-dār desires to remove thee from the Khilāfat and to raise Amir Abū-Bikr to that position;" and, as the Lord of the

1 The word Sultān here does not mean a sovereign prince: it is a mere title given by the Khalifahs to great vassals, and to governors of provinces, and some of the household slaves, under the last Khalifahs. After Burāk, the Hajib, had murdered his master and benefactor, sent his head to the Mughals, and possessed himself of Kirman, as usual with upstarts, he wanted a title, so tendered his allegiance to the Khalifah as well as the Mughal ruler, and solicited the title of Sultān from the former. The reply he received was, that it was not usual, with the Khalifahs, to grant that title, except to a Ba'dshāh, or a vassal who entertained not less than 30,000 efficient cavalry in his own immediate pay. Subsequently, however, Burāk obtained it. Baron de Tott, in his work, which contains much useful information on the Turks, Tātārs, and Mughals, says, with respect to its application in recent times, that the word Sultān is only used as a title of birth appropriated to the Ottoman Princes born on the throne, and to those of the Chingiz Khān's family, in the same way as Mīrzā is applied to the house of Timūr. See note to page 808, where Irādam-chī or Iradam-chī, the equivalent of Mīrzā, is referred to, and the reason for this title is explained.

2 This was a mere ruse on the part of the traitor Wazir.

I wrote the whole of these notes before going through this portion of the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh, because I suspected, from what I knew of other portions of "the great Raschid's" History, and from its being dedicated to Hulākū's great grandson, that the events respecting Baghdād, and the fall of the Khilāfat, would not be faithfully related; and I am not mistaken in my suspicions. There is not a word—not a hint even—about the notorious treason of the Wazir, and he is made to appear a very lamb-like and innocent person, while a loyal servant of the Khalifah, like the Sar Dawāt-Dār, is made out to be a traitor, who, surrounded by a considerable force, consisting of all the knaves, and villains, and scum of Baghdād, whom he is said to have taken into his pay, intended to dethrone the Khalifah, and set up another member of the
Faithful had become aware of the endeavours on both sides, he used not to pay any attention to the words of either party in their efforts against each other.

When therefore the Malikis laid before the Khalifah the letters which the Wazir had written to Hulakü, he replied: "These must be the doings of I-bak, the Dawat-där: besides, the Wazir would not act in this way." The Malikis were disheartened at this reply, until, when Hulakü had arrived within ten kurol [about twenty miles] of Baghdäd, Sulimän Shäh, the Amīr-i-'Alam, and Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, son of Fath-ud-Din, the Kurd, who was the champion of the Där-ul-Khilafat, and who led the right

house of 'Abbās, which plot the innocent Wazir having discovered made known to the Khalifah! The writer then, unintentionally perhaps, let the cat out of the bag. He says the Sar Dawat-Där was sent for, taxed with the crime, and admonished, but he replied: "If any crime shall be proved against thy slave, here is his head, and here is a sword, but it is the Wazir who is a traitor, who has been in constant communication with Hulakü, whose spies are continually passing to and fro, and, in order to lead us away from his own treason and screen himself, has falsely accused me." This statement, in the eyes of Rashid-ud-Din, is a proof of the Sar Dawat-Där's wickedness!

Rashid-ud-Din then goes on to assert that the Sar Dawat-Där still continued to entertain his army of knaves and villains, and the Khalifah, being afraid of him, gave orders to assemble troops to put him down! Then he tells us that the affair was peaceably settled, and that "the Dawat-Där's name was inserted in the Khutbah next after that of the Khalifah, which statement I should not credit if all the "great Raschids" under the sun had said so. He is careful not to mention the Wazir's letters to Hulakü: these proceedings are kept close, as well as the constant communication by other means, and the dispersion, by that traitor, of the Khalifah's forces. Our author shows what the facts were, as to the so-called plot to dethrone the Khalifah, as known in his day, and he is a contemporary writer.

The meaning of the Perso-Arabic word Dawat-Där has been already explained: its literal signification is bearer of the ink-case, which contains ink, pens, and seals, but what a "little Devatvar" may be among "Mongols Proper," who can tell?

The garbled accounts of these events show, that, however learned and talented he was, Rashid-ud-Din's statements, where his Mughal patrons and his own interests are concerned, are not to be trusted; and dishonesty in an author, when apparent, ought to be pointed out. He was a Wazir too, and had plotted against a rival who was put to death, and was himself put to a most cruel death, by Abu Sa'id, the great great grandson of the very Mughal Prince whose perfidy and barbarity he glosses over, and whose success was chiefly, if not wholly, owing to the aid he received from the arch-traitor Ibn 'Alkamī, the Wazir of the unfortunate Khalifah. Rashid-ud-Din was accused of having administered poison to Üljätü Sultan, and it is very probable that he was a Shi'ah as well as the traitor Ibn 'Alkamī, and Naṣīr-ud-Din, the Tüsī, and hence his concealment of facts.
IRRUPTION OF THE INFIDELS INTO ISLĀM.

wing of the Khalīfah's troops, held counsel upon the state of affairs with Sulṭān Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, I-bak, the Sar Dawāt-dār, the Mustaṣṣirī, saying: "Matters have gone too far, a potent enemy is close at hand, and an adverse Wazīr has plotted with the foe. It is necessary that it be communicated to the Lord of the Faithful in order that he may devise some expedient to repel the infidels." Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, I-bak, replied: "I have said everything that was possible on this subject, but it has made no impression upon the blessed ear of the Khalīfah. I can do no more than to request permission for a private audience for you. Do you make a representation to the effect [you have mentioned]." Malik Sulīmān Shāh, the Ayyūbī Turk-mān, and Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, son of Fāṭ-ud-Dīn, the Kurd, represented to the Khalīfah the arrival of the enemy, and solicited that means might be devised for his repulsion. The Khalīfah replied: "The Wazīr hath been spoken to: it behoveth ye to request a reply from him." Both withdrew from the audience-hall of the Khilāfat despairing.

The Nū'-in, Tājū [Tānjū], with 80,000 infidel cavalry, from the side of Ārān and ĀzARBājīān, obtained a bridge [of boats] belonging to the Malik of Mauṣīl [Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Lūlū], and, in order to command Baghādād, fixed it near to Takrit. The holy-warriors of Takrit sallied out of the town and fortress, and entirely consumed the bridge constructed by the Mughals, and despatched great numbers of the infidels to hell, while a few Musalmāns attained martyrdom. The following day, the Mughals repaired the bridge, as has been previously recorded, passed over,

---

8 That is to say he had held the office during the Khilāfat of Al-Mustaṣṣir B'llah.

4 Written Tājū in one of the oldest and best copies of the text, and in others, as previously noticed, Bājū, Bājūn, Nājū, Bākhū, and Mājūn, but as to the correctness of Tānjū there is no doubt whatever. In his account of the Saljūḳs of Rūm our author, or his copyists rather, also style him Tājū. See page 162.

6 How could it be repaired, if totally or entirely burnt?

6 Here the Printed Text, as well as the I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and the Ro. As. Soc. MS. have "καδέκτοκι—‘one another’—instead of κατ’ακραία—‘they passed over or crossed,’” and make, as may be imagined, an unintelligible jumble of the sentence. The Printed Text also has Dijlah for Ḥillah—a river for a town! The town lies on the west bank of the Dijlah, facing the supposed site of ancient Babylon.
and pushed on towards Kūfah, Hillah, and Karkh, and martyred the people. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, son of Fath-ud-Dīn, the Kurd, and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, the Sar-Dawāṭī, with 20,000 horse from Baghdād, crossed the Dijlah [Tigris], and summoned all the men of Karkh and other towns to aid them, and fought a battle with the infidel army. As the forces of Islām contained a great number of infantry, they stood firm, and received the attack of the infidels, fought valiantly, and forced them back. The army of the infidel Mughals sustained an overthrow, and great numbers of them went to hell. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, son of Fath-

7 The Hamilton MS. of the Text abruptly ends here, and contains no more than when and where the MS. was copied. It is minus just twenty-six pages. I notice it again in my Preface.

8 The Pro-Mughal writers materially differ with respect to some of these events, but, with others, their statements tend to illustrate what our author says, and make his accounts stand out more clearly, and therefore I must give a few extracts.

Having dismissed the Khalīfah's envoys, who brought the reply to his insolent message to the Khalīfah, from his camp at Panj-Angūshī, Hulākū's next move was to get possession of the fortresses in the difficult and mountainous tract between Hamadān and the Siwād of Baghdād. He accordingly began to enter into communication with another traitor, on a smaller scale than the Wazīr, whose name was Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Akah, the Ḥākim of the fortress of Dar-i-Tang, which, from its name—the difficult or narrow passage—refers to some fort guarding a pass leading into the plain of Baghdād. He had some cause for discontent against the Khalīfah's government, and at once complied with Hulākū's summons to attend him. Ḥusām-ud-Dīn was received with distinction, and many favours were conferred upon him, including the strongholds of Wūrūdah-Dijj and Marāh-Dijj, and several other forts, which did not belong to the Mughals to give. He was allowed to return to Dar-i-Tang, where he had left his son, the Amīr-i-Sa'd, in command; and, at once, proceeded to send bodies of his retainers to obtain possession of the forts in question, and put garrisons of his own in them. The forts appear to have belonged to the Amīr-i-'Alam, Sulīmān Shāh, because Ḥusām-ud-Dīn is said "to have gathered about him the soldiers of Sulīmān Shāh, and in that way hopes, long nourished, were fulfilled." Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, having now effected his purpose, asked the Ḥākim of Arbīl, Ibn Ṣalāyah, the 'Alawī, to make his peace with Baghdād and the Khalīfah's dīwān. He stated that he had been proof against all Hulākū's offers; and that, if the Khalīfah "would make his heart strong by encouragement, and would detach a body of cavalry to support him, he would raise a force of 100,000 infantry among the Kurds and Turkmāns around, occupy all the routes in front of Hulākū, and prevent a single Mughal from approaching Baghdād." The Wazīr is said to have acquainted the Khalīfah with this offer, but no further notice was taken of it. It would not have suited Ibn 'Alḵāmī's plans, and, therefore, he doubtless was the cause of the offer not being accepted. He, without doubt, communicated it to Hulākū, for the latter, soon after, despatched the Nū-yīn, Kaibūkā, with
ud-Dīn, the Kurd, earnestly urged the pursuit of the Mughals, saying: "It is requisite to pursue the routed
30,000 men, against Ḫusām-ud-Dīn, and had recourse to the usual perfidious measures in order to get him into his power. Kaibūkā sent a message to Ḫusām-ud-Dīn, saying that he was on his way towards Baghdād, that expedition having been determined upon, and that Ḫusām-ud-Dīn's presence was required in order to consult with him. Unaware of the snare laid for him, Ḫusām-ud-Dīn fell into it. After Kaibūkā had got him into his camp, he told him, "in order to show his sincerity," to muster all his family, dependents, and retainers, from the forts and elsewhere, so that they might be enumerated, and the amount of revenue, to be paid for them, fixed. Still did Ḫusām-ud-Dīn comply, unaware that Ḥulākū knew all. His family, dependents, and soldiers, with the exception of such as were in some of the forts with his son, being secured, Ḫusām-ud-Dīn, now that it was too late, found that his secret was known; and he gave up all hope of life. He was further called upon to give orders for the fortresses to be destroyed, as "an undoubted proof of his loyalty," and, being hopeless, he complied, after which, he and the whole of his people were massacred, with the exception of those with his son. Kaibūkā returned triumphant to his master's camp. The Amīr-i-Sa'd, Ḫusām-ud-Dīn's son, refused to give up the forts in his possession, and held them for some time. At last, he evacuated them, and retired to Baghdād. He was received with much favour, and subsequently was killed in defending the city against the Mughals.

This feat accomplished, Ḥulākū, after he had been again in communication with the traitor Wazīr, and with the Khwājah, Naṣr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, at his elbow—I have not space for all the prophecies of the Court Astrologer, Ḫusām-ud-Dīn, of calamities to happen, in case of attacking Baghdād, but the Tūsī was in favour of advancing, and the Mughal augurs and astrologers declared all portents favourable for it—gave orders to make preparations for the campaign, and the Bahādur, Sūnjāk, was directed to cross the Dīlah, to the northward of Baghdād, in order to effect a junction with the Nū-yīn Tānjū, who, as already mentioned, with the Amīrs and troops previously under Jurmānīn's command, was marching, on the right hand, through Āgarbālājān, for the purpose of invading the territories of Shām, Halab, and Rūm, but whose march had been stopped, and he had been directed to turn to his left, move by way of Arblī and Maṣṣūli, where there was a bridge, and effect a junction with Sūnjāk. The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh says Tānjū's yūrat, at that time, was in Rūm, and that he had lately defeated the Saljūq Sulṭān at Koshah-Dāgh, but this is somewhat different from the statements of others already briefly mentioned.

The Shāh-zādahs, Bulghān or Bulghā, Tūtār, and Kūlī, all grandsons of Jūl Kūn, and Būkā Timūr's forces, were also directed to advance on the right, from the district of 'Abbās-ḥād [west of Hamadān: in some Histories, Asad-ābād], and join Sūnjāk. These junctions having been effected, this combined force was to approach Baghdād from the west, through the tract afterwards called the "Garwāh of Suntā, the Nū-yīn." The Nū-yīn, Kaibūkā, Kadsūn, and Ilkān, or Ilḵān, or Ilḵān, as he is also named, were to move towards Baghdād through Khūṣistān, and approached it from the south-east, while Ḥulākū, himself, with the centre, advanced towards the city from the eastward, by way of Kānīn.

The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh states that Ḥulākū reached Dīnār, which is three
infidels, so that, with this victory even, the remainder of them may be brought under the sword;” but Mujahid-ud-Din, the Sar-Dawati, delayed in pursuing;* and, that night, the Musalmans encamped upon that same spot.

days’ journey from Hamadan, on the route to Baghda, with the intention of marching thither, as early as the 9th of Rab-ul-Âakhir—the fourth month—of 655 H., but returned from thence to Hamadan again, and reached it on the 12th of Rajab—the seventh month—of that year; and that, on the 12th of the latter month, he despatched his agents to Baghda with threatening messages for the Khalifah. Why Hulakul should have made this retrograde movement is not said, but, in all probability, it was because the traitorous Wasiri’s schemes, which “the great Raschid,” so glaringly, conceals, were not quite ripe for execution, and in order to put the loyal servants of the Khalifah off their guard.

Early in Muhamram—the 11th, according to some accounts—656 H., but Zil-Hijjah, the preceding month, and twelfth month of the preceding year—655 H., appears to be the most correct—within the period prescribed, Tanji, by way of Dajayl [lit. ‘branch’] or Dajaylah [the district of Dajayl, at present, lies on either side of the old bed of the Dijlah above Baghda. Dajayl is also the name of the Little Tigris], crossed the Dijlah, and reached the Nahr-i-Isa [the canal or rivulet of Jesus]. The masalik wa masalik states that “Karkh [which is a suburb of Baghda] is very well inhabited, and considerable traffic is there carried on. . . . On the western side is a canal or stream called Nahr-i-Isa, a branch of the Furat, which, passing by Baghda, falls into the Dijlah.”

When the Khalifah became aware of this, he nominated Fath-ud-Din, son of Alankul, with Mujahid-ud-Din, I-bak, the Sar Dawat-Dar, the Mustaniri, and Karan Sanjar, who were the leaders of the Khalifah’s troops [the Dawat-Dar was a civilian, not a soldier—the names given by our author, who was the contemporary of these persons, are far more trustworthy], with 20,000 horse, which the Fanakati magnifies into 30,000 men, fought a battle with Sinjak, and Bakh Tumur’s forces within the limits of Anbar, before the Kusik [castle] of Munsur, above Mardukah, on the east bank of the Furat, within nine farsaks of Baghda. Alif says the Mughals in the first charge turned their backs and fled before the Khalifah’s troops. The Fanakati, to flatter the Mughal pride, says they “fell back” as far as Shiriya, in the district of Dajayl, when they were joined by Tanji and his troops, and then compelled the Baghda troops to fall back.

* The Pro-Mughal writers make out quite the contrary, but I prefer our author’s version. Their statements are to the following effect:—

Fath-ud-Din [This is incorrect: Fath-ud-Din is the father’s name: ‘Izz-ud-Din is the son’s, as our author mentions], Alankul, who was a man of experience, on whose head the dust of the battle-field had fallen, when he saw that the Mughals, without having had many men killed, turned their backs and fled, suspected some stratagem on their part, and therefore forbade the Baghdadis to go in pursuit, but Mujahid-ud-Din, I-bak, the Sar Dawat-Dar [poor fellow! the Pro-Mughal writers put all faults upon him], who, besides being without any experience in such matters, was in the revenue department of the state, thinking this proceeding on the part of ‘Izz-ud-Din, son of] Fath-ud-Din arose from fear of the Mughals, said to him: “Dost thou consider that
In the vicinity of that place there was a stream, which they [the inhabitants] call the Nahr-i-Sher [the Lion's Canal]. It is cut from the river Furât [Euphrates], and the land through which it flows is somewhat elevated, while the place in which was the Musalmān encampment was low ground. During that night, the accused rāfizī Wazīr despatched a body [of men], and turned the water of that
debts of gratitude towards the Amir-ul-Mūminīn are to be paid in this way, that thou shouldst hold back thy hand when the enemies of the Khalīfah have been beaten and overthrown? It is advisable, before the infidels shall have received assistance, and they regain strength, to pursue them, and give tranquillity to the mind of the Amir-ul-Mūminīn respecting them.” Hearing this foolish speech, [Iizz-ud-Dīn, son of] Fatḥ-ud-Dīn gave orders to follow in pursuit of the Mughals. When the Baghdādīs had passed beyond the margin of the suburbs [the scene of the action was some distance from the suburbs] into the open country, the Mughals faced about, and the engagement was renewed, and continued until the ‘Abbāsī mantle of darkness [the ‘Abbāsī colour was black] covered the opponents, when the battle ceased, and both sides bivouacked for the night, opposite each other. During that night the Mughals, by cutting a dyke, let in the water of the river Furât, so that the whole of the plain where the Musalmāns were encamped became flooded with water, and the greater number of them were drowned in their sleep. They were attacked in overwhelming numbers in the morning, and [Iizz-ud-Dīn, son of] Fatḥ-ud-Dīn was killed in the engagement, and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn returned to Baghdād with three persons. The Fanākātī says the Mughals cut the dyke of a considerable river—قندف—in rear of the Khalīfah’s troops, and the whole plain was laid under water. Our author’s statement here is preferable, no doubt. The Pro-Mughal writers take away the credit of this act from their ally, the traitor, but it is evident that some one, who knew the locality, and who was well aware how easily the country might be laid under water, must have had the principal hand in the matter: the Mughals probably helped.

The next morning, which was the ‘Aghārā—the 10th of Mubarram, 656 H.—according to the Fanākātī—but Alī mentions these events as taking place a month earlier—the Mughals threw themselves upon the Baghdādīs—the few which survived—and overthrew them. [Izz-ud-Dīn, son of] Fatḥ-ud-Dīn, son of Alankū, and Karā Sunkār, and 12,000 men, besides those drowned and smothered in the mud, perished on that occasion; and the Sar Dawāt-Dār, Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, ʿI-bak, with only a few persons, reached Baghdād in safety.

1 This word may be shīr—the Canal of Milk—according to the vowels used with it; but I have no means of pronouncing which of the two names is right, but the above is the more probable. The Calcutta Printed Text has ʃahr—‘city,’ ‘of lion’ or ‘milk’ twice, because the word ʃahr—canal, rivulet, etc.—is something like ʃahr in MS., and yet ‘ʃakak’ and ‘Furât’ is used with it! The account of the canals in the neighbourhood of Baghdād by Captain Felix Jones, I.N., in the “Bombay Geographical Transactions,” may contain some information on this subject, but, in ancient times, the Dijlāh or Tigris, north of, or above, Baghdād, flowed farther west than at present.
canal upon the encampment of the Musalmāns; and the whole was flooded with water, and their arms and armour were all spoiled, and they became quite powerless. The next morning, at dawn, the army of the infidels returned, and another battle ensued; but the Musalmāns, from the extreme misery and affliction of the preceding night, were

Here too, the Printed Calcutta Text contains a great blunder, and has zāḥmat-i-sipāḥ—affliction, trouble, etc., of the soldiers—instead of zāḥmat-i-shabānah, as above.

Respecting the investment, and final operations against Baghdād, and the downfall of the Khilāfat, there are many conflicting accounts, especially in the matter of detail, and according as the writer was a Sunnī, a Shī‘ah, or an Official under the Mughal sovereigns or otherwise; but all materially differ from our author, who wrote at the very time the events happened, and whose valuable account they either never saw, or would not consult or quote. The subject is an important one in the history of Islām, and, therefore, I shall give some extracts from the various Histories I have mentioned at the beginning of this Section, for the information of those who may not have access to all the works referred to. I also do so because there are some accounts, lately given to the public, extracted from foreign histories of the “Mongols,” which are, without doubt, partially, and after a manner, compiled from some of the Histories I have quoted, but which, apparently, to judge from the very fantastic manner in which the events, the names of persons, and places, have been metamorphosed, have not been properly understood by the foreign translators, owing, possibly, to incorrect or defective MSS., or have suffered by translation at second hand.

Subsequent to the defeat of the Khalfah’s troops, after the inundation of their camp, and the rendering of most of their weapons useless, in the month of Zī-Hijjah, 655 H. [the Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārikh says the 11th of Muḥarram, 656 H., a month too late], the audience tent of Hulākū—equivalent to the “Head-Quarter Camp” in military parlance—was pitched opposite Baghdād, on the east side. The appearance of the Mughals filled the city with consternation, and sleep forsook the eyelids of the inhabitants, in their anxiety respecting the issue, and the prospect of their deliverance. The Khalfah directed that the gates should be closed, and the ramparts and bastions guarded and secured. The Amīrs and confidential officers of the Khalfah, such as the Amīr-i-‘Alam, Sulīmān Shāh, and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, the Sar Dawāt-Dār, and the household slaves, and, in fact, the men of the city, generally, came forth on the walls and towers prepared for action. Next day [the Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārikh, contrary to all others, keeps Hulākū inactive from 11th to 22nd of Muḥarram, which is not correct], early in the morning, the standard of Hulākū was raised; and, during the whole of that day to evening, a fire of arrows, flasks of combustibles, stones from catapults and slings, and a storm from other missiles, continued, during which a great number were killed and wounded on either side. Each party maintained its position during the night, and began the fight the following morning. In this manner the fighting went on with little intermission for a space of fifty days [the Fanākatī, who says twelve days, only begins the operations in the middle of the following month], when a number of the Sayyids [Shī‘ahs] of Hīllah, such as Majd-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Ḥasan, son of Tā-ūs, Sadīd-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf, son of Muṭahhar, and others, despatched a spokesman of their own people, with a letter to Hulākū, the purport of which
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defeated; and the Malikos Islām, broken and discomfited, retired across the Dijlah, and took up their position

was, that it had become known to them, from the sayings of their forefathers, more particularly from the Amīr-ul-Mūminīn, and Imām-ul-Murtakīn, 'Ali, son of Abī-Ṭālib—on whom be peace!—that, during this year [656 H.], Hulākū would become predominant over 'Irāk-i-'Arab; and that the Hākim of that territory, which was to say, the 'Abbāsī Khalīfah, would fall into his hands; that they tendered their fealty and submission, would carry out such commands as he might be pleased to issue, and would not place foot out of the pale of obedience to him.

The effect of such sedition, at such a crisis, may be imagined. Rather than not destroy their co-religionists of the rival sect, they would sacrifice anything. What did they care for the massacre of hundreds of thousands of innocent people by the Mughal barbarians, or the slavery of their country? was not Hulākū "a divine figure from the north"? and was not his sole object the "amelioration" of the condition of the Musalām people? Hulākū was overjoyed. He treated the bearer of the letter and his companions with great honour; and sent back along with them a person of his own retinue, named Tūkīlah, as Shāhnaḥ of Ḥillah, along with the Amīr Yahyā, the Nakhtjūāni. By this means the Sayyids of Ḥillah escaped all the misery and affliction of this troublesome time, and "remained safe," to quote the words of one writer, "under the protection of the Most High."

A body of 100 Mughal infidels was sent to Najaf to act as a guard to the tomb of the Khalīfah 'Ali, by way of flattering the Shi'ahs.

According to other accounts, after the Nū-yīn, Tānjū, and the Bahādur, Sūnjāk, became victorious over the forces of Baghdād, after flooding their camp, they, having crossed the Dijlah, advanced towards the city, and took up a position on the river banks, on its western side, about the middle of the month of Muḥarram, 656 H.—and the date of the letter, given in note 1, page 1261, proves its correctness—but the Raṣūl-us-Ṣaḥīh and Alī have the month of Zī-Ḥijjah, 655 H., and the latter, by way of making it more certain, adds, "which is 645 of the Rīḥāt." In the direction of Naḥāṣīlah and Sar-ṣar, Kaibūkā, and the other leaders along with him, also pushed forward towards the devoted city. Hulākū, leaving such of the families—for the Mughals took their families with them—and heavy materials, as he had brought with him, at Khānqāh [Lat. 34° 21', Long. 45° 22'], now advanced by quick marches, and took up a position on the east side, where, on the 15th of Muḥarram—but other accounts, already referred to, say in Zī-Ḥijjah—the last month of 655 H.—his audience tent was set up; and, like ants or locusts, the Mughal forces [including Musalām contingents from Kirmān, Fārs, and the other parts of the Khwārazmī empire which had fallen under the Mughal yoke, who were, consequently, forced to aid against the head of their faith and co-religionists] gathered round the city. On the left, or south side of the city, opposite the Burj-i-'Ajami—or 'Ajami bastion, the Nī-yīn, Kūkā Ilkān, the Amīrs, Tūṭār and Kūlī, took up their position facing the Kul-wāżī gateway, while Būghā, Arktū, and Shīrāmūn, occupied the open space before the gateway of the Sūk-i-Saltān—the Saltān's Market-place. Būkā Tinūr was on the side of the Kāl'āh, near the place called the Dolāb-i-Bākul, while Tānjū and Sūnjāk held a position on the west side, at the place where the 'Uzūf hospital was situated.

A simultaneous attack was commenced on Wednesday, the 23rd of Muḥar-
and encamped at Baghdād, at the place where the great Sanjarī masjid and ḥāsr [castle] are situated. On the army of the accursed infidels reaching that place, Sulīmān Shāh, the Aiyūbi Turk-mān, Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, the Kurd, ram, 656 H. [the Fanākatī says, Tuesday, the 22nd, but those dates were Wednesday and Thursday, unless counted as terminating at noon], when the sun was in the constellation of Aries. The fighting went on for a considerable time, until most of the walls and ramparts were destroyed by the discharges of stones from the catapults—a "bombardment" by means of catapults, as it is termed in the "Mongols Proper," is certainly something new in the art of war—and great anxiety arose in the mind of the Khalīfah, seeing that he had not the power sufficient to resist the invaders.

The Fanākatī also says, but his statement is not correct—he has greatly "compressed" events here—that the fighting continued for twelve days, during which the Mughals were occupied in slaughtering and pillaging; but this could only possibly refer to the suburbs, for the Mughals were not yet in possession of the place. That writer also says, that, during this period, Sulīmān Shāh, the Kā'id of the Khalīfah's troops, and his dependents and followers, were slain, and that the Mughals also slew the Amir-i-Hāj—the Superintendent and Conductor of the Pilgrims—the eldest son of the Sar Dawāt-Dār, and that their heads were sent to Mauṣil, thus showing that he has anticipated events.

To return to the account in Alfī and others. Finding himself powerless, the Khalīfah is said to have sent out the Wazīr, Ibn 'Alḵāmī—and the Jāšīk, or Patriarch of the Christians [Nestorians], according to the Jāmī'-ut-Tawāリkh—with a message to Hulāḵū saying, that he hoped he would keep his former promise. Hulāḵū, in reply, said: "I made that agreement at Hamadān. Now that I have reached Baghdād, and the sea of discord, sedition, and tumult, has become lashed into waves, how can I possibly content myself with one Wazīr? The recompense required is this, that the Khalīfah should likewise send to me Sulīmān Shāh, and both the Dawāt-Dār-i-Kūchak and Buzurg—the Chief and Under Secretary, and Keeper of the Seals."

The Khalīfah's envoys returned to the city with this reply; and, the next day, a deputation of illustrious and learned men [according to Rashīd-ud-Dīn, the traitor Wazīr was included] proceeded to Hulāḵū's camp to endeavour to obtain favourable terms of peace; but he sent them away, and the flames of war again blazed up, and continued for another six days. The fighting was obstinate, and great numbers, on both sides, were killed. On the seventh day, Hulāḵū, consequent on the arrival in his camp of the deputation above referred to, and the stubborn defence, caused seven farmāns to be written out, which were fastened to as many arrows, and discharged into as many quarters of Baghdād, the purport of which farmāns was: "Sayyids, Kāṣīs, 'Ulamā, Officials, Merchants, and persons who do not fight against us, will be safe and secure from our rage and vengeance."

Consequent on the receipt of these farmāns, a great number of scurvy patriots among the Baghdādīs deserted their posts, and gave up fighting; and, by this means, the Mughals were enabled to approach the Burj-i-'Ajāmī, and drive out of that important post the weak number now left to defend the walls on that side.

---

8 The masjid and castle erected by Sulṭān Sanjar, the Saljūk.
and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, the Sar-Dawātī, presented themselves in the Khalifah's presence, and represented, saying: "The enemy has reached the city gate, and we have but a few horsemen along with us in Baghādād, while the number of the infidels is 200,000 or more. It will be well that the Lord of the Faithful should embark on board a vessel, and give directions for placing his treasures, and his family, on ship-board; and we will likewise attend the Lord of the Faithful in the vessel, and push down the Dīlah as far as the limits of Baṣrah; and, in those islands, we will take up our abode until such time as deliverance cometh from Almighty God, and the infidels be vanquished."  

The Khalifah mentioned this matter to the Wazīr; and that accursed minister represented to the Lord of the Faithful, saying: "I have entered into a peace with the Mughals, and there is no necessity for leaving [Baghādād]. They [the Mughals] are going to present themselves before the Lord of the Faithful. If my word is not believed, it is necessary that the Amīr, Abū-Bikr [the Khalifah's son], should be sent out in order that he may understand the inclination of Hulāū." This counsel met with the approval of the Khalifah, and he sent out his son. The accursed Wazīr secretly despatched a confidant of his own to Hulāū, saying: "Treat the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, with great consideration, and pay him much reverence and respect, and send out and receive him, in order

4 The islands in the deltas, near the mouth of the combined rivers which fall into the Persian Gulf, are referred to here.

This is what the Pro-Mughal writers turn into the Dawāt-Dār's selfishly deserting his benefactor in his straits. They say, that, when the Dawāt-Dār saw that there was no other way of escape than instant flight, he, without the knowledge of the Khalifah, embarked with his dependents—some even go so far as to say that 10,000 men were with him—and dropped down the river. When the boats arrived opposite the Karyah-ul-'Ukāb [village of the Eagle], called by some the Karyah-ul-Ghaffār, a body of the Ikhān's [Hulākū's] troops, under Būkā Timūr, which had been detached to guard the road from Baṣrah, and the Madāyin, and prevent the passage of vessels, discovered them. With discharges of stones from catapults, and flasks of burning naphtha, the Mughals compelled him to turn back, after they had succeeded in capturing three boats, all on board of which they slew, and plundered the property in them; and the Sar Dawāt-Dār, after a thousand stratagems, succeeded in reaching Baghādād again. The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārikh asserts that this act caused the Khalifah to determine to submit, s he could not trust his own Amīrs!
that the Khalifah may have reliance, and thy object will be gained." 

At this time, the Khalifah, who had become resigned to loss of country and possessions, despatched Faḥr-ud-Dīn, the Dāmghānī, and Ibn Darwesh, with a few rarities, as offerings to Hulākū, saying: "We will acknowledge dependency, and submit," but he paid no attention to the message; and they returned repulsed and disappointed.

Next day, the 27th of Muharram, the Khalifah's son, Abū-Bikr-i-Abūl-Faṣl—called Abū-l-Faṣārī by some—with a body of grandees, the chief men of the Khalifah's Court, proceeded to Hulākū's camp, bearing presents of great value, by way of pesah-kaṣh or tribute, but they also had to return without being received; and the traitor Wazīr returned with them to the city. The same day [the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh says, the first day of Safr, which was on a Thursday] Hulākū despatched another traitor, the Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsī, in company with one of the Mughal officers, to communicate with the Wazīr, urging that the latter, along with Ibn Jawzī and Ibn Darwesh, should, by all possible means, pacify the minds of Sulṭān Shāh, and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, the Sar Dāwāt-Dār, because they were the cause of the Khalifah's resistance. The Amir, Sulṭān Shāh, was, indeed, and had been, the bulwark of the faith of Islām against the infidel Mughals, which they did not lose sight of. The Rauṣat-ud-Ṣafa says, that, to complete the usual system of Mughal perfidy, "Hulākū even sent to them a deed of immunity and a safe conduct; and, volentes volventes, they were induced to proceed to the Mughal camp." The author of the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh also details this shameful act of Mughal treachery without the least remark, as though it were a mere every-day affair, and a very pious action.

Hulākū, however, wanted more victims—the cup of treachery on the part of the barbarian monster was not quite full—so he despatched Sulṭān Shāh and the Sar Dāwāt-Dār, into the city again, in order that they might bring out, along with them, their families, kinsmen, dependents, and retainers, pretending that he was going to despatch them, along with some of his own forces, against Miṣr and Shāhī. This further duplicity appears to have thrown them off their guard, and made them trust to the word of a Mughal prince. They returned, and brought out their people; and a great number of the soldiery of Baghdād and other persons, in hopes of saving themselves, came out along with them to Hulākū's camp. On their arrival there, they were all distributed among the different bands of Sadhaks and Dahhas; and, shortly after their return thither, an arrow from the city—for hostilities do not seem to have been suspended during these negotiations—struck a Hindū [probably a native of Hind, but not necessarily, although possibly, a worshipper of idols, is here meant] Bitikčī, in the eye, and destroyed it. [Von Hammer, by some error, turns this upside down, and says that an Indian struck out the eye of one of the principal emirs]. As this man was one of Hulākū's chief officials, he was so enraged that he ordered his troops to the assault, and to strain every nerve to capture the city. He then directed the massacre of the Sar Dāwāt-Dār, and his family, connexions, and kinsmen, and all the fugitives who had accompanied him and Sulṭān Shāh from the city, while the Amir-i-‘Alam, Sulṭān Shāh, the Turk-mān, who had so often overthrown the Mughals, was brought fettered, together with his family, kinsmen, and personal dependents, to the foot of the barbarian's throne. He demanded of the Musalmān warrior: "Thou art an astrologer [doubtless the Tūsī Khwājah,
IRRUPTION OF THE INFIDELS INTO ISLĀM.

On the Amir, Abū- Ḍikr's, coming forth [from Baghdād], and reaching the camp of Hulāū, a throng of people, infidels and Musalmāns, went forth to receive him, and observed the usages of service. When he reached Hulāū's place of audience, the latter advanced about four paces to receive him, treated him with due ceremonial, conducted him to, and seated him in, his own place, and himself reclined on the knees of reverence in his presence, and said: "I am come to present myself [before the Khalīfah], and will pay homage [to him]. My uncle, Barkā, has become a Musalmān at the hands of the Shaikh, Saif-ud-Dīn, the Bākhurzi, and I was, then and there, going to become a Musalmān likewise, but I inquired among my Amirs: 'Who is the greatest among the Musalmāns?' and they directed me to the Court of the Khalīfah, in order that, at the hand of the Lord of the Faithful, I might become a Musalmān."

also an astrologer, had furnished this information], and art acquainted with the propitious and unpropitious aspects of the heavenly bodies, the degrees and minutes, the rising and setting of the stars, and the like, how was it that thou didst not perceive thine own inauspicious day, and wherefore not warn thy benefactor, so that he might have acted accordingly, and not have become so shattered and broken?" The unfortunate Sulīmān Shāh replied: "Alas! it was the misfortune of the Lord of the Faithful that he gave not ear to the words of his faithful servants, but listened to those of a traitor." In short, after some taunting on the part of the Mughal, and words of proud defiance on the part of Sulīmān Shāh, he and his family, kinsmen, and personal dependents, were also massacred, to the number of seven hundred persons. These events are said to have happened on Friday, the 2nd of Safar.

After the murder of the Amir-i-ʿAlam, Sulīmān Shāh, and the Sar Dawāt- Dār, Mujāhid-ud-Dīn [some say the Dawāt- Dār-i-Kūchak, and the Sharāb-Dār, or Purveyor of Drinkables, were also massacred on this occasion], their heads were sent, by Hulāū's command, to Mauiṣil, to Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Abū- I- Faṣāʿīl-i-Lūlū—the "diplomatic and wily old gentleman" of the "Mongols Proper"—by the hands of the latter's son, Malik Ṣāliḥ, who was then in the Mughal camp, because great love and friendship existed between Sulīmān Shāh and his father. The Mauiṣil ruler was directed to have the heads suspended from the gates of Mauiṣil. Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Lūlū, was greatly afflicted, and wept involuntarily, but, as he had submitted to the Mughal yoke, he was obliged to comply to save himself from destruction.

The printed text leaves out the word ً، and so turns out the whole of Hulāū's host.

7 This is not unlikely, as part of the treachery at which the Mughals were such adepts, in order to throw dust into the eyes of the Khalīfah's son, and so make sure of trapping his father. Most of the Pro-Mughal historians, and particularly Raṣīḥ-ud-Dīn, only seem anxious to conceal how much the success of Hulāū and his hordes was owing to the traitor Wāzīr.
Having introduced these sweet expressions into the discourse, the Amir, Abû-Bikr, placed credence on these deceitful, poisoned, words; and returned from thence, well pleased, to the presence of the Lord of the Faithful, and related all that he had seen and heard. The cursed Wazîr now said: “It is advisable that the Lord of the Faithful, himself, should move out, in great state and solemnity, surrounded by the cavalcade of the Khilâfât, in order that Hulâû may be able to observe the ceremony of receiving him, and perform the rites of homage.” Notwithstanding the Maliks of Islâm—God reward them!—exhorted the Khalîfah, saying: “It is not well to show such confidence;” still, as the decree of destiny, and divine mandate, had come down, the dissuasions and exhortations of those Musalmân holy-warriors were of no avail, and, in the end, fate was using the whip of wrath behind the horse of the Khilâfât, until the Lord of the Faithful went forth, on horseback, accompanied by twelve hundred distinguished and eminent persons of the city, consisting of Maliks, Ṣadrs, 'Ulamâ, Grandees, Merchants, and the officials of the State. When they reached the camp of Hulâû, the accursed Mughal, the Khalîfah and the train with him were stopped, the whole [of the latter] were separated from each other; and they [the Mughals] seized the Lord of the Faithful. He [Hulâû] commanded him, so that, in his own handwriting, the Khalîfah was compelled to issue his commands to the rest of the eminent men who had remained behind at Baghhdâd, in such wise, that they came out from the city [to the Mughal camp], until the whole were seized; and the Mughals martyred the whole of them.¹

¹ The investment having now continued for nearly two months, the difficulties of the Khalîfah increased; and the simple-minded Musalmân Pontiff again turned for counsel to the traitor within his own house, and snake within his own bosom, who was bringing destruction upon himself, his race, and the Muḥammadan people. He inquired of the traitor Wazîr what had best be done to escape from this calamity. He replied that the Mughal troops and Tâttär soldiers were already very strong in point of numbers, and that reinforcements were continually arriving, while the weakness of the servants of the Khilâfât daily became greater, and that there were not forces enough in Baghhdâd to defend it and repulse the Mughals, and that therefore it was advisable “that the Khalîfah should abandon hostility and resistance, and proceed to the presence of Hulâû; open his hoards of treasure and valuables,
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Here, respecting the putting to death of the Amir, Abū-\text{Bikr}, the son of the Khalīfah, there are several statements;

and, by means of them, guard his honour and good name from hurt and injury, since the object of Hulākū, in coming to Baghūdād, was to obtain wealth.”

Further, the arch-traitor stated that, by some means or other, after the Khalīfah should have entered into “terms of concord and amity, this dissen-
sion might be changed into friendliness; in fact, into connexion and relation-
ship, by a pearl out of the family of the Chingiz Khān being strung on the
string of matrimony with the Khalīfah’s eldest son, and another pearl from
the Khalīfah’s family being united to the son of Hulākū, which connexion
would be, as it was in the time of the Saljūks, of immense advantage to the
state and to religion, a source of dignity, strength, and grandeur [!], and, at
the same time, would save very many people from slaughter and pillage.”

The Mujāmi’-ul-Khiyār states that it was the pretence that he had arranged
all this with Hulākū, and only required the Khalīfah’s presence to confirm the
alliance, that induced the unfortunate Musta’ṣim B’illah to trust himself in the
barbarian camp.

When the Khalīfah, who had now become so lost in amazement, and so
stupefied by his misfortunes, as to be incapable of distinguishing villainy from
goodness, and could not calmly consider what these words contained, perceived
that all hope was gone, he resolved on going out to the Mughal camp, con-
trary to the prayers and exhortations of his faithful subjects; and accordingly,
on Sunday, the 4th of Šafar, 656 H.—the 9th of February, 1258 A.D.—
accompanied by three sons [but some say, two, and some, four—Abū-Bikr-i-
Manāzil, called, by some, Abū-i-‘Ablās-i-Aḥmad], and a body of about 3000
persons, consisting of Sayyids, Ecclesiastics, Kāfīs, Philosophers, Doctors of
the Law, Amīrs, and other Grandees and Officials, in short, all the most dis-
tinguished personages of the centre of Islām, he moved out of the city. On
reaching the canvas curtain before the entrance of the audience tent of the
barbarian, Hulākū, the Khalīfah, with his sons, and four or five attendants,
were permitted to pass in, but the rest were forbidden, and were distributed
among the soldiery.

“When the sight of the Mughal, Hulākū,” writes one of my authorities,
“fell upon the Khalīfah, Al-Musta’ṣim B’illah, as is the custom with the
perfidious, he did not look crossly upon him, but made the usual [complimen-
tary] inquiries with warmth, in such wise that the Khalīfah and his sons were
hopeful of good treatment therefrom. After these inquiries, Hulākū turned
his face towards the Khalīfah, and said: ‘Send a person into the city so that
the men may throw down their arms, in order that we may have them
numbered.’ The Khalīfah, accordingly, despatched a person, in order that a
proclamation might be made, in his name, to the effect that whoever wished to
save his life should lay down his arms, and set out for the camp of the Il-
Khān, Hulākū.” Consequent on this having been done—and, doubtless, at
the suggestion of the traitor Wazīr—the greater number of the people laid
down their arms, and set out for the Mughal camp; and all who proceeded
thither fell under the ruthless swords of these infidels.

Such infatuation as marked these last events is scarcely conceivable, after so
many proofs of Mughal treachery, but the Musalmān people were now without
a head.
but God knows the truth. One statement is this, that they martyred him, and the Amir-i-' Alam, Suliman Shâh,

Hulâkû having got the Khalifah into his power, sent him to Kâribûkâ’s camp, at the Kul-wâzi gate, where a tent was pitched for him, and he was placed in charge of a guard; and the Mughal leader gave orders, at dawn the following day, to make a general massacre of the people of Baghâd. The broad and deep ditch was speedily filled up, part of the walls thrown down, there being no opposition whatever, and the Mughals, soon after, began to pour into the city; and the work of slaughter, violation, pillage, and destruction, began. This was ruthlessly carried out; and the Haram-Sârâe—the private dwelling—of the Khalifahs, which, for five hundred years, had been the place of prostration of the Musalmân peoples, was so utterly demolished that no one would have imagined that a habitation had ever existed there. The other buildings of Baghâd—the masjids, mausolea of Musalmân saints and Khalifahs, the palaces, hospitals, colleges, and libraries—were all given to the flames; and places adjacent, constituting a vast extent of suburbs, were completely sacked and devastated.

Guzidâh states that, during the massacre, a Mughal named Miânjû, in one small street of the city, found upwards of forty motherless sucking-babes; and, thinking to himself, that without mothers’ milk they would perish, put them to death to deliver them from their suffering!

I pass over the accounts given by some Oriental writers respecting the hoards of treasure, to get at which the rack was freely used, but I cannot pass over, without comment, the statement that “Mostassim,” who had given up all hope of life, and who did not know at what hour the order for his murder might be given, “beggred to be allowed to keep 700 wives [Musalmáns can only have four at one time, but concubines are unlimited] upon whom neither sun nor moon had shone, and was allowed to select 100,” as we are told in the “Mongols Proper.” What could he do with 100 wives, when he and his sons were kept in a tent under a Mughal guard, and allowed but four or five attendants for himself and them? Was he to leave his 100 wives for the sun and moon to shine upon in the camp among the brutal Mughals?

This is a specimen how History may be travestied, and of “taking up the mattock” to “complete the work which the pioneer can only begin.” This little episode is taken from some foreign translation of “the great Raschid’s” Jâmi‘ut-Tawârikh, but the meaning of Raschid-ud-Dîn was either not caught by the translator, or the author of the “Mongols Proper” misunderstood it. The words of Raschid-ud-Dîn, after his mentioning that directions were given to number the Khalifah’s haram—the exact meaning of which word should be duly weighed—it is not solely the place wherein wives and concubines dwell, but the home of mothers, grandmothers, aunts, daughters, and female relatives as well, including sons’ families, and sometimes daughters’—and that it was found to contain 700 females and concubines, and 1200 domestics, are: “When the Khalifah [who had been conducted to his own palace on the 9th of Safar, according to Raschid-ud-Dîn] found what was going on, he implored saying, ‘The inmates of the haram, on whom neither sun nor moon has shone, spare unto me’ [مغمر:—i.e. pardon or spare them for my sake].” Hulâkû said: “Out of the 700, choose 100, and give up the rest.” The unfortunate Khalifah chose 100 females, consisting of his relatives and kinswomen [including his mother, aunts, sisters, wives, and female children,
the Aiyūbi, Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, son of Fath-ud-Dīn, the Kurd, and Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, I-bak, the Sar Dawātī, all four of them; and some [persons] narrate, that, when the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, returned to the presence of his father on coming back from the camp of Hulāū, at the time the Lord of the Faithful was setting out [to proceed thither], the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, did not accompany him, and that he [subsequently] left Baghdād, and proceeded into Shām [Syria] by way of the desert. Others again state, that he was martyred, after he had, in the presence of Hulāū, uttered harsh and taunting words; and the words are [said to have been] these: The Amīr, Abū-Bikr, said: “It was supposed by us that, as thou hast high birth, thou mightest be an honourable man, and that thou wouldst be a high-minded monarch; and we placed reliance on thy word. Now it is obvious that thou art neither a monarch nor a man, since thou hast acted thus perfidiously, for kings commit not perfidy.” Hulāū commanded so that they martyred him. On the other hand, some state, that the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, commanded one of the great Sayyids that they should take him towards Azarbājān, and said that he would remain there some time, until, in freedom and in honour, after Baghdād became tranquil, command would be issued [as to what it would be advisable to do]. When that venerable Sayyid had taken the Amīr, Abū-Bikr, some stages on the way towards Azarbājān, a number of renegades represented to Hulāū, saying: “Thou hast made a

and the females of the families of his sons], who were allowed to issue forth with him when he was removed, and were thus to be saved from slavery to those barbarians; but what subsequently happened to them, with one or two exceptions, has not transpired. The fate of the remaining 600 may be easily conceived—much the same as, but certainly not worse than, helpless Turkish women have suffered, and are still suffering, in these days of “crusaders,” “ameliators,” Bulgarians and Cossacks.

9 The Calcutta Printed Text, and the MSS., from which it has been printed, kill the father, Fath-ul-Dīn, who, in the former, is styled “Gird”—كر—
again, while the name of his son, who was killed, is left out altogether. The father probably had been dead half a century, after the manner of the father of Muḥammad, the ’Arab conqueror of Sind, namely, Kasim, whom some translators and compilers make the conqueror instead of the son, and without being conscious of the blunder, in the same manner that Bakht-yār-ud-Dīn, the Khalji Turk, has had the credit of being the conqueror of Lakhānawatf, instead of his son, Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad. See note 1, page 548.

1 Respecting the future affairs of the Khilāfat, he meant.
mistake. If the Amir, Abū-Bikr, should reach Azarbā́jān in safety, all the forces of Rūm, Shām, and Maghrib, will flock round him; and, undoubtedly, he will take his revenge.” Hulāū [on this] despatched people of his own in pursuit of the Amir, Abū-Bikr; and they brought him back, and Hulāū martyred him; but God knows the truth. The Almighty reward him [Abū-Bikr] and the whole of his family! Amin.

ACCOUNT OF THE MARTYRDOM OF THE LORD OF THE FAITHFUL, AL-MUSTA’ŠIM B’ILLAH—THE ALMIGHTY REWARD HIM!

For some time, the infidel Mughals desired to detain the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Musta’šim B’illah. There were a great number of Musalmā́ns among the Mughal forces, and they declared: “If Hulāū should pour out the blood of this Khalifah⁴ on the ground, both he, and the Mughal army will be swallowed up in an earthquake; and therefore it behoveth not to slay him.” The object of these Musalmā́ns was this, that the Lord of the Faithful should remain alive; for, among all, hesitation arose about putting the Khalifah to death. The Malik of Mauṣil, Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Lūlū—God’s curse upon him!—and other infidels,³ represented to Hulāū, saying: “If the Khalifah continues alive, the whole of the Musalmā́ns which are among the troops, and other [Musalmā́n] peoples who are in other countries, will rise, and will bring about his liberation, and will not leave thee, Hulāū, alive.” The accursed Hulāū was frightened at this, saying: “If the Khalifah continues to live, an outbreak of the Musalmā́ns may take place; and, if he is slain, with the sword, when his blood falls upon the ground, an earthquake will take place, and people will be destroyed;” so he proposed to put the Khalifah to death after a different fashion. He gave orders therefore so that they enfolded him in a [leather] sack for holding clothes, and kicked his sacred

⁴ Instead of Khalifah, some copies of the text have Ṭabakāh—dynasty.
³ Referring to the Musalmā́n contingents from the subject states in the Mughal camp.
person until he died—May the Almighty reward him and bless him!"

Some Historians affirm that the Khalifah died of starvation, while others say—as our author stated a century before any Pro-Mughal author wrote—that Hulakü consulted with his confidants and chief officers about putting him to death. Some said that, if he should escape from the present danger, assistance would reach him from the whole Musalmân world, and that troops would gather round him from every part of Islam, and great sedition and trouble would arise. This advice Hulakü considered was given out of loyalty to him, and he determined to have the Khalifah put to death. Husam-ud-Dîn, the Astrologer [this is the "Hossam ud din," who is "probably a Muhammedan," of the "Mongols Proper"; but did any one ever hear of any Husam-ud-Dîn who was not a Musalmân?], who was allowed admission to the presence of Hulakü, caused it to be made known, that, if the Khalifah should be put to death by the Mughals, the world would become overspread with darkness, and that the portents of the judgment would appear; and many other similar things he stated, which filled the superstitious mind of Hulakü with fear and dread. He therefore consulted with the Khwâjah, Nasîr-ud-Dîn, the Tusi, the Shi'ah, and ally of the traitor Wazîr, who also laboured for the downfall of the 'Abbâsis; and he replied, saying: "No such portents arose when Yahyâ [St. John the Baptist], the Innocent, was put to death, when the Prophet, Muhammed, died, and when the Imâm, Husain, was unjustly martyred; and, if Husam-ud-Dîn asserts that such as he states will arise if an 'Abbâsi is put to death, it merely shows his excessive simplicity." Others said that no sword could possibly be dyed with the Khalifah's blood.

The Khalifah left the city, and came to the Mughal camp [Guzidah says, contrary to others, that he was put to death two days after he came out], on Sunday, the 4th of Safar, 656 H.—9th of February, 1258 A.D.—as previously mentioned. Of this date there is no doubt whatever, but there is some discrepancy with respect to the date of the last act in this tragedy. Some say that, on the following Wednesday, which would be the 7th, the Khalifah was summoned to the presence of Hulakü, while others say it was the 6th. The Fanakat says the 10th, without mentioning the day, which was Saturday, while some say Tuesday, the 16th of Safar, but the 16th was on a Friday, and others again say it was Tuesday, and others Wednesday, the 14th of that month, equal to the 18th of February. As, in the east, the date commences after noon, as in nautical time, it is evident that the date was the 14th of Safar, and that it was Wednesday, as I shall afterwards show. That same day Hulakü had moved his camp from near the city to a position close to the Dhi-i-Wakî, and the Dih-i-Jalâbîah; and thither the Khalifah was conducted from the tent, in which he had been under a guard at the gate of Kul-wâgî, to the camp at Dih-i-Wakî. Giving up all hope of life, and expecting speedy martyrdom, he asked permission to be allowed to go to the bath, that he might perform his ablutions anew. Hulakü directed that five Mughals should accompany him, but the Khalifah objected to "the society of five of the infernal guards," referring to the XCVI. Chap. of the Kur'an, verse 18.

On that same day, the Khalifah, with his four sons [the Ro. As. Soc. M.S. of the Fanakat merely says "his eldest son"], together with their servants, were ordered to be put to death. Notwithstanding the assurances of the Khwâjah, Nasîr-ud-Dîn, the Tusi, the superstitious mind of the barbarian feared lest what
The Amīr, Abū-Bikr, the Khalīfah's son, and the Amīr-i-
'Alam, Sulīmān Shāh, the Aiyūbī, they likewise martyred,
had been predicted might come to pass if the blood of the Khalīfah should
be shed. He therefore directed that he should be rolled up in felts, and that,
in the same manner as the felt-makers beat the felts in making, he should be
beaten to death, and every bone in his body broken. This mode of punish-
ment, from what has already been stated, was not unusual among the Mughals
[see note at page 1185]. The Mujāmi'-ul-Khiyār says, like our author, that
the Khalīfah, and his sons, were sewn up in bullocks' hides, and kicked to
death.

Thus was the thirty-seventh and last of the Khalīfahs of Baghdād, of the
house of 'Abbās, martyred at the village of Wašf—there never was such
a pla.: as "Vacuf"—towards the close of the day, on Wednesday [our
Tuesday afternoon or evening], the 14th of the month of Šafar, 656 H., at the
age of forty-seven, but some say forty-six years and three months, and others
forty-three years and three months. His reign occupied sixteen years and
nearly three months; and the Khalīfah of the house of 'Abbās had lasted 523
years, eleven months, and one day. His sons, and other offspring, and
the whole of his family and kin were also massacred, two days after, and utterly
exterminated according to the generality of the Pro-Mughal writers; but our
author, who, evidently, had correct information respecting these events, gives
an interesting account of the subsequent death of the Khalīfah's daughter
farther on; and he likewise states that a son, a mere infant, also survived.
We also know that fifteen Khalīfahs of the house of 'Abbās, subsequently,
filled the office of Khalīfah, in Miṣr. See note 8, page 1259.

The author of the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh, with great apparent glee, asserts that
the youngest son of the Khalīfah, Mubārak Shāh, so called, was given
to 'Uljāe Khātūn, one of Hulākū's Khātūns, who accompanied him into
'īrān-Zamin, and that she sent him to Marāghah that he might be with the
Khwājah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tūsf, and that she [subsequently?] gave him a
Mughal wife, who bore him two sons.

The third day after the above tragedy was enacted, on Friday, the 16th of
Šafar [the third day before Friday would be Wednesday, for the date of the
Khalīfah's death], Hulākū commanded that the massacre, pillage, and devast-
tion, should cease [Von Hammer, who has reversed the events, says the sack
and pillage commenced four days before the Khalīfah's death, and continued
for forty days after!], and he came to view Baghdād. The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh
differs here again considerably from other Histories. It states that the
massacre began on the 7th of Šafar, and terminated on the 9th, on which
date Hulākū entered the city, and that he moved from near Baghdād and
encamped at Dih-i-Wašf and Dih-i-Jalāīfah on the 14th of Šafar, the same
date as that on which the Khalīfah was put to death.

Nearly all the inhabitants of Baghdād had been massacred, but the few
which remained now began to appear in the baẓārs and the shops; and com-
mand was issued to remove the dead from the streets, and baẓārs, and for them
to be buried.

Ibn 'Alkāmī imagined, up to this time, that the good offices he had per-
formed for Hulākū, and the aid he had rendered him in destroying his bene-
factor, and the people of Baghdād, would have been rewarded with the
government of that city and its territory; but Hulākū had now made as much
until the whole of the Amirs and Maliks of the Court of the Khilâfat, with the exception of the little son of the Lord of the Faithful, were made martyrs of.

Hulûl seized all the treasures of Baghdad, the enumeration of, and amount of which wealth, the pen of description

use of the traitor as he required, and took no farther account of him otherwise than to despise him for his base ingratitude, and to be convinced that no faith could be reposed in one who had betrayed his benefactor. The Bahadur, 'Ali, a Turk or Tattar Musalmân, was made Shahmah or Intendant of the city and territory, as a reward for his intrepidity, because, out of the whole of Hulâkîl's army, he was the first to place foot within the walls of Baghdad. Fakhr-ud-Dîn, the Dâmghânî, was made Sahib-î-Dîwân, but Ibn 'Amrân, another traitor, was made Hâkîm or Governor of the Baghdad territory, which Ibn 'Alkâmî hoped to have obtained as his reward. During the investment, Ibn 'Amrân had helped the Mughals by supplying them with grain and forage from the neighbouring district of Ya'kübâh, where there were immense quantities stored. He was a man of the very lowest class, and was the menial servant of the 'Amil or Revenue Officer of Ya'kübâh, and, among other duties, he used to shampoo his master's feet—I have not space for a full account of him here—and the learned Ibn 'Alkâmî was placed in a subordinate position as Wazîr, under this boor. Now that it was too late, the late Wazîr became a prey to shame and remorse; and, bitterly regretting his misdeeds, lived, for a short time, brooding over his disappointment, shunned, and treated with contempt and disdain by the people of Baghdad, notwithstanding his utmost endeavours to get any one to notice him. He was soon after laid on the bed of sickness, brought on by the state of his mind; and he died in less than two months after the martyrdom of the Khalfah, on the 11th [Râshîd-ud-Dîn says the 2nd] of Rabî-ul-Âkhir, 656 H. His son, Sharaf-ud-Dîn, was afterwards installed in the subordinate office to which his father had been nominated, under Ibn 'Umran.

But why need any one, who can read the originals for himself, say so? Are we not told in the "Mongols Proper" [p. 201], that "Khulagî appointed governors to take charge of the captured city," and that "Ibn Alkamiyyî, the vizier, retained his post. He is accused of treachery by the majority of the Mulem historians ["the majority" which the writer has seen in translation probably. What Musalmân author does not accuse him of treachery, except the partial historian, "the great Raschid"?]. Of the sect of Râfisîs, it was natural that he should delight in the overthrow of the Abbasidian dynasty and the reinstatement of that of Ali [Where and when, and who was the first person of the dynasty of "Ali" reinstated?]. . . . He [Ibn ul Alkamiyyî] died three years after the capture of Baghdad," etc., etc. Such is history!

The number of people, who fell during these massacres, has been omitted by several authors. Some say 800,000 perished, but the number generally quoted is the enormous amount of 1,800,000, which includes not only the ordinary inhabitants of the city, but also those of the extensive and populous suburbs, and the unfortunate people from the country round, who, in a similar case, as we have witnessed, lately, having been stripped of house, home, and property, fled to the capital city of their country for refuge from the barbarian invaders.

8 See note 8, page 1259.
could neither record, nor the human understanding contain, and conveyed the whole—money, jewels, gold and gem-studded vases, and elegant furniture—to his camp. Such of these as were suitable for Mangü Kahn [Ka'an].

There is, as previously mentioned, some discrepancy among the Histories and Historians I have been quoting in these notes, respecting Mangü Ka'an's death, but it seems strange that such discrepancy should exist. There is no doubt whatever that Bagdad fell in Safar, 656 H., but the Tarkh-i-Jahan-gir and Hafs Abrü state that Mangü Ka'an died in Ramaqan, 655 H., just six months before that event took place. Yet in Guzël, Faşih-i, the Raşat-uş-Şafa, Jamil-ut-Tawârîkh, and in other works, it is recorded that "the Il-Khan [Hulakü], after the capture of Bagdad, despatched a vast quantity of the best of the plunder, and other valuable things of Irâk-i-Arab, and Irak-i-Ajam, to his brother Mangü—which our author had already stated the best part of a century before any Pro-Mughal author wrote—under the charge of the Nû-yfn, Shiktür [the Jamî-ut-Tawârîkh, referring to his departure, styles him Hulâkı], but, when mentioning the receipt of the news of Mangü's death, calls him Shiktür also], with the good news of the fall of Bagdad, and a full account of his proceedings, and informing him that he intended to march towards Misr and Sham. When his envoys reached the throne of Mangü Ka'an, and delivered their message, Mangü was overjoyed, exalted Hulakü of his royal favour, and permitted the envoys to set out on their return." These two statements are widely different from each other; and the only way to reconcile them is, as is stated in the Lubb-ut-Tawârîkh, and some other Histories, that Mangü Ka'an died early in 657 H., and not in 655 H., as in the Tarkh-i-Jahan-gir and Hafs Abrü, for the news reached him in the last month of the year 656 H.; and, if we only consider the immense distance that separated the brothers, and the time it must have taken to convey the news from the Yangtsi to the Euphrates—to Halab, where Hulakü then was—we can pretty clearly arrive at the correct date.

I must now, however, say a few words on another remarkable event which happened in the middle of 656 H.—the year before Mangü's death, and which, correctly, belongs to Mangü's reign—the erection of the Observatory on a high hill north of Marâqah, more particularly, because his ferocious brother, merely because he happened to have carried out his sovereign's instructions, has had the chief, if not the sole credit, among European writers and translators especially, of the good work, and the love of scientific research, while Mangü's attainments are unknown: Hulakü, however, is said to have had a great passion for alchemy, and expended vast sums in its pursuit. We are informed, in the "Mongols Proper," in almost every page of which D'Ohsson's History is drawn upon, that "Mangu" had sent, with his brother, "Khulagu," an astrologer styled "Hossam-ud-din, who had been sent as his adviser," and that "Hossam was probably a Muhammadan!" Farther, that "Nassir ud din, a famous astronomer, was ordered by Khulagu to build an observatory," etc., and that he "had impressed upon Khulagu the necessity of forming new astronomical tables," etc.

The facts are these—and I quote my authorities almost in their own words—that, out of the whole of the sovereigns of the Chingizfah dynasty, Mangü was the only one who nourished a great and sincere love of science, more particularly of mathematics. His study was Euclid, several of whose problems
with some of the females of the Khalifah's haram, together
with a daughter of the Khalifah, he [Hulū] despatched
towards Turkistān; some [things?] were sent, as presents,
and as his portion, to Barkā, the Musalmān, and some
Hulū himself retained.

Trustworthy persons have related, that what reached
Barkā he refused to accept, and that he slew the
emissaries of Hulū; and, on this account, enmity became
established between Barkā and Hulū.7 With respect
to such things as he [Hulū] sent to Mangū Khān, when
that property, and money, reached the city of Samr-

he had solved; and, from the great interest he took in astronomy, he earnestly
desired that, during his reign, an observatory should be erected. He had,
previously, commissioned Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Tāhir, son of
Majd-ud-Dīn, Al-Dakhūrī, to carry out some important observations, but, on
account of the paucity of appliances and instruments, and the defective
acquaintance with the subtleties and niceties of mathematics, several important
astronomical matters still remained doubtful.

At this period, the eminent acquirements of the Tūsī Khwajah, Naṣīr-ud-
Dīn, Muḥammad, were famous even in those parts—in Turkistān and Tāmghāj.
The Khwajah, at this time, used to dwell in the fortresses of the Mulāhidahs:
he had been long and liberally patronized by the last few Khudawands of the
sect, had composed his famous work on ethics—the Akhlāq-i-Nāṣīrī—in the
fortress of Maimūn-dujz, and dedicated it to one of the Muḥtashims of the
order. When Mangū Kā'ān despatched Hulākū into I-rān-Zamīn, at the time
of taking leave of each other, he said to Hulākū, "No doubt you will meet
with the Khwajah, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn of Tūs, who is now among the Ismā'īlīs
[some writers say that he was among them against his will, but, as I have
already shown, this is erroneous]. Treat him with honour and favour, and
send him to me." When the Tūsī reached Hulākū's presence, the latter, on
account of the great distance which separated him from his brother, who had
left his urdū for the territory of Manzī, put off, from time to time, sending the
Khwajah to the Kā'ān's presence; and, by degrees, he became so much taken
up with him himself, and found him so useful, in combination with his brother
Shī'ah, the traitor Wazīr of Bagh demás, as already narrated, that, at last, he
determined to retain him about his own Court, and in his own service.

Hearing from Hulākū the objects of the Kā'ān, the Khwajah himself proposed
to Hulākū to carry them out in Āzarbājīān, and he was furnished with a
mandate accordingly. Four other astronomers and mathematicians were
associated with him in the erection and furnishing of this observatory—
Mu'ayyid-ud-Dīn, ʿArīzī, Fakhīr-ud-Dīn, Marāqī, Fakhīr-ud-Dīn, Akhlāṣī,
and Najm-ud-Dīn, Kāzwīfī; and, in the 57th year from the accession to
sovereignty of the Chingiz Khān, the Raṣūl-i-Il Khānī was erected, and
important observations began to be carried out. I have no space for farther
details here: hereafter, if time permits, I hope to enter more fully into
these subjects.

7 For some account of these matters, see the notice of Barkā's conversion,
farther on.
Kand, the daughter of the Khalifah—God reward her!—requested permission from the authority sent in charge of them, saying: "The mausoleum of one of my ancestors is situated in the city of Samarkand, namely, that of Kusam, son of 'Abbās: permit me to go and visit his tomb." The intendant in charge acceded to her request; and that innocent [creature] proceeded to the mausoleum of Kusam, son of 'Abbās, and celebrated the usual rites observed on paying a visit to a tomb, performed a prayer of two genuflexions; and, bowing her face to the ground, prayed, saying: "O God! if this Kusam, son of 'Abbās, my ancestor, hath honour in Thy presence, take this Thy servant unto Thyself, and deliver her out of the hands of these strange men!" The door of compliance was opened; and, then and there, in that act of adoration, she transmitted her pure soul to the Most High God. God reward her and bless her, and her ancestors, and all martyrs of the true faith!

The author of the Tārīkh-i-Mu'kaddasi, in the Section entitled "Kawā'in," and in the mention of the outbreak of the Turks, quotes a tradition from 'Abd-ullah-i-'Abbās—on whom be peace! He says: "'Abd-ullah, son of 'Abbās," took oath and said, 'the Khilafat of my posterity

Kusam, son of Al-'Abbās, accompanied Sa'id, son of the Khalifah 'Uṣmān, who held the government of Khurāsān, and who had been despatched, at the head of an army, into Māwarā-un-Nahr. Kusam died in that territory, and was buried, at Samarkand.

Muḥammas Ḥusain Khān, otherwise Mīrzā Ḥaidar, the Duqlūf Mughal, says in his History respecting the names of certain cities mentioned in previous Histories as formerly existing in parts of Central Asia, referred to in note at page 889, para. 4, that he himself visited a well-known place in Mughalistan, which is known by the name of Yūmhāl—where there was a cupola still standing, with part of an inscription remaining, which he read—"Shāh Jalīl, son of Kusam, son of 'Abbās"—the rest was wanting, and indicated that that was the tomb of the son of the very Kusam above mentioned.

9 Here occurs a very good example of the use of the ḥāfat instead of, or for, bin, son of. The late Mr. W. H. Blochmann, M.A., in his "Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal," says that "the use of the ḥāfat, instead of bin or pisar (son), is restricted to poetry, and does not occur in prose," and took exception to my use of it. At page 441 of the Printed Calcutta Text, line second from the bottom, are the following words: از نص ""Mawlāwis Khadim Hosain and Abd Al-Hai"" are
will continue up to such time as Turks of ruddy countenances, whose faces will be broad like unto a buckler, shall overcome their dominion and grandeur." Therefore, 'Ulamā have all [from time to time] given an interpretation respecting this prediction. Some have said that they might be Musalmān Turks, and others have said that they might be from the tribes of the Turks of the empire of Chin, who would subdue the land of Irān, 'Irāk, and Baghadād; but unto all the sages of the world, and 'Ulamā of the race of Adam—God reward them!—it [now] became manifest that the latter interpretation was the correct one, and that the downfall of the seat of the Khilāfāt would be wrought at the hands of the infidels of Chin—the curse of the Almighty be upon them!—because the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Musta'sim B'llah—God reward him!—attained martyrdom at the hands of that race.

May the Sulṭān of Sulṭāns, who, up to this present time, continues as usual to read the Khuṭbah in, and adorn the coin with, the name of that lawful Imām and Khalīfah,

the editors of that Printed Text, under the supervision of Colonel W. N. Lees, L.L.D., and it comes from Calcutta, where the "Turani idiom" is so much cultivated, one must give these learned men credit for knowing something of that idiom, and that, if the text, as it stands, was not considered right by them, they would not have allowed the words to remain as they are. I may add that the Calcutta Printed Text agrees, in this instance, with several MSS. copies of the text, and that the only variation is that a few copies leave out the bin, intending isḥāfats to be used in both instances.

1 That is to say the descendants of Turk, which, according to their own traditions, the Mughals are. This prophecy seems different from that which the Sayyids of Ḥillah referred to. See last para. of the note at page 900.

2 Our author continually styles the Mughals infidels of Chin.

3 It appears to have been considered necessary to do this until such time as a successor—a Khalīfah and Imām—should be installed.

This is a pretty good proof that, at Dihlī; they were not quite so "singularly ignorant," nor "strangely indifferent," as appears to have been supposed:—"While the throne of the Khalīfs became an idle symbol, and the centre of Islām was converted into a ghastly camp of Nomads, the latest Muhammadan conquest 'in partibus infidelium' must have been singularly ignorant of, or strangely indifferent to, the events that affected their newly-conceded allegiance [7], as the name of the martyred Must'asim [sic] was retained on the Dihli coinage for some forty years after his death."—Thomas: "Pathān Kings of Dihli," page 255.

After the capture of Baghadād, those of the 'Abbāsī family who escaped the sanguinary Mughals fled into Miṣr; and there, the ruler, Malik Tahir-I-Bandkādar, acknowledged Ahmad, son of Tahir, brother of the late Khalīfah, as his successor to the Khalīfah, at a great meeting assembled for that purpose,
be long preserved and maintained upon the throne of sovereignty, for the sake of the honour of the martyrs of the family of 'Ali and of 'Abbās, and the souls of the Lords of the Faithful, through the mercy of Him who is the Most Merciful of the Merciful!

After Hulāū had sacked Baghādād, and had caused the people to be martyred, he made over those that remained to the Wazir, and assigned him a Mughal Shaḥnāh [Intendant] that he might cause them to be collected together. When the accursed Wazir returned again to Baghādād, and had collected some of the people, and located them therein, some of the servants of the Khalifah, who had retired into the Wādi, and remained alive, to the number of about 10,000 horsemen, collected, and, suddenly,

and then and there did homage to him, on the 9th of Rajab, 659 H. He assumed the title of Al-Muntaṣīr. The ruler of Miṣr furnished him with an army and all things befitting his position, and despatched him, at his own particular request, towards Baghādād, which the new Khalifah hoped to recover. He however encountered a Mughal army within the limits of Anbār, and was slain; after an obstinate battle, in 660 H. Some say he disappeared, and was no more heard of. He was succeeded on the 26th of Safar, 660 H., by Abū-l-'Abbās-i-Aḥmad, son of Ḥasan, son of Abū-Bikr, son of 'Ali, who was with him in the battle, and escaped into Miṣr. He took the title of Al-Ḥākim, and filled the office of Khalifah for upwards of forty years. He died at Kāhirah, in 701 H. Thirteen successive Khalifahs of the same family filled the office; and the last, Al-Mutawakkil-ʿAlā-Ullah, was taken prisoner by Sulṭān Sulṭān, the first of that name, of the Usmānīf sovereigns, when he defeated the Miṣrīs in 922 H. The Khalifah was taken away to Constantinople, where he was allowed a pension, and was treated, as long as he lived, with all possible respect. With him the family of 'Abbās became extinct—at least, as far as could be discovered—and from that time, down to the present day, the Usmānīf Sulṭāns claim the office of Khalifah—the spiritual as well as the temporal authority—and as being the guardians of the holy places; and all Muḥammadan sects but the Shiʿah acknowledge this authority.

4 Not according to the Pro-Mughal writers. Farther on our author says Hulāū had him put to death.

5 Low-lying ground or valley, the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, also the channel of a river, marshy ground near rivers abounding in canes or reeds.

6 In some copies 2000. Nothing of this is mentioned by the Pro-Mughal writers, as may be easily imagined. Rashīd-ud-Dīn however states that the Nū-yīn Ikā and Karā Buḵā were left at Baghādād, with 3000 [30,000?] Mughal horse, as a garrison, but, certainly, two months after, from some reason or other, Ikā, "with several Amirs" along with him, reached Hulāū's camp in the neighbourhood of Hamadān. The son of the Sar-Dawāt-Dār, who succeeded in gaining Hulāū's confidence, subsequently served him after the perfidious
and unexpectedly, crossed the Dijlah and attacked Baghdād, captured the accursed Wazir, and the Shaḥnāh [Intendant] whom the infidel Mughals had installed there, and cut them both to pieces. As many of the dependents of those accursed ones as fell into their hands, and the whole of the Christians of Baghdād they seized, and despatched all of them to hell, and wreaked as much vengeance upon those accursed ones as they [the Musalmāns] were capable of, and withdrew with all speed. When information of this reached the camp of the Mughals, a body of cavalry was despatched to Baghdād. The remnant of the Musalmāns had departed, and with expedition; and not one among those holy-warriors of Islam was taken.

Some persons relate, that Hulāū, after he had finished the affair of Baghdād and the slaughtering of the Musalmāns, inquired of the Wazir, saying: “Whence was thy prosperity?” The Wazir replied: “From the seat of the Khilāfāt.” Hulāū said: “Since thou didst not observe the rights of gratitude towards thy benefactors, thou art, indeed, not worthy of being in my service;” and he gave commands so that they despatched the Wazir—God’s curse upon him!—to hell.

fashion of the Mughals, which may have some reference to the events our author refers to, but the particulars are much too long for insertion here. Suffice it to say that he succeeded in raising a large Musalmān force, for a particular service, with Hulakū’s consent, at Baghdād [according to Rashid-ud-Dīn, but we must take at their value the partial statements of that writer], with which he escaped safely into Miṣr.

7 After the capture and sack of Baghdād, Būkā Tīmūr, brother of Uljāe, one of Hulakū’s wives, was despatched, at the head of a considerable army, to the southward; and, on his reaching the Furāt, opposite Ḥillah, the traitor Sayyids, before referred to, went forth to receive him, constructed a bridge over the river for him and his army to cross, and received the Mughals with delight. Finding them firm in their loyalty [1], in a few days, he marched from thence, and advanced against Wāṣīq, and reached it on the 17th of Rabi’-ul-Awwal, 656 H. The people refused to surrender, and defended the place; but, after considerable opposition, it was captured by assault, and 40,000 persons were put to the sword. Shustar opened its gates; and Baṣrah, and other places in that part, also submitted to the Mughal yoke. On the 12th of Rabi’-ul-Ākhir, Būkā Tīmūr rejoined the main army; and on the 19th of the same month, the envoys of Ḥalab, who had come to Baghdād, were sent off, bearing the insolent letter, concocted by the Shī’ah confidant and counsellor of the Mughal barbarian—the Khwajah Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, the Tusi. The letter is as follows:—“We reached the camp before Baghdād in the year 656, and the noise of the unsparing men was terrible. We challenged the sovereign of that
ACCOUNT OF THE MARCH OF HULĀŪ TOWARDS ḤALAB AND SHĀM.

Hulāū, the Mughal, after he had satisfied his heart on the matter of Baghādād, moved towards Ḥalab, Mayyā-
city, but he refused to come; and upon him is verified the saying: ‘We seized it with a frightful violence’ [Kūr’ān : lvi., 88]. We said to him, ‘We have pressed thee to submit thyself to us. If thou wilt, then wilt thou find peace and happiness’ [Ibid. lxxii., 16]: ‘if thou refusest, thou wilt experience shame and misfortune. Do not act like the animal which, with his feet, discovered the instrument of his death [and heed not], or as he, who, with his own hand, cut the partition of his own nose. Thou wilt then be of the number of those whose works are vain, whose efforts in this present life have been wrongly directed, and who imagine they do the work which is right’ [Ibid. xviii., 103-4]. Nothing is impossible to God. ‘Peace be with the man who follows the way whither God directs’!” [Ibid. xxxv. 18].

Soon after the events related above Arbīl was invested.

After the capture of Baghādād, on account of the excessive heat and thirstiness of that territory, Hulāū, without making any longer stay there, marched from his camp at the Kubbah-i-Shaikh-ul-Mukārīm, on the 23rd of Shafar, and returned to Khānkhān, where he had left a part of his urdū and heavy war materials. By this time, the treasures of Baghādād, and the valuables taken in the fortresses of the Muḥāfāzah, and such other plunder as had been carried away from the frontiers of Rūm, Arman, Karḵ, and other parts, had been collected there, in the royal treasury, which, along with his adviser, Naṣir-ud-Dīn, son of ’Alā-ud-Dīn, the Şāhīb or Wazīr of Rai, Hulāū despatched towards Āzarbājān. Malik Majd-ud-Dīn, the Tabrīzī, who was one of the ingenious and skilful men of that country, was directed to construct a strong fortress on a mountain on the shore of the little sea of Ūrumf and Salmās—the Lake Ūrumīyah—and to melt down all this treasure into bālīk or ingots—the only thing in the nature of coin ever mentioned in the accounts of the Mughals at this period—and place them for safe keeping in the new stronghold.

Hulāū then marched from Khānkhān on his return to his urdū near Hamadān, and, after some time, marched into Āzarbājān. After he reached Marāḡah, Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Lūlū, ruler of Mauṣil, presented himself at the end of Rajab, 656 H.—July, 1258 A.D.—being then over ninety years of age, to pay homage. He was favourably received, for he also had acted a traitorous part in aiding—under compulsion, as a vassal of the infidels—the enemies of his faith. He was allowed to depart, shortly after, on the 6th of Shābān. On the 7th, Sulṭan Izz-ud-Dīn, Kāi-Kāsh of Rūm arrived—the Rauṣat-ug-Ṣafā says he joined the Khān’s camp at Tabrīz before the advance to Baghādād—and, next day, was followed by his brother, Rukn-ud-Dīn. ‘Izz-ud-Dīn had exasperated Hulāū, because he had ventured to oppose the Nū-yīn, Tānjū, and his forces, but, by a simple stratagem of his own, which flattered the vanity of Hulāū, and the countenance of the latter’s Christian Khāṭūn, Dūkūz or Dūkūz, he was forgiven. On the 14th of the same month, the Aṭā-Bak, Sa’d-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, the Shaghīrī ruler of Fārs, also presented himself in the Khān’s camp, “to congratulate him on the capture of Baghādād”
About this time command was given to construct the Raşad-i-İl-Khânf, or Il-Khânî Observatory, referred to in a previous note.

When Hülaḵû proposed to move against Bagdad, he detached the Nû-yn, Arktû, with a considerable force, against the exceedingly strong fortified town of Arbîl [Arbel of European writers, some fifty miles W. of which the Macedonian Alexander defeated Dărâ the Persian], held by Tâj-ud-Dîn, son of Şâlâyah, styled the Lord of Arbîl. He, on being summoned, came down, and submitted, but, although he attempted to induce the Kurds, who inhabited and garrisoned it, to submit, they would not hear of it, and reviled him for proposing it. All Arktû’s endeavours to take it were fruitless. He sought aid from Badr-ud-Dîn-i-Lûlû, but, before his help came, the Kurds sallied out, burnt the Mughal catapults, and slew a great number of the enemy. Badr-ud-Dîn-i-Lûlû, having arrived to his aid, advised him to retire, and give up the attempt to take it then; but to wait until the heat compelled the Kurds to retire to the higher hills before any further effort was made, as it would be impossible to take it by force, though it might be obtained by stratagem. Arktû accordingly gave up the attempt, and retired to Tabriz, leaving Badr-ud-Dîn-i-Lûlû to gain possession of it, when the Kurds should have retired to the higher ranges from the excessive heat, after which he was to destroy the defences. This was subsequently done; and the Kurds retired into Şîm. The unfortunate Tâj-ud-Dîn was made the victim of the refusal of the Kurds to surrender the place; and he was taken to Hülaḵû’s presence, and, by his orders, was butchered.

* The envoys having returned from Şîm with unfavourable replies from the Amîrs and Hâkîms of that territory, Hülaḵû determined to march against them. Previous to his entering İ-rân-Zâmîn, the Sultan of Halab, the Malik Un-Nâşîr, had despatched his Wazîr, Zain-ud-Dîn, Hâfizî, to the urdu of Mangû Khâtûn, tendering his homage, and in return received a farman couched in conciliatory and favourable words—the Fanâkâtî says a yarîzh, confirming him in his dominions, and a pâeâh of exemption from tribute. When Hülaḵû entered İ-rân-Zâmîn, Un-Nâşîr still continued to express his loyalty and submission, but, secretly. Nevertheless, his proceedings became known to the other rulers in Şîm, and they conspired against him; and he was forced to seek aid from Hülaḵû, and fled to his camp. These facts urged the latter still more in his determination to reduce those rulers to submission. Before setting out, he informed Malik Badr-ud-Dîn-i-Lûlû, that he should excuse him from accompanying him on this expedition, on account of his great age, but that his son, Malik Şâlih, should be sent in his place [with a contingent, as a hostage for his father]. His son arrived in due time; and Turkân Khâtûn, daughter of the unfortunate Sultan, Jalâl-ud-Dîn, Khwârazm Şîh, who had been brought up, from an infant, in the Haram of one of the Mughal Khâtûns, and who had been sent along with Hülaḵû, by Mangû’s command, in order that he might bestow her in marriage on some suitable person in İ-rân-Zâmîn, was united to him.

Hülaḵû now put his troops in motion from Azarbâijân. The Nû-yn, Kaibûkâ, was despatched at the head of a strong force, forming the van; the troops under the Nû-yn, Sûnjâk, formed the right of his army, while the Nû-yn Tânjû led the left [Raşhib-ud-Dîn says Tanjû and Saungkûr led the right]; and, on the 22nd of Ramazân, 657 H.—20th September, 1258 A.D., Hülaḵû set out with the centre, or main body, towards Şîm.
Bakr; and this is the country of the son of Shihaub-ud-

On reaching the Alä-Täk, or Tägh, or Dägh, all three of which forms are correct, he was much pleased with the pasturage thereabouts, and gave it the name of Lanba [also written Labnä]—Sähüt [ساحوت] or Sähhoot, and, in a place therein, built a Sarä for himself. It lies a few miles to the west of Bäyazid, a place often mentioned of late, and near the N. shore of the Lake Wän [vul. Van], near the head waters of the eastern branch of the Furät, [Euphrates]; and, by way of Akhät, he entered the territory of the Kurds. They were particularly obnoxious to the Mughals, for they had, under the banner of the later Khalifahs, routed them on several occasions; and wherever they were found they were mercilessly butchered. On reaching the Diyär-i-Bakr, Hülbük first despatched his son, Yûshmüit, with the Nû-yin, Sûntäe, against Mayya-färikän [Martyropolis], and Märdän, while Malik Şalîh was sent against Âmid [Amadia], but certainly not without a Mughal, and a Mughal force, to look after him. Our author, however, distinctly states, that Malik Şalîh was with the Shâh-zâdah, Yûshmüit, at the investment of Mayya-färikän. Hülbük then proceeded to reduce Rûfah, and, after little effort, gained possession of it. He then attacked Danisur, Harrän, and Nisîfîn, took them by storm, massacred the people, and sacked the places. He then crossed the Furät, and, suddenly and unexpectedly, appeared before Halab. The inhabitants, aware of the strength of the place, resolved to defend it. It was closely invested, and held out for a week, but, after that time, it was assaulted and captured in Zü-Hijjah, the Mughals having effected a lodgment at the Bäb-ul-'Iräk, or Iräk Gateway: the citadel held out for forty days after that. Fakhr-ud-Dîn, Säki, who was acquainted with the place, was put in charge of the city and fortress, and the Bakhsîhi, Tükal, was made Shâhnah [Intendant]. The Habib-us-Siar, however, states that Hülbük, after promising the people of Halab safety for their lives and property to induce them to surrender, made a general massacre of them, and sacked the city during seven days. The capture of the strong fortress of Hâzam, west of Halab, next followed; and the inhabitants, although their lives had been solemnly promised them, were all massacred. On leaving Halab, however, a general complaint was made against Fakhr-ud-Dîn's tyranny, and he was put to death; and the Wazir of the Malik-un-Näšir, Zain-ud-Dîn, Hâṣîfî, before referred to, was put in charge of the administration. After this, Hülbük prepared to attack Damashk, but the authorities there, having taken warning from the fate of Halab, made overtures, on the arrival of the van of his army, through certain Bulgâr merchants, and submitted. With the capitulation of Damashk, all Shâm came under the sway of the Mughals.

It was at this juncture that the Nû-yin Shikutür or Shikutür, who had been despatched by Hülbük to his brother's presence after the capture of Baghad [Reshid-ud-Dîn, when mentioning the despatch of Mangü's share of the plunder, says the Nû-yin, sent in charge of it, was called Hülași], arrived in his camp, near Halab, having come with all possible speed, bringing him the tidings of Mangü Ka'an's death. Hülbük's sorrow was great, but he kept it secret within his own breast, and suddenly resolved to return into Âsarbaljân, in expectation that troubles would arise respecting the succession. He set out without further delay, leaving the Nû-yin, Kaibükâ, the Nämân, to guard his conquests in Shâm; and reached Akhät, 24th of Jamâd-ul-Âkhir, 658 H.

In a "History of Persia," by Sir John Malcolm, the author, quoting Des Guignes, states [p. 423, vol. I.] that "Hulakoo" was "desirous of returning
Din-i-Ghazi-i-Malik-ul-'Adil, of Shām, and his [the son's] title is Malik-ul-Kāmil. He is a man of great godliness and sincere piety.

The cause of Hulāū's proceeding into that territory was this. The son of Malik Shihāb-ud-Din-i-Ghazi was Malik of Mayyā-fārikīn, Mārdīn, and Āmid; and these three towns [cities] and fortresses of that territory appertained to him. When the army of Jurmāghān, and the Nū-in, Tājū [Tanjū], who subdued Arrān, Āzarbāijān, and Irāk, carried their incursions to the frontiers of this territory, the Maliks on those confines all requested Mughal Shah-nahs [Intendants], and this son of Malik Shihāb-ud-Din-i-Ghazi—the Malik-ul-Kāmil [Muḥammad]—determined to proceed and reach the presence of Mangū Khān, [and did so,] and, from him, he obtained a special honorary dress. The reason of his obtaining it was this, that, at a drinking party, Mangū requested the son of Malik Shihāb-ud-Din-i-Ghazi to drink wine, and he refused, and did not drink it. Mangū Khān inquired of him the reason of his refusal.

to Tartary to take possession of the government of his native country," now become "vacant," but that "the defeat of his general by the prince of the Mamelukes [Mamluks?] compelled him to abandon the design," etc., etc. This however is as far from being correct as the statement at page 382 of the same volume, that "Hulakoo" was "the son of Chenghis." See last para. of note 3, at page 1279.

If I did not put an iṣāfat here, which stands for "son of," I should make a great blunder. The person referred to is styled Al-Malik-ul-Muqaffar, Shihāb-ud-Dīn—by some entitled, Taqī-ud-Dīn-Al-Ghazi—son of Al-Malik-ul-'Ādil, Abū-Bikr, son of Aiyūb, son of Shādī, Al-Kurdi; and, consequently, Shihāb-ud-Dīn-Al-Ghazi was a nephew of Sulṭān Salāḥ-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf. The Malik-ul-Ādil, during his lifetime, entrusted the government of the different parts of his kingdom to his sons, of whom he had several, but this particular branch never ruled over Shām or in Misr. The Malik-ul-Kāmil, Muḥammad, succeeded his father as ruler of Mayyā-fārikīn and its dependencies, in 642 H. See page 226. See also Calcutta Text, page 377, line 71.

1 Mārdīn was under a different ruler at this period, but he may, previously, have been subject to Shihāb-ud-Dīn-i-Ghazi. See note 3, page 1275, para. 13.

2 It is stated in Alī that the Malik-ul-Kāmil was the first of any of the rulers of those parts to proceed to the presence of Mangū Ka'an, in consequence of which he was received and treated with great honour. He subsequently received a jartaq confirming him in his territory, and a pācak or exemption from all taxes and public burdens. The pācak was not peculiar to the Mughals.

3 The word used is "gharāb," not necessarily wine, but drink of any sort. Here, however, intoxicating drink is referred to, probably the Mughal beverage, fermented mare's milk.
He replied: "Because it is forbidden by the Musalmān religion; and I will not act contrary to my faith." Mangū Khān was pleased with this speech, and, in that very assembly, invested him with the tunic he had on, and showed him great honour. From this incident it appears that the dignity inherent in the Musalmān faith is, everywhere, advantageous, both unto infidel and Musalmān.

In short, when Hulāū was appointed to proceed into the land of I-rān, Mangū Khān commanded that the Malik-ul-Kāmil should return towards 'Ājam along with Hulāū, and they reached the territory of 'Irāk. Hulāū determined to molest Baghdād, and had directed the Malik-ul-Kāmil, son of Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn-i-Ghāzī, that, from his territory, he should bring 7000 horse and 20,000 foot to Baghdād, and render assistance. The son of Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn-i-Ghāzī replied: "The extent of my forces is not so great that it is possible to furnish such a number: more than about 2000 horse and 5000 or 6000 foot I am unable to bring." Hulāū importuned him in demanding a larger number of cavalry, and the Malik-ul-Kāmil persisted in his reply; and Hulāū, in secret, said to his Wazīr, 4 who was a Musalmān, an eminent man of Samrḵand: "It seems to me that Kāmil meditates rebellion in his mind, and that he will not join with us; and it is necessary to put him to death." The Samrḵandī Musalmān Wazīr was fond of the Malik-ul-Kāmil, and he, secretly, acquainted him with this idea and design. The next day, the Malik-ul-Kāmil went to Hulāū and asked permission to go out hunting. He set out from that place [where they then were], accompanied by eighty horsemen of his own; and, with the utmost expedition, got out of the Mughal camp, and pushed on towards his own country, so that, in the space of seven days, he reached it, and gave orders to put to death all the Mughal Shaḥnāhs [Intendants] 5 in his territory, by pinning them against the

4 The Calcutta Printed Text leaves out Hulāū here, and so, as that text stands, the Malik-ul-Kāmil said this to his Wazīr: not Hulāū to his Minister! The Editors must have been much enlightened from their own version. The same text is defective a few lines farther on.

5 Located in his cities and territory. The text is defective here, in all copies, respecting these Shaḥnāhs. Here the best British Museum Text ends, all the rest being wanting.
walls by means of five spikes—one mortal one being driven into the forehead, and four others into the feet and hands. When three days passed, since his disappearance, Hulâû became aware of the fact of his flight; and despatched horse and foot in pursuit of him, but they did not find him, and again returned.

The Malik-ul-Kâmil, son of Malik Shihâb-ud-Dîn-i-Ghâzî, when he reached his own territory, despatched emissaries to the presence of Zahir, the Malik-un-Nâṣîr, and solicited his assistance, and that he would assemble his troops and come [along with him] to the seat of the Khilâfât, Baghdâd. The Malik-un-Nâṣîr agreed to aid him; and the son of Malik Shihâb-ud-Dîn-i-Ghâzî [i.e. the

* The Calcutta Text is deplorably bad here again, indeed throughout this Chapter.

When it became known that Hulâû meditated hostility towards the Khilâfât, and had prepared to move against Baghdâd, the Malik-ul-Kâmil, Muḥammad, as might naturally be expected, could not look on calmly with folded arms and see the successor of his Prophet, and head of the Musalmân faith, assailed, and the seat of the Khilâfât’s power, and centre of Islam, captured, and sacked by infidels. He therefore had gone to the Malik-un-Nâṣîr, ruler of Şâm, and endeavoured to induce him and others to join him with their forces, and march to the Khilâfât’s support, as our author also states, but the Malik-un-Nâṣîr showed carelessness, selfishness, and negligence, in the matter until it was too late, and the opportunity lost.

This ruler must not be confounded with the Malik-un-Nâṣîr, Dâ‘ûd, son of the Malik-ul-Mu‘âqqam, Şhâraf-ud-Dîn, Īsâ, who was a grandson of the Malik-ul-‘Adîl, Saif-ud-Dîn, Abû-Bikr [brother of Sulṭân Şâlah-ud-Dîn, Yûsuf]: the titles of these Kûrîfân Princes are so much alike that they are liable to be confused. The ruler of Ḥalâb and Şâm, here referred to, is the Malik-un-Nâṣîr, Şâlah-ud-Dîn, Yûsuf [not Zahir; he was named after his great-grandfather], son of the Malik-ul-‘Azîz, son of the Malik-ul-‘Azîz, Ghiyâṣ-ud-Dîn, Abû-Mansûr-i-Ghâzî, third son of Şâlah-ud-Dîn, Yûsuf. The Malik-ul-‘Azîz died in 634 H., and was succeeded by the Malik-un-Nâṣîr. Rubruquis saw the envoy of the Malik-un-Nâṣîr at Mangû Kâ’ân’s Court. See note 1, page 221.

We are informed, in the “Monguls Proper” [page 205], from D’Ohsson, apparently, that “Syria was at this time ruled over by Nassir Saladin Yussuf, a great grandson of the great Saladin,” while a little farther on [pp. 205-208] we are likewise informed, that his name was “Prince Nassir Seif ud din ibn Yagmur Alai ud din el Kaimeri”! This strange jumble of names, probably, is the several ways in which “the embossed bowl” is made by those “specially skilled in their various crafts,” but the above, with some other specimens which I have given, seem more after “the case of the western farmer whittling his own chairs and tables with his pocket knife,” as we are told at p. vii of that book. Saif-ud-Dîn, Al-Kaimarî, also written Kamîrî, was one of the Malik-un-Nâṣîr’s Amîrs.
Malik-ul-Kāmil, Muḥammad], with the whole of his troops, horse and foot, marched towards Baghdād [to aid the Khalīfah]. On the way he received information of the downfall of Baghdād, and the martyrdom of the Lord of the Faithful. He turned back again with the utmost expedition, strengthened his fortresses and cities, and gave intimation to the nomads of his territory, so that the whole of them sought shelter in places of strength, whilst he himself entered and took up his quarters in the fortress of Mayyā-fārikīn, and prepared for holy warfare against the infidels.

Mayyā-fārikīn is a small city and strong fortress; and to the north of it is a mountain of considerable height, and within the city[7] is a monastery [of Christian priests] which they call Markūmah, and that Markūmah is a place of sanctity. From the foot of that mountain a large stream flows, and, in the tag-āb [low ground where water collects[8]] in which the city stands, much water collects; and, to the south of the city are gardens, and, to the east of it, are tombs. The place has a fortified hill, and walls with ramparts [of stone], and a parapet.[9]

---

[7] The Calcutta Printed Text is deplorably bad here, and places the mar-kūmah on the top of the mountain, which is contrary to fact.

[8] See note 8, page 334, for an explanation of tag-āb. Some copies of the text, instead of foot of the mountain, have top of the mountain. This stream is one of the tributaries of the Dijlah or Tigris.

[9] It is said to have been surrounded with a strong wall of stone, and to have possessed two strong castles. "Mayyā-fārikīn is a celebrated city in the Dīyar-i-Bakr, near a feeder of the Dijlah or Tigris. There was a church of the Christians there from the time of the Masihā—on whom be peace!—and some of its walls still remain. They relate that there was a physician whose name was Maroṇsā or Marūnṣā, of the kindred of Kūn̄s̄ā, the Lord of Kūmfah-i-Kibīr [Rome]; and a daughter of Shāpūr-i-Zūl-Aktāf [that is "Shāpūr of the Shoulder-Blades," because he caused every 'Arab who fell into his power to be deprived of his shoulder-blades. Such is well known from the Persian historians, but Gibbon, in his History, assures us, on the authority of D'Herbaret, that "Doulacnas," as he terms it, signifies "protector of the nation"!] had fallen grievously sick, even unto death, and the physicians of Fārs were totally unable to cure her. Some of Shāpūr's courtiers—lords of his Court—suggested that it was advisable to send for Maroṇsā, whose skill was famous, and so Shāpūr sent to Kūn̄s̄ā, saying: "Send Maroṇsā," and Kūn̄s̄ā did so. When Maroṇsā arrived he set about curing the daughter of Shāpūr, and the remedies he administered had the desired effect, and her cure was brought about.

"This good service was duly appreciated by the King, and he said to Maroṇsā: