SECTION XXIII.

THE AFFAIRS OF ISLĀM, AND IRRUPTION OF THE INFIDELS.

[As our author relates here the various prophecies respecting the end of the world, of which the irruption of the Mughals was one of the chief indications, I need scarcely follow him, since the world has not yet come to an end, although more than six centuries have elapsed since he foretold it, and closed his history, and, therefore, I may pass over these matters altogether, and begin where he commences his relation of events.]

Notwithstanding that, by the will of the Almighty, and the decrees of Destiny, the turn of sovereignty passed unto the Chingiz Khan, the Accursed, and his descendants, after

1 This is, perhaps, the most interesting portion of our author's work; and it contains much information not hitherto known, and many important particulars respecting the Panjāb, Sind, and Hindūstān, and throws additional light on other events mentioned in the preceding Sections. This highly important portion has not been given at all by Elliot in the extracts from our author's work contained in the second vol. of his "Historians of India."

2 Chingiz or Chingiz Khan signifies "The Great Khan," and therefore, although apparently pedantic, that is the correct mode of writing his title, which will be explained farther on.

I did not intend to give an account of the descendants of Yāfis, son of Nūb, but, perhaps, it will be well to do so, since many persons appear to entertain very erroneous ideas respecting Turks, Tattārs, and Mughals, and respecting their correct names, and as our author here has also made some errors respecting the last-named people. I shall be as brief as possible; but I fear that, in giving this account, I shall seriously interfere with some people's theories on the subject.

This account is taken from several histories which I will name, in order that I may not have constantly to quote them, viz. :—'Abd-ullah bin Khurdād-bih, Tārikh-i-Fanākatf, Jami'-ut-Tawārikh of the Wazīr, Rāshid-ud-Dīn, Tārikh-i-Ghāzānī, Tārikh-i-Jahān-gir, Tārikh-i-Alīf, Shajarah-ul-Atrak, Mujmal-i-Fasih-i, Tārikh-i-Yāfa-ī, Tārikh-i-Guzīdah, Tārikh-i-Jahān-Kushāe of the Jīwānul, Tārikh-i-Jahān-Ārā, Lubb-ut-Tawārikh, Tārikh-i-İbrahīmī, Muntaḥab-ut-Tawārikh, Rauṣat-us-Ṣafā, Ḥabib-us-Siyar, Majāmi'-ul-Khiyār, Tārikh-i-Abū-l-Ghāzī, Bahādur Khan, and the Akbar-Nāmah, the last of
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the kings of I-rān and Tūrān, that the whole of the land of

which works contains the history of the Mughals more for the purpose of glorifying the author’s master than anything else, as I shall presently show.

I. Yāfīs, son of Nūḥ, from whom the Turks and all their ramifications claim descent, after coming out of the ark with his father, is said to have been sent, by him, into the farther east, and to have fixed his yūrūt or encampment, and to have pitched his tent, at a place written in the original—سيكان سکان—which is somewhat doubtful, in the vicinity of the rivers Atīl—أتيل—the Wolga, which rises in the country of Rūs and Bulghār—and Jāfik—یافک. He received from his father the famous stone which possessed the virtue of producing rain and other blessings, which stone the Turks call yadah-tāğh, the 'Ajams, sang-i-yadah, and the 'Arabs hajar-al-maṭar—the rain-producing stone.

In after-times the descendants of Yāfīs casting lots for the possession of this miraculous stone, the Ghuzz, hereafter to be mentioned, are said to have made an imitation of it, and the Khalj tribe won the false stone, while the Ghuzz secured the real one. The author of the Ḥabīb-us-Siyar says it was preserved among the Úzbaks and Mughals, and possessed the same virtues when he wrote!

Yāfīs had eight sons:—1. Turk—طک—2. Chīn—چين—3. Khurz—خزر—4. Saklāb—سکلاب [also Šaklāb], 5. Rūs—روس [an 'Uṣmānī Turkish author, who lately published a work at Paris, very correctly, contends—according to the historians previously quoted, among whom the Fanākāṭī says his work contains what the Sages, Astronomers, and Chroniclers of the Ġhūrs, the people of Tīlabat, and the tribes of the Turks relate in their chronicles—that the Russians are not Selāvīs—i.e. Saklāb. See also Mascou’s History of the Germans, vol. ii. page 615]. 6. Mang—منگ also written Mansag—مانساغ and Mansīf—مانسیف, 7. Tāraḵ—طارخ and even Māraḵ—مارخ from the fourth son of whom is descended Sikandar-i-Zūl-Kārmaイン, not the Macedonian. 8. Gumārī—کومري [Gomer] also styled, by some of the writers quoted, Kīmāl or Gīmāl—کیمیل and Gīmāl or Kimāl—کیمیل and Gimāl or Kimāl [I may repeat here that I always put the most trustworthy names first; in all instances]. Some of these writers, and also the author of the Jāmī-i-'Uṣm, add the names of three more sons—Khāljan—خلجان—Ghuzz—غژ and Sadsān—سداسن but the two first mentioned cannot be sons of Yāfīs from what these writers themselves subsequently state respecting the origin of their names, presently to be noticed.

Some of the authorities mention the confusion of tongues, which necessitated the eight sons of Yāfīs separating, and they are mentioned as taking up their residence, with their families, in different parts of what they called Turkistān, and which, subsequently, were called after their respective names; but the others state that Nūḥ sent Yāfīs into the farther east, into Tūrān.

II. Turk, the eldest son of Yāfīs, son of Nūḥ, took up his residence in that pleasant locality famous for its hot and cold springs, which the Turks call Salingā—سلینگا—which is also written Issiḵ-Kol—یسیکول and Salingā—سلینگا—which is also written Issiḵ-Kol—یسیکول—by some writers, but which, as subsequently explained, refers to the parts about Issiḵ-Kol—یسیکول—or Issīg-Kol—یسیگول—or Issīğ-Kol—which and یسیگول—being interchangeable.

According to 'Abd-ullah-i-Khurdāb-bih, and Abū-l-Ghāzī, Bahādur Khān, "Salingā lies round about Issīg-Kol, which is a little sea, or great lake, seven days’ journey in extent [about 120 miles long], surrounded by mountains,
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and into which seventy rivers fall, but the lake is salt, and some say the water
is warm."

Chīn, son of Yāfiṣ, was very clever, and inventive, and among other things
invented by him was the custom of winding silk [from the cocoon], and weaving
silken textures. He had a son whom he named Mā-Chīn, who was exceedingly
wise. When the latter’s family became numerous, he said to his father that he
would construct a place of abode for himself, and he founded the city of Mā-
Chīn. He acquired the jade stone, and discovered its properties and virtues,
and made it known to his people, and he also took musk from the musk-deer.

Khurz, son of Yāfiṣ, was very mild, tractable, and taciturn, and, having
roamed about in all directions, at length fixed his residence by the bank of the
river Ātil—ji In the summer season he dwelt [with his family] in the open
country, and, in winter, in a town—[tā]—a fixed habitation, probably.

Saḵlāb, son of Yāfiṣ, made some request to the chief of his ʿulūs or tribe
—one writer says, to Gumārī, Khurz, and Rūs, to be allowed to dwell with
them—which was not granted, and, on this account, enmity arose between
them. Others say, that the descendants of Saḵlāb, having become much more
numerous than the others, came to a fight with their kinsmen, but, being
worsted, took up their residence in more distant parts, farther west, beyond the
seventh clime, where the cold is great. They appear to have not only made
up their feud in these latter days, A.D. 1876, but also, for political purposes, to
have merged into one people. 'Abd-ullāh-i-Khurdād-bih calls him Sag-lāb—
ʃy ʃl— and says that he was suckled by a bitch, hence the name, and which,
if true, may account for the very Christian-like proclivities manifested lately
by his simple-minded “Christian” descendants, so-called, in cutting off ears,
lips, noses, and heads, and otherwise mutilating their dead foes, a very dog-like
disposition. They—the Shors of European writers—are notorious for such-like
acts, as Tacitus and Procopius testify.

Rūs, son of Yāfiṣ, is the ancestor of the Rūšāns [Russians].Being held
in little account, and without sufficient means, he continued, for some time, to
dwell along with Saḵlāb, but, subsequently, left him. Among the descendants
of Rūs the custom prevails of giving the parents’ whole inheritance to the
daughters, and nothing but a sword to the sons.

Mang, or Mansag, son of Yāfiṣ, was full of deceit and artifice, and he
took up his dwelling on the side of Bulghār. There is the land of the Ghuzz,
and the whole of that race are his descendants, from his son, named Ghuzz; and
they are the worst of the descendants of Yāfiṣ. Some few writers say
“the worst of the Turks,” but to be Turks they must have been descended
from Turk, which does not appear to have been the case. After the decease
of Yāfiṣ, Mansag managed to get possession of the rain-stone, and it remained
with the Ghuzz, but, on one occasion, when Turk required it to bring rain,
he sent and demanded the stone from them. They substituted a false one and
sent it, which being discovered, strife arose, and numbers of the Ghuzz family
were killed in consequence, and, from that time, enmity has continued between
the Turks and Turk-māns. [See under Āghūz, farther on, for the origin of
this name.] Ghuzz’s eldest son was killed in this affair. He was named Beghū—[酐], which is also written Beghūn—[酐n], the “ being nasal, and
hence the Turk-māns style themselves Beghū. See note 6, page 374, and
note 6, page 433.

Gumārī [Gomer of European historians who is also called Kīmāl or Gīmāl
and that the authority of the Muḥammadan religion de-
and Kīmān or Gīmān and Giṃāl, &c., as previously stated, son of Yāfīg, was
addicted to pleasure and jollity, and passionately fond of the chase; and he
took up his residence in the part which is known as Bulghār. He had two
sons:—1. Bulghār, and 2. Bārtās, and the Māshkhūrīn—probably,
the Bāshghūrīn or Bāshkhūlīn—by a strange coincidence, the Bāshkhūrs? are
of their seed. Bārtās took up his quarters on the side of Bulghār, and the taking
of furs is attributed to him. Bulghār is the ancestor of the Bulghārs, vul.
Bulgarians, and therefore are not Sāḵlabs [Slavs].
Some historians are of opinion that the Yūnānīān, and Rūmīān [Ionians and
Romans], are descended from Gumārī, otherwise Kīmāl or Giṃāl, and that
Yā-jūj and Mā-jūj [Gog and Magog]—who, probably, are the ancestors of the
Samoydes—were likewise sons of Gumārī.
No account whatever is given of the eighth son of Yāfīg—Tāraż, Tārakh, or
Bāraḵ.
This is the genealogy of the descendants of Yāfīg, son of Nūḥ, but, as such
numbers of tribes have sprung from them as cannot be easily enumerated, and,
as the object of the writer was merely to give an account of the Turks, they
do not chronicle much more respecting the other sons of Yāfīg, but concentrate
their attention on the movements of his eldest son, Turk.
Yāfīg, son of Nūḥ, having died at the age of 250—some say 240—years,
Turk was chosen head of his people; and they styled him Yāfīg Ughlān,
or the Younger Yāfīg. The vast tract of country, called Turkistān, takes its
name from him. He is said to have been contemporary with Gailū-murt, the
first of the Maliks of 'Ajam, and he was the first who was chosen Khān
among the children of Yāfīg. The Jāmi'-i-'Uzm states that he succeeded to
the authority at a place named Sīlāḵ—سیلاک.
He had four sons:—1. Tūnāk or Tūnāg—تینک—but, according to some,
his name was Tūtāg or Tūtāk تدک[2. Jinkal—جینک—also written Jikal or
Jīgāl—چیگاق—and Chikal or Chīgāl—چیکاق] [This latter name is still known,
and is now applied to a small tract of country], 3. Barsinjār—برسنجار—and
Barsinjūr—برسنجور and 4. Amlāḵ or Inlāḵ—آملک—which may be written also
Amlāgh or Inlāgh—آملگ[1.
Tūnāg, or Tūnāk or Tūtāk or Tūtāg, took up his quarters on the banks of
the river Ātil, but the dwelling places of the other brothers are not mentioned.
At this point considerable discrepancy occurs among the authors quoted,
respecting the successor of Turk, entitled Yāfīg Ughlān. With a single
exception they state that, when his end drew near, Turk made over the
chieftain-ship to his son, whom they styled Alminjah—علماخ—Almīnḥā—ألمینح—
and Alnājāh—این‌ناخ—in some works—طلعها—and Ilijāh—یلیخ—and Ilijā
یلیخ[1. Turk, however, had no son so called, even by their own accounts,
for, as regards the names of his four sons, previously given, they all agree
except the Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, in some copies of which Turk is said to have had
five sons, of whom Alminjah—علماخ—was the eldest, but this, although
apparently correct from what follows, is contrary to every other work I have
named, except Abū-l-Ghāzf's, which again is different to all others. It is
possible that Alminjah was a grandson of Turk, and son of one of the four
named above.
Abū-l-Ghāzf, Bahādur Khān, states, that "Turk, at his death, bequeathed
his sovereignty to his son Tūnāk" [Tūtāk or Tūtāg, previously mentioned],
and that "Tūnāk left the sovereignty to Jalzah [جله], his son." This
parted from those regions, which became the seat of
Jalzah may be meant for Aljinjah or the like, but I must mention that Abū-l-
țaz is the most modern of all the authors I have referred to, he having only
begun his History in 1074 H. = 1663 A.D., and that, in one place in his work,
he states that he himself copied from other authors what is contained therein
down to the time of his ancestor Shābānī Khān, the contemporary and enemy
of Bābar. Those authors must have been some of those whose works I have
already named; but Abū-l-țaz differs from them essentially, and can
scarcely be considered a better authority than those who centuries previously
compiled the history of the descendants of Yāfīsī by command of Mughal
sovereigns, and from the best authorities.

For the above reasons I must assume that Turk was succeeded by his
grandson, Aljinjah or Aljinjah, possibly the son of Tūtag or Tūnag:

III. ALJINJAH—or ALJINJAH—having succeeded, during his
chieftain-ship the whole of the Turk tribes forsook the true faith [of their
ancestor Yāfīsī] and turned pagans. When he became stricken in years he
resigned the chieftain-ship to his son, Dib-bāiks.

IV. DIB-BAĩK—one also written Dib-bāik—
and Dib-bāik—
and Dib-bāik—
and Dib-bāik—
Dib-bāik—
Dib-bāik—
Dib-bāik—
Dib-bāik—

The son of Aljinjah or Aljinjah, succeeded his father, and, in his chieftain-ship, all the
Turks took the road of error and perversity. Dib signifies throne, grandeur,
possession, and bāik, great, venerable, and the like. He had four sons.

V. KİWAK—one also written Kİwak—
by some, Kyūk, and by
two authors Kür, or Gür—
another son of Aljinjah or Aljinjah, but,
according to some, his eldest son, succeeded to the chieftain-ship over the Turks.
He became an idol-worshipper according to the Fanākati, who then makes a
sudden leap to Ăghīz Khān who does not belong to this dynasty at all.
Others state however that Kiwak did not deviate from the just and virtuous
path of his forefathers.

VI. I now come to a period respecting which all the authors named, with a
single exception, to be referred to presently, agree, namely, that wherein Kiwak
was succeeded by his son, ALJINJAH—Khān, during whose chieftain-ship
his people, filled with arrogance at their prosperity and flourishing condition,
continued to fall deeper into darkness and perversity until they all became
infidels. After a considerable time, two sons were born to him at one birth,
to the eldest of whom he gave the name of Tättār—
and to the second
the name of MUGHAL—
which is also written Mughul—
and Mughul—
but Mongol is wholly erroneus: I cannot imagine how it
ever came to be adopted. When Aljinjah became old and infirm, and his two
sons had grown up, he divided his territory between them, giving to each a
half, and retired from the world. The two brothers appear to have ruled
jointly, and in harmony, for some time, but, eventually, separation took place
between them, and two septs or tribes arose, whichauthors call by the
Turkish words İ-mak—
— İ-mak—
— İ-mak—
or İ-mak—
— İ-mak—

It may be well to mention another matter which occurs to me here, and,
although it is not a necessary or very material part of the present subject, it
can scarcely be deemed foreign to it.

Those Turks—Tättārs, and Mughals—who occupy at present the old seats
of the Täzik Ghürfs, between Hirat, Kābul, and Kandahār [“the Afghans
of Ghore” as they were wont, until very lately, improperly to be styled, and
who are said to have founded the ‘pre-Mughal’ Putdn dynasty of Hin-
paganism, the kingdom of Hindūstān, by the grace of
dostan”), to whom Elphinstone refers in his “Account of Caubul,” under
the name of “Eimauks,” still style themselves “Chahār [Four] Ī-māk or
Ūs-māk,” after the same Turkish words as given above, they having been ori-
ginally four tribes of those people, and the people now styled Hazārāhs—which
word is not a proper name but derived from hasār, a thousand, the name
given by the Mughal rulers to bodies of 1000 men, but these so-called hasārāhs
often contained many more, even 4 and 5000. One or more bodies of these
troops were, with their families, stationed in those parts—once exceedingly
flourishing and populous—after their conquest by the Mughals, subsequent to
which period likewise the Chahār Ī-māk were settled therein. One of the
former was the Hazārah of the Nū-yīn, Muḥā, a Karāyat Muḥāl, who with
his ilūs, was sent to reside on the frontiers of Khurāsān, and occupied the tracts
extending from the limits of Balkh to Bādghais of Hīrāt. They were not the
first, however, for, long prior to the time of the Turkish rulers of Ghāznī, we
find Turkish tribes settling in the N.W. parts of that tract of country which is
called Afgānīstān in later times, and in the parts between Kābul and
Peshāwar, about the skirts of the Safed Koh. Elphinstone says, “Their
features refer them at once to the Tartar stock, and a tradition declares
them to be the offspring of the Moguls (sic)”; and, in a footnote, he adds: “I find it difficult to account for the number of Torkée words
which are met with in the language of those tribes. Why, if they be Moguls,
should they have spoken Torkee?”

“Torkey,” I beg leave to observe, is the mode in which Dow and Briggs
thought proper to write the word Turkeiy—ئرکی—after the absurd elegancies of
a “pronouncing dictionary,” I suppose, or the Fonetic Nuz, and they appear
to have been under the impression that Turk and Turkeiy referred solely to
the Ḥūsmāni (Ottoman) Turks and their language, and that they, accord-
ing to their supposition, were a totally different race from the children of the
son of Yāfīs, and so they invariably wrote the word, without any authority
whatever—Torkey—as if it were written in the original ترکی with ی, which it is
not. It will also be seen that Elphinstone's difficulty was a self-made one,
and that the "Moguls should have spoken Torkee" is not to be wondered at.
He also says [vol. ii. p. 222]: "the Moguls and Uzbeks"—for he seems to
have been unaware that the Uzbaks are Mughals in reality—"compose what
we call the Tartar nation"! The fact however is precisely the contrary.

Bābār mentions these Chahar Ī-māk. He styles them respectively “the
Turk Ī-māk,” “Hasārah Mughals,” “Turk-māns,” and “Tāmāni [not
Tymunee] Ī-māk.” I have never come into contact with them myself or I
would have learned the correct names of their Ī-māks and their descent,
but, certainly, the Nikūdārs were included among them in former days
“Fīruz-kohī” is a mere local name.

I now return to the account of the two Ī-māks of Tāttār and Mughal, and
commence with the eldest branch.

The Tāttār Ī-māk.

The chiefs or sovereigns of the Tāttār Ī-māk consist of eight persons, the
first of whom was the eldest of the twin sons of Aliningh Kān.

I. Tāttār Kān—تاَر گَن—son of Aliningh, ruled for a considerable time,
and was succeeded by his son,

II. Būkā Kān—بُکا—also written, in some histories, Būkū—بُکو—who
was succeeded by his son,
Almighty God, and the favour of fortune, under the shadow

III. Aminjah—مَهَرُتُهُ—and, by different authors, Alninah—النَّبرُ—and Balinjah—بَالِنْجَرُ—and without points—النِّبرُ—which may be anything; but Abū-l-Ghāṣlī, contrary to all other writers, styles him Jalinjah [721]. He was succeeded by his son,

IV. I-LEV—بُنِيُّالْيِهِ—whom some style Ansif or Insī—أنسِي—and Isley—السَّلي—-and Jamīl—جَمِيلُ—without diaritical points. Abū-l-Ghāṣlī styles this ruler Itelah [732]. He was succeeded by his son,

V. Ațsiz—اتُسيز—and which is written in some of the works quoted Altur الزُّورُ and Aṣīr الأسِرُ but they are evidently both intended for Așīr آشِر which is a well-known Turkish name. This however is a specimen of the manner in which careless copyists, ignorant of the subject copied, make correct names incorrect. Abū-l-Ghāṣlī calls him Ațisir or Ațsir [734]. He was engaged in wars, but against whom is not recorded. Hostility had probably already arisen between the Tattār and Mughal Ěmāk.

VI. Ardū or Urdū—وردُ, 956 son of Ațsir, succeeded to the authority, and, at his death, his son,

VII. Bādū—بَادُو succeeded to the chieftainship. He was much superior to his predecessors in power and state. He marched his forces against the Ěmāk or Ēlīs of the Mughals, and hence commenced that inextinguishable hostility which has ever since existed between the two septs. Abū-l-Ghāṣlī says he died whilst war was going on against the Mughals.

VIII. Sōntr Khān—سُنْتَرُ—-and by some styled Sāndz—سَانْدُزُ—son of Bādū, succeeded; but, before I say more concerning him, I must bring the Mughal Ěmāk down to his time.

The Mughal or Mughīl Ěmāk.

This Ěmāk was ruled over by nine persons, and from this circumstance the number nine is held in great veneration by the Mughals. The first was,

I. Mughal—مُغْحَالُ—or Mughīl—مُغْحَلُ—Khān, second son of Aminjah, who was a chieftain of great dignity. It must be remembered, however, that nearly every one of the writers named at the head of this account wrote for, or under the reigns of, the Mughal sovereigns, and, consequently, nothing good is said of the Tattārs. Mughal Khān had four sons: 1. Kara Khān—كَارَةُ—2. Awar, Āwar, or Aor Khān—أوَرُ—3. Kin Khān—كنُ—and, 4. Kur, or Gur Khān—قُرُ—also written Kūr or Gur —کُرُ—With respect to the second and fourth sons' names, particularly with regard to the second, considerable difference exists in these Histories. Some call him Āzār or Āzur—ازُوُرُ—perhaps Āzar or Āzur—ازُوُرُ—is meant, others, Āwar or Āwuz—إِوْزُ—Āwās or Āwūs—إِوْسُ—And the fourth son is called Kūz, or Kauz, Gūz or Gauz —غُوُزُ—Kūz or Guz—گُوُزُ—and Kūz or Guz—گُوُزُ—&c., according to the vowel points, that may be used with the word without marked in the original.

II. Kara Khān, eldest son of Mughal Khān, succeeded his father, and, in his time, most of the descendants of Turk were idol-worshippers, and but few followed the faith of their ancestors. During his reign a movement took place among his people, and he made subject the parts about Karā-Kurum, and the tracts lying between those two lofty mountain ranges which they call Ur-Tāğ—ةُرُ-تَأْثُرُ—or Ür-Tāğ—ةُرُ-تَأْثُرُ—and Kar-Tāğ—ةُرُ-تَأْثُرُ—and some, War-Tāğ—ةُرُ-تَأْثُرُ—and Kar-Tāğ, or as—ةُرُ-تَأْثُرُ—is interchangeable with ḍ—هُ in Turkish words, it may be more correctly written Ur-Tāğh or Ür-Tāğh, and Kar-Tāğh, or War-Tāğh and Kar-Tāğh—تُأْثُرُ in Turkish, signifying a range of mountains—and therein took up his yūfāt—encamping
of the guardianship of the Shamsī race, and the shade of
ground—and his ỉ-lāk or ỉ-ỉgh, or summer, and kīṣh-lāk or kīṣh-ỉgh, or
winter station. These terms are still used by the Ghahār-I-māk in Afghānistān,
and even the Afghāns have, during the course of time, adopted the terms from
them.

Abū-ỉ-Ghaiẓi says "those mountain ranges are now [in his time] called Uluq-
Tāgh—the high, great, over-topping mountains, and the Kīzīl-Tāgh—the red
or ruddy mountains," which are sufficiently delineated on all good maps, but
under various different names. Karā Khān's kīṣh-lāk, or winter quarters, was
generally at the foot of the mountains in about Lat. 40°, Long. 94° or 95°.
The name leṣī-red—occurs constantly in the names Kīzīl-kol, Kīzīl-kum,
and the like. Another writer describes the country of the Mughal I-māk as bound
E. by Kbirth, W. by the I-ghūr country, N. by Kirthr [which is
also written, by some, Kirtiz, and Kerkiz, but Mīrzā Haidar always writes it
Kīrī-kir—Franz—]—which evidently refers to the country around the Kirthr Nor
of the Jesuits' map; and the Tārīkh-i-Ālī has Kirtir—Franz—Mīrzā Haidar
does not refer to the tribe of Karīghūz, which he always writes خرغمیکحزا] and S. by
Kharkhez Tungūt—Franz— خرغمیکحزا

Karā Khān was a tyrannical and odious infidel, and greatly feared and
avoided. During his sovereignty he had a son born to him by his chief
Khātūn, who received the name of Āghūz, which name refers to his refusal of
nourishment from his mother's breast for three days and nights, according to
the Mughal tradition—but I have not space to detail it here—because she too
had become an infidel, the word Āghūz being said to mean the sound of milk
taken from an ewe which has recently had young. It was usual among the
Mughals not to name their offspring until they were a year old; but Āghūz
turned out to be a most remarkable infant, and so he named himself, to the
surprise of his parents, who were consulting upon what name to give him,
crying out from his cradle: "My name is Āghūz."

Āghūz Khān grew up in the true faith, which his mother returned to, and his
father, Karā Khān, discovering this, resolved to put him to death, and to take
advantage of such time as Āghūz should be following the diversion of hunting
in order to carry it out. Āghūz was married, in succession, to three
dughters of his three uncles, one of whom adopted the true faith, and she
gave him intimation of his father's design, and he, being in consequence joined
by numerous partisans, kept aloof from his father. At last, however, a con-
flict ensued between the father and son, and Āghūz slew his parent. Abū-ỉ-
Ghaiẓi says the father "was killed" during the rout of his followers.

III. Āhūz Khān—Franz—also written Āghuz—Franz—which is equally
correct, and by the Fanākafī, Uighuz—Woguz—having succeeded to the authority,
for a space of two or three years, but, according to some of the best of the
Histories this account is taken from, for seventy-two or seventy-three years
[seventeen years are more probable], waged war with his paternal and mat-
ernal uncles and other kinsmen and their dependents, and his own tribe, and,
at length, succeeded in compelling the greater part of them to return to the true
faith, and those who would not he treated with the utmost rigour. His
uncles, however, with their dependents, and some of his father's likewise, fled
from his territory farther to the east, to the borders of Chān, and sought pro-
tection from the Malik of the Tāttār I-māk. He aided them with his forces,
and they marched against Āghūz Khān, but, being filled with fear and terror
of him, they were put to the rout. Āghūz Khān pursued them, and even
the protection of the I-yal-timishī dynasty, became the

penetrated to the frontiers of Chín, and subdued part of that clime likewise. How this will agree with the Chinese annals remains to be seen, but, as one of his uncles was named Kin Khān, this may possibly account for the Kin— who are styled “Kin Tartars,” but, perhaps, more correctly, should be Kin Mughal—in the farther east, who subsequently conquered Northern China.

After this, such was his power, and the awe he was held in, that many ulūs or tribes of the Tātār İ-māk, as well as that of Mughal, became subject to him. He also brought under his sway the city of Tālāsh, and Şairām or Şirām to the frontiers of Būkhrā.

He adopted wise laws and regulations, and assigned names to several Turkish tribes [i.e. his own Mughal İ-māk and such of the Tātār İ-māk as had acknowledged his sway], by which names they are known still, such as Ī-ğhūr—[an offshoot of Mughal Khan’s family] which signifies “coming to one’s aid” and “making a compact,” they having been the first to join him when his father resolved to take his life; Kāñkūlī—which is also written Kāñghūlī—and Kāñghūlī—and Kāñkūlī— which means a wheeled-carriage or cart, which, on a certain expedition, invented, when the booty was so immense that there was difficulty in removing it. They are still to be found on the banks of the Sīhūn and parts adjacent. Abū-ľ-Ghāzī says kāṅkūlı— which signifies the creaking of a wheel; Kābchāk— which is also written Kābchāk—and Kābchāk— which signifies a tree hollow in the trunk.

One of the conflicts in which Ağhūz Khān was engaged was with Ayat, the Burāk, and Ağhūz was overthrown, and had to retire into a delta, but seventeen years after he finally overcame him.

There was with his forces, on that occasion, a pregnant woman—the Mughals and Tātārs used to take their wives with them in war—whose husband had been killed in that affair, and, being taken in labour, she took shelter within the trunk of a hollow tree which happened to be there, and gave birth to a son. Ağhūz, hearing of it, took pity on her, as her husband had been slain in his defence, and adopted the boy, and gave him the name of Kābchāk because he was born in a hollow tree. When he grew up, Kābchāk was sent into the tract of country called Tāmāk, to guard that frontier, and it got the name, in course of time, of dashē or plain of Kābchāk.

The next to whom he assigned a name were the Kārlūks—also Kārlūgh—Kārlūk— and Kārlugh—and the circumstance which gave rise to it was this. Ağhūz Khān, returning from an expedition into the eastern parts of İ-rān Zamin, was passing the borders of Ghūr and Gharjistān on his way back to Tūrān. It was the depth of winter, and he therefore commanded that his followers should not loiter on the line of march because of the dangerous state of the route by reason of the frost and snow. Some few of his followers however—men of one family—did loiter, and soon found themselves unable to come up with the main body until a considerable time afterwards—some say Ağhūz was on his way into İ-rān Zamin, and that the loiterers did not rejoin him until the following spring. After punishing them he gave them the nick-name of Kārlūgh, which word, in Turkish, according to my authorities, signifies “the father of snow,” i.e. “pertaining to snow,” but here, “detained by the snow,” which name their descendants, who formed
focus of the people of Islam, and orbit of the possessors of

a separate tribe of Turks, were ever after known by, and continue to be known
by up to this day. There is a couplet respecting them which is well known:

κόμος ήρκη α' ή μή ερμή φραγμός θαδ

and they are continually mentioned in Oriental history, but European trans-

lators have transliterated the words Φραγμός — Φράγμα — Φράγμα — Φράγμα

according to their ideas of the value of the letters of the Arabic alphabet, and the
different languages in which they themselves wrote, and turned them into
Carluks, Karlik, Corluces, Carlingues, Carracs, Karluks, and the like,
whereby they are nearly unrecognizable.

Some of these simple Turks, who appeared on the N.W. frontier of the I-yal-
timishk kings of Dihil, subsequent to the irruption of the Mughals, have
been turned into "Indo-Scythians" by Major-General A. Cunningham. See
Thomas, "Pathan Kings," p. 97. See also the theories on this name con-
tained in the Geographical Magazine for 1875, vol. ii. page 217, last para.

Aghz Khân also named the Turk tribe of Khâlj — خل — sometimes
pronounced Khalaj, in poetry — from the following circumstance. On one
of Aghz's expeditions, the particulars of which are too long for insertion here,
some of his men fell out on the line of march, and remained behind. When
they came up with the army again, Aghz demanded the reason of their dis-
obeying his strict orders against loitering. One of them replied, although they
had been directed to take food with them sufficient for some days, that they
had stayed behind in search of it, and that, in his own case, he had to remain
because his wife was taken in labour, and, when the child came into the world,
the mother, for want of nourishment, had no milk to give it. He had no food
to offer her; when, looking about him, he espied, near by, a fox which had
caught a partridge. He threw a stick at the fox which dropped the bird,
which he seized, and, having roasted it, gave it to his wife to eat, and thereby
she was able to afford nourishment to her babe. Hearing this tale, Aghz
gave the child — a boy — the name of Khâlj or Khalaj, which signifies, accord-
ing to some authors, "leave the woman behind," but others again say it is
a compound word derived from جل — Khal, left, and جل — čj, hungry — "left
hungry." The posterity of this man became, in time, very numerous, and various
branches of them went out into Mâwar-un-Nahr, the Garmîr of Ghûr, and
other parts of Khurásân, and into Irâk [see also note 9, page 287]. They furnished subsequently several independent Sultân to Lakhanawatî
[Bengal], and other independent kingdoms of India. There are branches of
them still to be found in Central Asia. Connolly, during his travels, had one
of their descendants as his guide at Astarâbâd.

The 'Ughtânî [vul. Ottoman] Turks trace their descent from Aghz.

It may not be amiss here to mention likewise the tradition respecting the origin
of the Turk-mâns, and the reason of their being so named. On the occasion
of Aghz Khân's entering Khurásân with his tribes, some of them had children
born to them there, and, liking the climate "in preference to the rigorous
winters and hardships of Turkhâf," and partly through certain exigencies
which arose — they were enemies of the Turks from the time Beghû, son of
Ghuzz, was slain — they selected to remain and dwell there, near the banks
of the Amâlah. They multiplied considerably, and by degrees, possibly by
further intermixture with the natives of the country, their appearance became,
in course of time, somewhat like the Tâziks, or Sarts, as they are also styled,
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religion; and, as from the extremity of the territories of

but, as they were not Tājziks [Can the term Sārīk—ساريک—or Sārīgh—ساريگ—applied to the Tājziks by the Turks, signifying poor-spirited and the like, be the derivation of Sārt? The Üzbaks call traders, and citizens, and people of the towns generally, Sarts, while others style them Būkhārs], those people styled them Turk-mānīnd, and Turk-mān, the both terminations, mānīnd and mān, signifying, like, similar, &c. In this tradition, Khwārazm or the northern tracts between the Sīhūn and the Jīhūn, and not Khwārasn, must be meant, because most authors agree that it was many centuries after the time assigned to Āghūz Khān before any Turk-māns made their appearance west of the Jīhūn or Oxus, which, by two channels, then fell into the Caspian. See note ⁶, page 374. Some traditions assert that the Turk-māns have neither connexion nor affinity with the Turks, and that they are altogether of a different race, which is tolerably correct, since they are not descended from Turk, but his brother.

The Kānkūlf tribes dwelt in the same tracts as the Turk-māns for some time, in the sandy desert, but, on a great movement among the latter, and some of them taking up their residence in towns and villages, the Kānkūlfīs left them, and pitched their tents about the Tālāğh river, and Issīgh-Kol, or the Issīgh Lake, but the greater part of those who continued there were massacred by the Chingis Khān on account of their relationship by marriage to the Khwārazmī Sulṭāns.

The movement of the Kārlīghs is connected with that of the Ghuzz already mentioned in note ⁶, page 374, which see.

The other tribes of the Turks, not being so much mixed up with the events of Western Asia and frontiers of Hind, at the period of our author's history, need not be referred to here, as the details would make this account much longer than necessary.

To return to Āghūz Khān. He, having returned to his original yūrat, "which was Kar-Tāgh and Ur-Tāgh," after his great expeditions and proposed conquests, gave a mighty feast, to which all the chiefs and principal men of all the tribes were summoned, and, at which, 90,000 sheep and 900 mares were consumed, besides other dainties, and a vast quantity of kāmīs, and other strong drinks. He assigned yūrats and names to all the different tribes [under his sway], made laws and regulations, and organized armies into the various divisions, as subsequently continued to be observed. He occupies much the same position and celebrity among the Mughal I-māk, as Jamshed among the I-rānis. According to Abū-l-Ghāzl, he was contemporary with Gaū-murt and his son Hūshang, but, as he said the very something previously with respect to Tūtag or Tūnag, son of Turk, we may doubt his accuracy upon other subjects.

One day, Āghūz Khān, attended by his six sons, went out on a hunting excursion, when the latter found a golden bow and three golden arrows which they brought to their father. He gave the bow to the three eldest, and the arrows to the three youngest. The former divided the bow into three portions, for which reason they were styled Bardz-ūkī—بارذیکی—and Baj-ūkī—باژیکی—from Bardz-ūk or Baj-ūk, which is said to mean "broken bow," but, more probably, "sharers of the broken bow;" and the three youngest were styled Üdz-ūkī—ویژکی—and Üj-ūkī—ویژکی—from Üdz-ūk or Üj-ūk, signifying "three arrows. On this account, the Bardz-ūkī are greater in degree than the Üdz-ūkī, in the same manner as the bow represents sovereignty, while the arrows refer to the
THE ṬABAḴĀT-I-NAṢIRĪ.

Chīn, Turkistān, Māwar-un-Nahr, Ṭukhāristān, Zāwul,

sovereign’s representatives and lieutenants. On all state occasions, and in war, the right hand, which the Turks call baranghār—ئرمار—or barankār—ئرمار—and the succession to the sovereignty, was assigned for ever to the Badzūḵī, and the left hand, or juwānghār—ئرمار—or juwānkār to the Üdz-ūḵī, with the lieutenancy and command of the soldiery.

After having ruled for 116 years, Āghūz Khān died, leaving the sovereignty to his eldest son, Kun or Kūn.

The six sons of Āghūz Khān are named: 1. Kun—کن—or Kūn—کن—which signifies sun, 2. Aē or Ā-ī—ای—moon, 3. Yal-duz—یل-دوز—Yūl-duz—یل-دووز—or I-yal-duz—یل-دووز star [See APPENDIX B, pages xi and xii. This is a complete answer to Mr. Blochmann’s “Contributions” as to “عين” —a moon—instead of yul—یل—and I-yul—یل—being contained in the name of I-yal-timish—یل-تیمش—and I-yal-timish—یل-تیمش &c., as well as in I-bak—یباق], who were the eldest or Badzūḵī; and 4. Kūk—کوک—or Kuk—کک—sky, 5. Tāk—تک—or Taḵ—تک—and Dāgh—دغ, [Turks use ṭ where Ajanīs use d, and substitute b where the latter use ṭ] mountain; and 6. Tingīz—ژی sea, but probably lake, and this name is still used for the great lake known as the Bāl Kagh, or the Tingīz.

From these six sons descended twenty-four sons, and, according to some historians, each had four sons, while some others say that each of the brothers had six sons, but this last seems an error. Abū-l-Ghāzī states that each of the six brothers had four legitimate sons, and also four natural sons, which appears from the very even numbers to be doubtful and improbable, and is totally contrary to other writers, thus making them forty-eight in all; but, farther on, he again contradicts his own words.

The Akbar Nāmah of Abū-l-Faṣl, contrary to all others, asserts that Āghūz’s sons and sons’ sons are twenty-four in all, and that “the whole of the Turk-māns” are descended from these patriarchs or great men. This statement does not give us a very favourable opinion of that writer’s knowledge of his subject, and, if all these six sons’ descendants were Turk-māns, where does he manage to get a Mughal pedigree for his master from? This is what my Akbar Nāmahs have: what other Akbar Nāmahs may contain I am unaware.

The Fanākatī says that “Ughūz Khān sent some of his sons and kinsmen, with a body of forces, into the parts more to the east, now called Mughalīstān,” which statement I shall have to refer to again farther on.

IV. Kun—کن—or Kūn—کن Khān, eldest son of Āghūz, succeeded his father. He ruled over an extensive territory, and acquired predominance over great part of Samārān, and died after a reign of eighty years, but some say seventy-three, and some seventy. By advice of his father’s old Wazīr, Kabal Khwājah, he made such wise arrangements that each of his brothers and their sons had an appanage conferred upon him, and the place and rank of every one was so specifically assigned that each knew his proper place and his share even to the portion of the sheep at meal times, and this tended to keep them all on a good understanding towards each other.

Abū-l-Ghāzī says he divided his territory among his brothers and “their twenty-four legitimate sons and natural sons.” He appears to have forgotten that, by his own previous account, four legitimate sons, and as many natural ones, belonged to Kun Khān himself. What he calls a division of dominions is, no doubt, what I have just previously mentioned.
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V. On the death of Kun Khān, his brother, Āz or Ā-i Khān, succeeded, and, after a long reign, was succeeded by his eldest son.

VI. Yal-duz—V01-duz or I-yal-duz During his rule the people of Mughalīstān were flourishing and prosperous. Abūl-Ghā́fīl, contrary to other writers, says he was not Āe Khān's brother of that name, but merely one of the same family, and says nothing of his being Āe Khān's son.

VII. Next succeeded Mangalī Khān—Jkí son of Yal-duz. He also made his people happy and prosperous, and died after a long reign. Some writers, however, do not even mention his name.

VIII. Tingīz Khān—Jk also written, according to the Tajik method of substituting j for g—Tingīz—Jk son of Mangalī, succeeded on the death of his father. A few writers are in doubts whether he was the son of Mangalī or not, but there can be no reasonable doubt on the subject. By some he is said likewise to have abandoned the just ways and customs of his ancestors, but the contrary seems the fact, and that he reigned worthily for a period of 1110 years over Mughalīstān, and then resigned the authority into the hands of his son, and retired from the world. Some say his rule extended to a period of 100 years, and some 102.

IX. I-yal Khān—Jk—but which may be, according to the vowel points that may be used with it, Iī Khān, son of Tingīz or Tingīz, succeeded to the chieftain-ship of the Mughal I-māk. His reign is a most important one in the annals of the descendants of Turk; and, at the period in question, Tūr, son of Farīdūn, sovereign of 'Ajam, ruled over [what the 'Arabs subsequently styled by the name of] Māwar-un-Nahr, and Turkīstān, which he had, it is said, lately reduced, and invaded I-yal Khān's territory with a numerous army. Invertebrate enmity had, long prior to this, arisen between the I-māk of Tattār and I-māk of Mughal, as previously mentioned, and Tūr succeeded in gaining over to his side Sūnī or Sundz Khān, the eighth chief of the Tattār dynasty, and his subjects, and the I-ghūrs, who were descended from another son of Mughal Khān, and had formed a separate tribe at an early date, and had now become a great nation, likewise aided Tūr. The confederates marched against I-yal Khān, but the tribes of the Mughal I-māk, being much attached to I-yal Khān, fought bravely in his defence, and a great number of Tattārs and I-ghūrs and followers of Tūr were slain in the conflict which ensued, and were pursued for two farsakhs by the Mughals; but victory was soon turned into defeat. The retreat of the confederates was a mere ruse, and, the Mughals having left their strong position and broken their array to pursue them, the confederates faced about—some say the confederates did not renew the attack until next day, when they fell upon them unawares—and entirely overthrew them, put the whole of them to the sword, and made a general massacre of the Mughal people, in such wise that, with the exception of Kān—Jk—son of I-yal Khān, and Nagūz—Jk—son of I-yal's maternal uncle, and their two wives who were sisters, and all four of whom chose to be without the camp at the time, not a soul escaped of the whole Mughal I-māk.

This event is said to have happened 1000 years after the time of Āghūz Khān. At this rate, his five successors must have reigned 200 years each on the average, and it is therefore evident that, either what are termed rulers are the names of dynasties, or that only the names of the most celebrated of their chiefs or sovereigns have been handed down to posterity, or the thousand years must mean from the time of Yāfīs, not Āghūz.
the Jazīrah, Anbār, Sijistān, Mūkrān, Kirmān, Fārs.

At this point, the Fanākatf, who gives but a very brief notice of the Chingiz Khān's ancestors, seems quite at sea. He says nothing whatever about Āghūz Khān's five successors, but states that, "after Īgūz had conquered many countries, and had become firmly established, he despatched some of his sons and kinsmen, with other persons, and a body of forces into the east, into the parts now, i.e. in his time, called Mughalīstān [only Īgūz himself was ruler of Mughalīstān as his forefathers had been before him], and, after a period of 4000 years, one among the Badshāhs of Khitāe began to make expeditions against those peoples, crossed the Kairā Mūrān or Black River, made a night attack upon them, and massacred the whole [of the males], and carried off into captivity their women and children. Of that people, but two persons, named Nāgūz and Kāīān, with their families, fled into the mountain tract which they call Irganah—\( \text{\textit{I}} \)—in one copy, and Iarkanah Kāīān—\( \text{\textit{K}} \)—in another, entered it, and there continued to dwell for a period of 400 years, during which time they increased to such degree that that tract became too confined for them," &c.

This statement of his is simply impossible, because, if it were only those peoples sent into the east, into what in the writer's time was called "Mughalīstān," by Īgūz, under "some of his sons and kinsmen," that were massacred, what became of the parent stock of the Mughals over whom Īgūz reigned? They too must have also increased immensely during 4000 years. How is it that he says nothing about them? He has turned two events into one, and the last part of his statement is the account of the extermination of the Mughal I-māk related above, and the former refers to a great massacre of the Jalā-īr tribe by the Khaṭāi-is in after years, as will be presently related.

There is little to be gathered from the traditional history of Ḥārān respecting these events, and the little that is mentioned is contradictory of the Mughal accounts. Careful comparison of the voluminous traditions of the two peoples might throw some light upon these occurrences, and some day I may attempt it. According to the Ḥārāni accounts, however, Faridūn divided his dominions among his sons, and gave Turān—not all Asia east of the Oxus, as modern writers appear to assume—the capital of which is Kashghar, and part of which tract was afterwards called Mawar-un-Nāhī by the 'Arabs, Khuras, and Sākūsh, to Tur, and Turān is so named after him. Some of the Ḥārāni chronicles relate that the Turks are of the seed of Tur, and that Afrasiyih [who is certainly styled "the Turk"] by the 'Ajamīs was his great grandson, and that he ruled over the countries east of the Jīlūn, from the limits of Hind to the frontier of the Turks.

Our author, Minhāj-ul-Dīn, in his account of the Ḥārāni or 'Ajamī kings, also says that Afrasiyab was third in descent from Turk, and that his father was Sunj—\( \text{\textit{S}} \)—which is much the same name as that of Sunj—\( \text{\textit{S}} \)—Khān, the VIIIth of the Tāttār I-māk, which may also be written Sunj, without the long \( \text{\textit{a}} \).

But, as all this happened 1000 years—taking the most moderate period—after Īgūz Khān, and as Faridūn, father of Tur, was contemporary, they say, with the patriarch Ibrahīm, who was born in his reign, Īgūz Khān must, according to those chronicles, have flourished very far back indeed, and anterior to Nūh's flood.

Abū-l-Ghāfīr, whose history, as previously mentioned, is the most modern of those named at the beginning of this account, relates these events differently.
Khūzistān, the Diyār-i-Bakr, and Mauṣil, as far as the

He says that I-yal or Il Khān and Sūndz Khān were continually at war with each other, and the former was always victorious, but it must be remembered that Abū-l-Ghāzī sprang from the Mughal I-māk. Sūndz Khān had therefore to seek aid from the Khān of Karkir or Karkez, who was a very powerful ruler, and he also worked so much upon other tribes, the neighbours of I-yal Khān, that they too combined with him. I-yal Khān, in consequence, took up a very advantageous position which he strengthened so much, that the confederates were unable to force it, but, having placed their best soldiers in ambush, pretended flight, to draw the Mughals from their stronghold.

The rest agrees with what has been already stated, and Kar-kez or Kar-kiz is evidently a mistake for Khar-khez— خرکه —also written Khar-kher— خرکه —of the I-ghūrs, which is generally used in conjunction with Tungū in the history of the Chingiz Khān. Abū-l-Ghāzī however mentions, with regard to those who escaped the massacre, that they were taken captive by the Tāttārs, but, subsequently, escaped from the solitary guard placed over them. The Khān of Kar-kez or Kar-kiz, in this account, would seem to be meant for Tūr of the I-tānī authors.

Abū-l-Ghāzī however constantly falls into error, for, after having given this account of the destruction of the Mughals by the Tāttārs, he, in another place, makes “the tribe of Tāttārs” an entirely new subject, as though another, and distinct tribe. See also the translation of that work:—”History of the Turks, Moguls, and Tartars,” page 38, vol. i. London, mdcxxx.

Mīrā Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, otherwise Mīrā Muḥammad Ḥaidar, son of Muḥammad Ḥusain, Doghlat, who preceded Abū-l-Ghāzī, Bahādur Khān, by about a century, says, that the country and tribes of Mughalistān had become so utterly ruined and dispersed a hundred years or more before his time even—he wrote in 951 H.—that not a sign or trace remained of men capable of writing history, and mentions this as the reason of his own inability to furnish better accounts of them than he has done. I mention this to show that Abū-l-Ghāzī, although he did possess eighteen books on the subject—including the Tārīkh-i-Ghāzānī—written by Turks and Tājziks, preferred, it seems, rather to collect oral traditions, many centuries old, than refer to his written authorities.

Abū-l-Faḍl, the author of the Akbar Nāmah, who conceals everything that he fancies does not tend to the glorification of his master, Akbar, smooths over this total overthrow and almost extinction of the Mughal-I-māk, from which his master traces his descent, gives a cock and bull story to begin with, and says that, “after putting Tūr, and Sūndz Khān, and the I-ghūrs to flight, they played the part of the fox upon the Mughals,” and winds up with excuses and apologies for the disaster, where none are required, and the uction of consolation that it was “all for the best,” &c., &c. If the Mughals had been the triumphant party, what a flourish of trumpets we should have been treated to!

Thus it was then that the Mughal I-māk was exterminated, with the exception of two males, Kāinān and Nagūz, and two females, their wives, and, hence, all Mughals whatsoever are descended from them—with the exception of those of the I-māk who followed the uncles of Āghūz into the farther east, according to the traditions contained in some works—and are not Tāttārs, although they are, by descent, Turks.

From what has just been stated, and what has been previously mentioned, it will now be clearly seen why such hostility existed—and continues to exist to
boundaries of Rūm and Shām, fell into the hands of the

this day—between the Turks of the Tāttār Ī-māḵ, from that time known in
the writings of Oriental historians under the general name of Turks as
well as Tāttārs, and the descendants of the two Mughals who escaped this
general massacre, and who were destined to become the progenitors of that
sanguinary conqueror, the Chingiz Khān. This enmity, doubtless, burnt in the
breasts of himself and his tribe, when he invaded and attacked the dominions
of Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, besides the provocation he had received
through the treatment of his envoys and merchants, that Sultan being a
Turk of the Tāttār Ī-māḵ, and also allied to them by marriage.

We cannot fail to perceive the same enmity existing from the pages of our
author. The great Turk Maliks of the Dihlī kingdom, and the Dihlī sovereigns,
were Turks of the Tāttār Ī-māḵ, and, consequently, natural foes of the
Mughal Ī-māḵ, and our author, probably taking the cue from his patrons,
invariably styles the latter the "infidel Mughals," and hence too the refusal of
Sultan, I-yal-timish, to hold any communication with the emissaries of
the Mughal Khān, the descendants of the Chingiz Khān, and of Bārakān Khān
in particular, although he was a Musalmān like himself, and his emissaries
likewise were of the same faith, and the Sultan's sending them to the fortress
of Gwāliyūr; and afterwards, by command of his daughter, Sultan Raḥiyyat,
they were confined at Kinnair, beyond which city they were not allowed to
go, and there they subsequently died, as will be found farther on. Ulugh
Khān's own tribe—the Ilbari—too had to fly before the Mughals when they
acquired predominance over Turkistan, and the tribes of Khafchaḵ, and his
little brother, afterwards the Amīr-i-Hājīb of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd
Shāh, fell into the hands of the Mughals, and was sold by them as a slave, as
previously related, at page 800, which see.

The same natural enmity probably influenced Timūr in some way, in after
years, in his hostility towards the Uṣmānī Sultan, Bāyazid, for Timūr was of
the Mughal Ī-māḵ, and of the royal tribe of the Mughals, whilst Bāyazid was
of the Tāttār Ī-māḵ. To call a Turk, or a Tāttār Turk, a Mughal was the
greatest insult that could be offered him, or to call a Mughal a Tāttār, but
several European writers have held peculiar ideas respecting these two Ī-māḵs.
I extract the following as a specimen, from a work entitled "Travels in the
Steppes of the Caspian Sea, the Crimea, the Caucasus," &c., by Xavier Hom-
maire de Hell. London, 1847.

"Perhaps no people has given occasion to more discussions than the Tatârs
and Mongols, nor is the problem of their origin completely solved in our day,
notwithstanding the most learned investigations. Some admit that the Tatârs
and Mongols formed but one nation, others allege that they are two essentially
different races. According to Lesvèque, DiHerbelot, and Lesur, the Tatârs
are but Turks. Klaproth, while he asserts that the Tatârs and Mongols spring
from the same stock, nevertheless regards the White Tatârs whom Genghis
[Chingiz?] Khân conquered, as Turks."

The first three authors mentioned were quite correct in their statements, and
Klaproth is both right and wrong, for his "white Tatârs," like all other Tâttârs,
are undoubtedly Turks. The statement of D'Ollsson is the most astonishing,
and totally incorrect:—"Lastly, D'Ollsson, in his remarkable history of the
Mongols, treats the Mongols and Tatârs as distinct races, but does not admit
the theory [1] of the Turkish origin."

The writer continues:—"The same uncertainty, that hangs over the Mon-
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infidel Mughals, and not a trace of the Muḥammadan
gol and Tatar hordes of the fourteenth century, prevails with regard to the
people who, under the name of Tatars, now dwell in the southern part of the
Russian empire; and they have been considered sometimes as descendants of
the Turkish tribes that occupied those regions previously to the twelfth century,
sometimes as remnants of the conquering Mongol Tatars."

This last compound is an utterly impossible name. There is no uncertainty,
and no theory, whatever, in the matter, as might have been seen had the
Oriental writers been correctly read, and the difference between the Turks of
the two I.-māks of Tātār and Mughal been properly understood. I hope I
have clearly demonstrated the fact now, because, according to compilers of
Indian history, who merely draw their inspirations from Dow, Briggs, and
some few others, the Turks with other wholly different races have formed
their "Pathan or Afghan Dynasties," so-called—the "Dehli Pathans," "Jownpoore Pathans," "Ghūrī Pathans," "Khilji Pathans," "Tughluk Pathans," &c., of the Oriental Congress of 1874—and which fantastic names, I am later informed, signify, or, are meant to signify, "Pre-Mughal"
dynasties!

The same writer continues to show into what a state of utter confusion this
simple genealogy has been thrown by the writers themselves:—"The Chinese
writers for the first time make mention of the Tatar people in the eighth cen-
tury of our era, under the name of Tata, and consider them as a branch of the
Mongols. The general and historian, Meng Koung [Klaproth: Asia Poly-
giotta], who died in 1246, and who commanded a Chinese force sent to aid
the Mongols against the Kin, informs us in his memoirs that a part of the Tatar
horde, formerly dispersed or subdued by the Khitans [who, in the same work,
are said to have occupied the country north of the Chinese provinces of Tschy
Li and Ching Ching, watered by the Charamuin [Karā Murān?], or Liao Ho
and its confluent], quitted the In Chan mountains, where they had taken refuge,
and joined their countrymen who dwelt north-east of the Khitans. The white
Tatars and the savage or black Tatars then formed the most important tribes of
those regions." Here undoubtedly the issuing forth of the descendants of
Kaian and Nagūz is referred to, which I shall presently mention.

The author continues in the same strain, making similar blunders, while the
truth lies under his very nose, but he fails to see it, and here is a very rich specimen:
—"The princes of this empire [Kaptschak—Khachk?] were Mongols or Tatars,
but the majority of their subjects were Turks"! He also states, taking his
information from different European writers, that "Genghis Khan, though born
in the tribe especially designated as black Tatars, yet adopted the denomination of
Mongols for his people," and "that the appellation Tatar lost all signification in
Asia under the destroying power of Ghenghis (sic) Khan, and has ever since
existed only in the European vocabulary."

The writer of this last marvellously incorrect statement also asserts that "the
word Tatar owes its origin only to a jeu de mots of which St. Louis was the
author." Perhaps St. Louis stood god-father to Tätār the son of Alanjah, and
gave him that name.

The assertion that the Chingiz Khān was "a black Tatar," and adopted the
denomination of "Mongols" or Mughals for his people is, as I have already
shown, and shall show still more farther on, totally and utterly incorrect, and
for that, as well as the other incorrect assertions contained in this book, and
its author's authorities, respecting the Turks, Tattārs, and Mughals, I challenge
Maliks and Sultāns of Islām remained in these countries—

any one to show me a single proof in any Muḥammadan, or in any Asiatic, writer whatever.

I notice, and, I must say, with utter surprise, that much the same erroneous ideas are put forward in “AN ANCIENT HISTORY from the Earliest Records to the Fall of the Western Empire, by Philip Smith, B.A., one of the principal contributors to the Dictionaries of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, and Geography,” published in 1868, and which has gone through several editions. He says [vol. iii., page 737]:—

“Sober criticism has cast more than a doubt upon the romantic story, originated by Des Guignes and adorned by the pen of Gibbon, which seeks in wars upon the frontiers of China the remote cause of the appearance of the Huns in Europe in the former part of the fourth century. It is quite true that the people belonged to that great Turanian race, known to the Greeks as Scythians, and in modern times as Tartars,” &c., &c.

No “romantic story” originated with Des Guignes; he merely related what he found in the history of the people he wrote about, and who, at least, may be allowed to have known their own history and traditions better than a Greek who wrote down what he heard from illiterate soldiers, and the often idle tales of traders.

In a foot-note he says: “The extension of this from a specific to a generic name is due to the prominent place occupied by the Tatars of Eastern Mongolia in the army of Zingis (or Genghis) Khan: and the common corruption into Tartars is ascribed to a pun of St. Louis... As the name of Tatar is even more specific than that of Mongol, it were to be wished that ethnologists would follow the practice of the Greeks, and use Scythians for the generic name.”

If ethnologists were to do so, they would commit a terrible blunder. The error of asserting that the name of Tattār—which appears in the earliest of the Muḥammadan writers—is modern, is not greater than the assertion that they owed the name “to the prominent place they occupied in the army of Zingis (or Genghis) Khan.”

“The Tatars of Eastern Mongolia” did not occupy “a prominent place in the army of Zingis (or Genghis);” but the Mughal I-māk did; and the Tattārs contained in it, who were comparatively few, had been compelled, by the Chingiz Khān, to join him.

Again [page 738]: “The Scythians are divided into four great races.—1. The Mongolians are the least numerous, though many writers apply their name to the whole family, in consequence of the fame of their chief Zingis Khan. 2. The Tungusian race... 3. The Ugric race... 4. The Turkish race occupied not only the great region of West Central Asia from the Lake Baikal to the Caspian, which the progress of Russia is fast depriving of the name of Independent Tartary; but they extended over the vast steppes of south-eastern Europe, round the northern sides of the Caspian, the Caucasus, and the Euxine. Their precise partition from the Slavonian race is a difficult problem,” &c., &c.

Their “precise partition from the Slavonian race” is no “difficult problem” whatever. In the Scythians so-called, we have clearly included the whole of the descendants of Yāfīs’ sons, as given in the fourth para. of this account of them. The localities of the Turkish races are wrongly given, and most of the tracts mentioned above were peopled by the descendants of other sons of Yāfīs, more particularly of Bulghar, ancestor of the Bulgarians, Sāk-lāb, of the Slavonians,
the Almighty's mercy be upon them, and may He long pre-

and Rūs, of the Russians. It is something new to hear the name of "Mongolians," who "are the least numerous," applied to the whole race of Scythians.

The writer continues in a similar strain, and we are at length told that the name "Decebalus" is "strange to Gothic, strange to Slavonic, not strange to Turkish history," but the writer would have had some little difficulty to name any Turkish history in which such a name occurs; and Darius and Herodotus are also quoted to prove such statements as these, but which the authors who wrote in the country of the Turks, Tattārs, and Mughals, and with many tribes of those people dwelling around them, would simply ridicule.

After this long, but necessary, digression, I return to the subject of the Mughal I-māk.

The reason why we possess much greater information respecting the Mughal I-māk is owing to their overwhelming successes and conquests, and because nearly all authors who have written on the subject were subjects of the Mughal rulers, and their object was to trace their descent more particularly, but the main facts are not concealed—they merely gave more attention to the history of the Mughals. It is to be regretted however that we have no detailed accounts of the movements of the tribes of the Tattār I-māk and their rulers, after the time of Sūndz Khān, the eighth of the Tattār dynasty herein mentioned, who, with the aid of his allies, nearly exterminated the whole Mughal race; but, from what may be gathered from Oriental history, and as shown in this Translation, the Tattār I-māk, the offshoots of the descendants of the seven chieftains preceding Sūndz Khān, also formed, like preceding offshoots of the descendants of Turk, in the course of time, great independent tribes who are correctly styled Tattārs, as well as those springing from Tattār Khān and his descendants, the whole being undoubtedly Turks, or, in other words, all those who do not spring from the Mughal I-māk, and are not descended from Mughal Khān—Tattār's brother—being correctly styled Tattārs, and others, not springing in a direct line from Tattār Khān, but from others, the offshoots of his ancestors, being properly called Turks.

All these formed mighty tribes and nations, the names of some of which have been herein mentioned, and some formed great empires, like as did the Seljūks, Khwārazmīs, and others. The early Musalmāns made raids upon them, and the Khalīfahs also, from a very early period, entertained numbers of Turks and Tattār I-māk in their service, but we never hear of Mughals being entertained by them. There is no doubt that their taking service under the Khalīfahs and their great vassals, many of whom were their own countrymen, considerably tended to the greater civilization of the Turks and Tattārs, and their early conversion to the Musalmān faith, but, with regard to others not converted, it is evident that feuds arose among them and that Musalmān merchants carried on a large traffic in Turkish slaves.

The four persons, two males—Kajān, son of I-yal-Khān, and Nagūz, his maternal uncle's son, with their respective sisters, their wives—the Timūr Nāmah says two females, sisters, who, at this juncture, they took to wife—having escaped the slaughter of their people, secured some of their effects, and as soon as night set in, they mounted horses, and made for the mountains which were some distance off. They also collected some of the stray cattle and flocks which they met with in their flight, and reached the mountains—some say, the next morning—entered them by a narrow track, scarcely distinguishable, made by the wild animals haunting it, and which was almost inaccessible, from rocks
serve the Nāṣiriah dynasty!—I desired to record in writing
and forests, and proceeded onwards for a long distance among its mazes until
they reached a more open country where was plenty of pasture. At some dis-
tance, farther off, they perceived a still higher range, the sides of which, bare
and barren, appeared to be of flint alone, and which towered upwards like a
vast fortress. With much difficulty they ascended it, and to their great joy
found themselves in a delightful tract of country, well watered, with plenty of
rich pasture, and abounding with game, and there they resolved to take up
their dwelling. This higher range is called Irgānah Kū or Kūn—أرجن
أو كن—irgānah being said to signify a valley, and كن or Kūn a steep ascent or
height—the valley [or table-land?] surrounded by hills, or valley of precipices.
The mountains referred to are evidently those mighty ranges towards the
sources of the Sālingah and its upper tributaries.
In this place of residence Kāiān and Nagūz flourished, and in the course of
time their posterity multiplied, and separated into several branches under
different names. The descendants of Kāiān are styled Kāiāt—قياس—and
those of Nagūz, Dūrāl-gīn or Dūr-la-gīn—دورالجین—or Dūrā-gīn or Dūr-la-gīn
درالجین. After a considerable period, which most of the works I have quoted
do not pretend to fix, their writers moreover stating that no chronicler is
cognizant of it, but which the Fanāḵat, who is followed by Abū-l-Ḡāzī, says,
was over 400 years, the tribes of Kāiāt and Dūrāl-gīn had increased to such
degree that the country about Irgānah-Kūn was insufficient to afford them sub-
sistence. They therefore resolved to leave it, and seek the encamping-grounds
which they had heard, through tradition, their ancestors had formerly possessed,
and they entered the old country of the Mughal I-māk accordingly.
Abū-l-Fažl, the author of the Akbar Namah, however, makes a very bold
guess indeed, and has the assurance to fix the period at “about 2000 years.”
—This is almost as absurd as the Fanāḵat’s 4000 years previously referred to—
He has mixed up the account of the I-ḵūrs with that of Kāiāt and Dūrāl-gīn,
and hence this assumption. He also asserts that this migration took place at
the end of the reign of Nūshirwān, the Just, ruler of I-rān [A.D. 521—579],
and “supposes” that the art of writing and reading did not exist. He also
states that, during that period of “nearly 2000 years,” while they dwelt in
Irgānah-Kūn, twenty-five persons “reigned,” which would give over eighty
years’ reign to each; but most of the other writers I have compiled this account
from, with the exception of Abū-l-Ḡāzī, say nothing about any previous
rulers, while some others distinctly state that they obeyed no single chief, until
the period when the chief authority over the different tribes fell to I-yal-dūz,
son of Mangāf.
At the time that the descendants of Kāiān and Nagūz determined upon
issuing from Irgānah-Kūn, the chieflain-ship had fallen to Yal-Doz—dal—ر
or Yool-Doz—ووولدوز—Khan, son of Mangāf Khān, [styled Mangāf Khwājah, by some], son of Tīmūr-Tash, of the race of Kāiān,
and he was a chieflain of considerable power and dignity. In this matter all
agree except Abū-l-Ḡāzī, who states that, when they issued from Irgānah-
Kūn, their chief was named Bartazinah [بترذین], and gives names of seven
other chiefs before he reaches that of Tīmūr-Tash, Mangāf Khān, and Yul-
dūz or I-yal-dūz, but gives no account of them beyond their succeeding and
dying. This however we cannot credit, since, in the account of the Chingiz
Khān, almost immediately after, he says, that, while dwelling in Irgānah-Kūn,
the Mughals were in total ignorance of the names of the rulers, but that they
an account of these occurrences, from the beginning of the

were certainly Kāfāts, and, since the books of the Mughals contain nothing certain on this head, he is obliged to leave a gap in this place!

At this point the different writers I have been quoting mention the boundaries and limits of the Mughal country—Mughalistan. “It lies,” they say, “a long way east, and far from cultivated countries, and is seven or eight months’ journey (in extent),” some say it is a year’s journey. The Mughals lived in forests and wilds, their food was from the animals of the chase, and the produce of their flocks and herds, and their garments the skins thereof. The extreme eastern limit was the frontier of Khitā, on the west it adjoined the country of the I-ghurs. On the north it extended as far as the country of the Kirghiz—[the Akbar Nāmah has Fārghānā which is S.] which is also written Kirghiz—[and Kirīz, Kiriz, and Kiriz—being interchangeable, and Sālingāc—[the country towards the River Sālingah is evidently meant here], and south it reached to the frontiers of Tibbat. Our author [page 273] says the forces of the Chingiz Khān had to undertake a three months’ march through “the wilderness,” or steppe, from the place where he assembled his host on hearing of the massacre of his emissaries and merchants by the Khwārazmīs, to enable them to reach the Utrār frontier.

The country of the I-ghurs is described as containing two great ranges of mountains, one of which they call Karā-Tū, and the other, Uskūn-Lūj, and the mountain (range?) of Karā-Kuram lies between these two ranges. The residence built by Üktāe Ka’tān near it is named after this koh of Karā-Kuram. To the south of these two great ranges, before named, is another which they style Kūt-Tagh. Out of one of these ranges ten rivers flow, and out of the other nine; and, in ancient times, the I-ghurs dwelt along the banks of these rivers. Those who dwell on the ten [zin] rivers were called Un-I-ghurs, and those who were located on the nine [zuk], Tokūz-I-ghurs. There were some other tribes dwelling near them, but space forbids my going into farther detail here.

Mīrāz Muḥammad Ḥaidar, of the Doghliāf tribe of the Mughals, previously mentioned, a native of Fārghānāh, in his work, written in 951 H., explains the southern boundary as extending towards Tungūt or Tungūt, and the northern to Kirā-Kīr, the Kirīz or Kirghiz of others. He adds [I only give a brief abstract] that of “these four boundaries, mentioned in the Jahān Kūshāe of the Juwainī, the country of Khitāe is distinct and known, but, as regards the I-ghūr country, nothing is known of it at present as to where it is, and, at this day, nothing is known of Karā-Kīr or Sālingāc, and no places with such names are indicated. The name of Tungūt often occurs in the history of the Mughals, and the Chingiz Khān, at the outset of his power, dispatched an army thither, but now nothing whatever is known of it, nor is information to be obtained regarding these parts which are mentioned in books, and the same may be said of many famous cities such as Bīlāsā-ghūn, Ṭarāz, and the like.”

He further states, that “the extent of Mughulīstān, so called in his time, which was much contracted from what it had been [and which is styled Jatah in the History of Tīmūr], was seven or eight months’ journey in length and breadth, and gives following as its boundaries. On the N. the Kokjah Tīnglās-Bom-Labas or Labs—[and Karā-Tāl—S. the territory of Fārghānāh, Kāshghar, Akīs, Jālīsh, and Tūrfān. On the E. it adjoins the land of the Kālīmāk-[the Kāl 1-māk? this is not the name
irruption of that race, and domination of that nation, up to
of the people, but merely their nickname] which is the Pāras or Pārs-Kol—
[also the name of a tract of country] and the Pāras-Kol is its eastern limit; and the W.
boundary is the territory of Turkistān and Taškand [the Altān or Golden
Mountains, the northern boundary of Taškand]. The writer was himself
well acquainted with its southern boundary, and, respecting the other three,
obtained his information from persons who had visited, and were acquainted
with them, and Mughulistān consists entirely of mountains and plains [steppe]."
What he himself saw of it, he says, he cannot find words to praise sufficiently,
and that, from the accounts of others, the other parts are equally delightful, but
the winters are cold. "Mughulistān," he says, "has several rivers, like unto
the Jīhūn and Siḥūn in size and extent, such as the I-lah—۲۱—I-mil—۲۱—I-
Irtaš—Jūžlik—I-wīl—Nārīn—all of which, in respect of volume, are not less than the Jīhūn and Siḥūn. These waters mostly fall into
the Kokjah-Tīngīz, which is a Kol or Lake Bāk-Kol [the Baikal Lake of
our maps] between Mughulistān and Uzbekistān. Its length is eight months’
[weeks’?] journey, and its width, in some places, by computation, is thirty
farsaks, and, when it is frozen in the winter, the Üzbeks pass over it, and
enter Mughulistān. The Issīg-Kol is also in Mughulistān."
Bābar however, who preceded Mīrzā Muḥammad Haidar, a few years, says
that Almālıgh, Almati, and Utrār, lay north of Farghanah, but that they had
been laid waste by the Üzbeks.
Abū-I-Ghāzi says the true Mughal country contains two ranges of very lofty
mountains [which are plainly shown on the best maps of Central Asia] extend-
ing from east to west, and between these two ranges, nearest to the west, is
the true country of the Mughals. Still more west lay the country of the
I-gūrs. This description agrees with that given by other authors in the
account of Karā Khān [page 875], and those two great ranges ... mountains
have been already named.
To return to the descendants of Kaiān and Naqūz. They, having deter-
minted to issue from Irgānah-Kūn, thought of doing so by the same route or
defile by which their ancestors had entered it, but they found it impossible. The
pass had been destroyed by an earthquake, and no trace of it remained. They
searched about in all directions, and at last they found one spot which seemed
easier than any other, but it was impeded by a hill in which was a mine of
iron [iron-stone rock], and to enable them to get out they split the
rocks by means of fire [Hannibal used vinegar in the Alps], and succeeded in
making a practicable route. The tribe of Kungkurāt or Kunghrūrāt, as it is
also written, led the way out, and were in such haste to do so that they are said,
in the tradition, to have burnt their feet. The Majāmī-ul-Khiyār distinctly
states that this event took place some time after the 200th year of the Hijrah.
This is improved upon by Petis de la Croix, in his "Life of Gengh'īzau the
Great," page 6, who says that the Cayat [Kaiāt?] derived their name "from a
certain people who lived in the remotest Northern Parts of Mogolistan which
were called Cayat, because their Chief had heretofore erected a Foundry for
Iron-work in a mountain called Arkenekom, which gained them a great Reput-
tation, and made this Branch of the Moguls highly esteemed, by the great
advantage all the Moguls Country received from this Invention; they therefore
called these people the Arkenekom-Smiths." This is history with a
vengeance!
the year 658 H., when this work was brought to a conclusion,

Their former country had been in the meantime occupied by tribes of the Ṭāṭār ʿI-māk, and other Turks, and the Mughals fought with them, and drove them out. The former, consequently, had to seek other tracts. Some went away to the eastward, while others went west, and south, and north; and, about this period, we find a great movement among the Saljuqs and the Ghuzz in a south-westerly direction. Those tribes of the Mughal ʿI-māk which left Ughūz Khān’s country, as previously related, and had gone towards the borders of Ḍaḥ and sought the protection of the Ṭāṭār, now returned, and rejoined the tribes of Ḥaṭṭāt and Dūrul-ḡīn, while some other small tribes, but of which ʿI-māk is not mentioned, which submitted to Yal-ṭūz or I-ṭal-ṭūz Khān, were permitted to dwell in his newly acquired territory.

According to the Fanākait the name Mughūl or Mughūl is the appellative or generic name applied to those who came out of Ḫīgān-Ḵūn, and to the others of that ʿI-māk who rejoined and continued to dwell with them, and that name commenced to be used respecting them from this period, but they had been known, centuries before, as Turks of the Mughūl ʿI-māk, by his own account.

Some writers who approach this subject from the “Mongol” point of view, and who, unable to read the originals for themselves, imagine that every author who wrote in the Persian language must necessarily be a Persian, and, consequently, cannot know anything of Mughal or Mughūl history, because such a word as “Mongol” is not to be found in their works, hug themselves with the idea that the History written by the “great Raschid” may contain something in support of their crude ideas. For the information of such I here append the headings of the first four Sections of Rasḥīd-ud-Dīn’s History of the Mughūls, as he styles them, and which was compiled from the Āltān Daftar, or Golden Record, and other authorities:—

“First Section.—History of the tribes of Aḥūz, who was the great grandson of ʿAlmine Ḫān, son of Turk, son of Yāfgh, son of Nūḥ, the Prophet, and of the tribes descended from his uncles, with an account of their genealogy and ramifications.

Second Section.—Account of the Turk tribes whom they designate by the name of Mughūls, but every one of which, in ancient times, bore distinct and particular surnames, and have had Sar-wars and Amīrs over them.

Third Section.—Account of the Turk tribes, every one of which have had Bāḏaḵāns and Chiefs, but who bore no relationship to the tribes mentioned in the preceding Sections. [This is a paradox, even from his own words, because, being Turks, they naturally bore relationship to the Turks as descendants from a common ancestor.]

Fourth Section.—Account of the tribes of Turks, whose surname from time immemorial was Mughūl; and this Section is in two parts. 1. Account of the Dūrul-ḡīn Mughūls. 2. Account of the Nairūn Mughūls. [The author cannot be right, for has not Mr. H. H. Howorth, in the Geographical Magazine for November, 1876, declared that Mongols are not Turks? This may be correct with regard to “Mongols,” but scarcely so with respect to Rasḥīd-ud-Dīn’s Mughūls.]”

The next Section treats of the ancestors of the Chingiz Ḫān.

Every year, when the anniversary of that day comes round on which the Ḥaṭṭāt and Dūrul-ḡīn came out of Ḫīgān-Ḵūn, the Mughūls keep it as a great festival, and on the night thereof the Mughal soverigns have the implements of the blacksmith brought in, place a piece of iron in the fire, and heat it, and,
and in order that that which I myself witnessed, and what

when hot, beat it on an anvil with a hammer, in commemoration of opening the way out, and this custom, imperfectly understood by Ibn Batūthah, and others, led them probably to make the absurd statement that the Chingiz Khān, or Tamur-chī, "was in his outset a blacksmith in the country of Khīṭā"!

Other authors say that all who can trace their descent to Kāiūn or Nagūz—Kāiūts and Dūrul-ghūs—are considered true Mughals.

On the death of Yal-duz or I-yal-dūz his son succeeded to his authority.

Jū-ināh—جوینہ—and, by some few writers, Chūbīnāh—چوبنیہ—and Khū-ināh—خوینہ—and even خیرام, but these two last forms are erroneous without doubt, particularly the last, succeeded his father, Yal-dūz or I-yal-dūz, in the chieftain-ship, but the Tā'rīkh-i-Jahān-gīr does not account him as a ruler, and makes Jū-ināh's daughter next in succession to Yal-duz or I-yal-dūz. The Tā'rīkh-i-Ghāzī, which Aḥū-ī-Ghāzī also quotes, differs considerably from other writers. It states that Yal-duz or I-yal-dūz had two sons named Bākjādī or Bāgījādī—بکجیدی—and Bilkdaqī or Bilgadaqī—بلقیدی—and according to Rāshid-ud-Dīn, the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh, Nūsh-Tīgīn-i-Gharjāh, the founder of the Khwārazmī empire, claimed descent from Āghūz through this very Bilkdaqī or Bilgadaqī. See note 3 to page 231, para. 4; but these names are somewhat doubtfully written and may not be quite correct. According to the same authority, both died before him, and he gave to the son of one of them, named Do-yūn or Dōl-ūn Bāyān—دوبن بابن—or Do-yūn Bāyān—which is also written Dūbūn—دوبن—Diyūn—ديیون—and in other ways, the daughter of the other son, who was named Ālān-Kuwa, a damsels of great beauty and talent, in marriage. Aḥū-ī-Ghāzī however differs from the preceding this much that he says the husband of Ālān-Kuwa, who was Yal-dūz's grandson, did not succeed to the sovereignty because he had not attained the age of thirty, and died soon after his father, leaving two sons—named as above—by Ālān-Kuwa; and that she acted as regent only, while others say that her husband was chief over some few ulūs, and that the Turks generally were under various independent chiefs.

The Tā'rīkh-i-Jahān-gīr however says that Ālān-Kuwa was given in marriage by her father, Jū-ināh, to her uncle's son, as stated by the others, and that, by him, she had two sons named Bilgadaqī or Bilgadaqī and Bākjādī or Bāgījādī, and after his death she assumed the sovereignty and occupied herself in the nurture of her two sons. At this time she dwelt near the upper sources of the Kalūr-Ān river.

Ālān-Kuwa—الان قووا—which is also written Ālān-Kū wā′—الان قووا′—and Ālān-Kuwān—الان كعوان—on the death of her father, her husband being dead, was entrust with the direction of affairs until such time as her eldest son should become of age to succeed; but, in the meantime, although she refused to marry again, whilst lying asleep upon her couch, on a certain occasion, a mysterious light entered through the hole in the top of the felt tent and enveloped her, and the light passed through her mouth, penetrated her, and she conceived. This mysterious light came more than once, such was her story; and, as matters could no longer be concealed, it was made known unto her tribe, who reviled her, and refused to believe her story. Some writers state that she asked some of the chief persons of her tribe to keep watch, and satisfy themselves of the truth of what she had stated, and that some did so, and found her story correct, and the tribe were satisfied.

This is not much like the "story of the incarnation of the Buddha Saky-
I became cognizant of from the accounts of trustworthy

muni" as a recent writer asserts, considering that the husband of his mother [who had never consummated her marriage with her husband] was, according to Chinese belief, ruler of Kasghmir, and that his birth took place 1222 years before the Christian era, while the Hindūs, on the other hand, give a different account of his birth.

This story of Alān-Kuwā is related somewhat differently by nearly every author, including Abū-I-Ghāzf, but I have no space for the various versions here. Abū-I-Faqīl, however, for the glorification of his master, according to his usual unctuous system of flattery, compares this circumstance to the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mother of our Blessed Saviour.

In due time, Alān-Kuwā gave birth to three sons at one time, with one of whom, the youngest, a new dynasty, and a new era commences, and therefore it will be well to conclude this one here.

THE BŪ-ZANJAR OR BŪ-ZANJAR DYNASTY.

I. BŪ-ZANJAR. Alān-Kuwā, the widow, having given birth to three sons at once, fathered on the mysterious light, according to the fabulous tale just narrated, the youngest of the brothers, according to some writers, and the eldest of the three, according to others, who was named Bū-Zanjār—which some write Abū-zanjār—and Bū-zanjār—which is said to signify Bādshāh-i-Mu'aggam—Great Sovereign—and who is the ninth ancestor of the Chingiz Khān, and fourteenth of Amir Timūr, in due time succeeded to the chieftainship over the Mughals; and, as I wish to compress as much as possible, I will only mention that the other two sons of Alān-Kuwā—the eldest and second sons—became the progenitors of the Kāt-ghan—and Sāljīt—and tribes, and whose descendants, together with those of Bū-zanjār himself, are designated Nūrūn—from nūr—light, which some authors write, Nairūn—Nīrūn. The whole of the Mughal Khāns [one copy of the Tārikh-i-Jahān-gīr adds "and all the Sultāns of Turkištān"] trace their descent from Bū-zanjār, but, really, the whole of his descendants are Mughals only on the mother's side, unless the father, of which there can be no doubt, was a Mughal also.

The descendants of Alān-Kuwā's legitimate sons, by her husband, are styled by the general name of Dural-gīn—Dural-gīn—Dural-gīn and applied to the descendants of Nagūz, whilst, by the different writers' own accounts, without exception, they, as well as their father and mother, belonged to the Kāiāt sept. They are considered lower in rank than the Nūrūn or Nairūn.

The majority of writers state that the birth of these sons of light took place in the time of Abū-Muslim, the Marwāzī, the proclaimer of the rights of the 'Abbāsīs to the Khilāfāt. He was born in 99 H. [A.D. 717—718]—some say in the following year—and he began to advocate the claims of that house in 128 H. [A.D. 745—746]. Abū-i-Ghāzf states that 450 years elapsed between the flight of Kāiān and his cousin Nagūz and the reign of Bū-zanjār, and, calculating from these dates, their flight would have taken place about 322 years before the first year of the Muḥammadan era, that is, about the middle of A.D. 300, but other historians, as I have stated before, mention that the Kāiāt and Nagūz continued to dwell in Irghanā-Kūn 400 years, and they say that Bū-zanjār succeeded to the chieftainship, when in his fifteenth year, in
informants, the events of the Muḥammadan territory, and

Rabi’-ul-Awwal, but no year is given. One work, however, the “Shajarah-ul-Atrak,” states that it was on the 1st of that month in the year 130 H.

Abū-l-Fāṣıl, in the Akbar Nāmah, as before mentioned, says the Mughals came out of Irgānah-Kūn at the end of the reign of Ngūshrwan, but he died in A.D. 579, about forty-three years previous to the year of the Flight or Hijrah, but Abū-l-Ghāzī gives neither month nor year. Faṣiḥ-li, on the contrary, states, that Alān-Kuwa gave birth to Bū-zañjar and his brothers in the year 376 H. [middle of A.D. 986], and this, coupled with the statement in the Majāmi’-ul-Khiyār, that the Kāiāt and Nagūz issued from Irgānah-Kūn some time after H. 200 [A.D. 815—816], doubtless, is the correct date. Now, if we add 400 to 579—the date of Ngūshīrwān’s death, and suppose that the date of Kāiāt and Nagūz entering Irgānah-Kūn, instead of the date of leaving it, we shall have 979 years, and, if we take 400 years from A.D. 986—the year mentioned by Faṣiḥ-li, namely 376 H., we shall have 407 years remaining, and this seems, to me, to show that the flight of the two fugitives and their wives took place about the middle of Ngūshīrwān’s reign, and not their issuing from Irgānah-Kūn, which took place some time after H. 200 [A.D. 815—816], and, if we allow the average of thirty years for each generation, and consider that Bū-zañjar was the great grandson of Yal-duz or 1-yal-duz, we shall not be far from the year 376 H. [A.D. 986].

More events are assigned to the period of Abū-Musilman than can be credited, and this is the period our author assigns to the rise of the Shansabāns of Ghūr. The date given by Faṣiḥ-li, for the birth of Bū-zañjar, is 186 years previous to the death of the Chingiz Khān’s father, the eighth in descent from Bū-zañjar, an average of little more than twenty years to each, but 130 H. for the accession of Bū-zañjar gives an average, to the death of the Chingiz Khān’s father, of exactly fifty-four years to each reign. On the other hand Bū-zañjar was third in descent from Yal-duz or 1-yal-duz.

Bū-zañjar, who is styled Kāiān, framed laws and regulations, and divided the Mughals into tribes as they still existed at the period when the different authors I have named, with the exception of Abū-l-Ghāzī, and Abū-l-FāṣİL, wrote their accounts. The Tarīkh-i-Jahān-gr f a few other histories likewise state, that some of the Tattār chiefs and Amirīs of other tribes which, for a long period of time, had been ruled by their own chiefs, now submitted to Bū-zañjar Kāiān’s authority, and acknowledged his suzerainty, but this, it must be remembered, is a Mughal account. Bū-zañjar at his death, of which no date is given, left two sons, Būkā—also written Būkfa—and Būkā—also written Tukfa—and Tukkā—also written Tukkā—and Tükā—also written Ma-Chfn.

II. Būkā or Būkā Khan succeeded his father in the chieftain-ship, and, dying, was succeeded by his son.

III. Zuttum—Zuttum Manān— as it is variously written, who was the father of nine sons, one of whom, Kaldū, succeeded to the chieftain-ship. During the time of Zuttum’s chieftain-ship hostilities broke out between the Jala-iran tribe, of the Dūrāl-gr branch of the Mughals, and the Khiṭā-īs. The Jala-iran had become a very numerous tribe at this period, and amounted to about 70,000 families, and had pitched their tents on the banks of the river Kalūr-Ān. The Mughals and Khiṭā-īs were always at enmity, and hostilities continued perpetually to go on between them. At the period in question, the latter suddenly
the transmission of the Mughal sovereignty from one to

resolved to make a raid upon the Jalā-Īrs, but on reaching the river found it
too deep to ford. They constructed a temporary bridge, crossed over in the
night, fell suddenly upon the Jalā-Īrs, and almost annihilated them. Those
that escaped, and other portions of the tribe not then present, fled for shelter
into the parts where the other Mughal tribes dwelt.

This is the affair about which the Fanākātī makes such a great blunder pre-
viously noticed in the account of Aghūz Khān. He there stated, that, "when
Ughūz became firmly established in his sovereignty, and had secured his con-
quests, he sent a party from among his sons and kinsmen, and a considerable
army, into the east, into the land called, in the writer's time, Mughulistan.
Four thousand years after, one among the Bādghāhs of the Khitā-Īs moved
against them, crossed the river Karā-Mūrān in the night, fell upon them,
and slew the whole of them [the males] and made their wives and children
captive, and only two persons escaped—Kāiān and Nagūz—with their wives,
who fled to Iraganah-Kūn, where they and their posterity dwelt 400 years."
It will easily be perceived what a muddle we have here: he has confounded
the two events, and makes a sudden leap from Aghūz Khān to the period of
the massacre of the Jalā-Īrs.

After the death of Zūtūmin, his Khātūn, Matulūn—or, as some
write it, Manulūn—an error probably of n for r—who was a talented
woman, with eight of her sons, and her numerous herds and flocks, took up
her residence in the retired tract of country—some say hill tract—named, but
somewhat doubtfully, Alūsh or Ulūsh Arks or Argf—but the first
name is also written Alūs or Ulūs—and Kolūsh—[Ulūs-i-Aur-
gah or Ūrgah—the Ourga or Kuren of modern maps? in about Lon. 108°
Lat. 48°] whilst her ninth son, Kādū, was absent. He had gone to
his uncle, Mā-Chīn—some say, to his uncle's son—to demand in marriage a
daughter of a kinsman of the sept of Dūral-gīn, who had become exceedingly
numerous, and who were also kinsmen of Mā-Chīn. During Kādū's absence
some of the Jalā-Īrs, overcome by the Khīṭā-Īs, came and took up their
quarters among the īr or tribe of Matulūn and her sons, and, in a
dispute arising between them, the Jalā-Īrs slew her and her eight sons.
Kādū sought his uncle's assistance to avenge them, and a message was sent to
the heads of the Jalā-Īrs demanding satisfaction for this outrage. This had
such an effect upon the chief men of the tribe, who were absent with their
people fighting against the Khīṭā-Īs, that they slew seventy Jalā-Īrs concerned
in the slaughter of Matulūn and her sons, and sent their wives and
families, with many apologies, to Kādū to do with them as he might think
fit. Kādū kept them as slaves; and, from one generation to another, for a
long period, they continued the slaves of his family.

IV. Kādū—Khan—the sixth ancestor of the Changiz Khan, through
the endeavours of Mā-Chīn succeeded to the chiefship. He had three
sons, 1. Bāb-Sunkar—Bāb Sungar—who was the
eldest, and successor of Kādū. 2. Jirkāh-Langūm—also written
Jirkāh-Likūm—Kharkāh-Langūm—and even Kharkāh-Langūm—but this
last is probably a mistake of خ for خ, and 3. Jār-chīn—Jārchīn—which
some write Jār-jīn—and Chār-chīn—Kārjīn—called Jason—Jason
—by Abū-l-Ghażī. These two last brothers were the progenitors of
other tribes. Some few authors relate that the son of Kādū's second
son, named Hamanākā or Hamanghā—Hīmāna or Hīmāna—was carried off by the
another, might become known, and also that [such account]

Tattars, and given up to the Altan Khan, who put him to death, but this appears to be incorrect, and to be the same circumstance which happened to Kabal's son, mentioned farther on, as it is unlikely Kabal himself would have ventured to the Altan Khan's court after one of his race had been thus put to death.

Kaldu cut a canal, in his territory, from a river, and named it Jarulm-[D'Osson's Karokol?] and thereby rendered that part exceedingly prosperous and flourishing. He also went to war with the Jala-Irs and overcame them. At his death he was succeeded by his son,

V. Bae-Sunkar—or Bae-Sunghar—which the Fanakatf writes Bae-Sunkür—also who made some conquests, and, dying, was succeeded by his son,

VI. Tumina-I—also written Tumnah or Tuminah—Tumina—and Tumina-I—also written Kachullf—and Kabal—also called Kabal-f

In consequence of a strange dream which Tumina-I had, when its interpretation was told him, he made these two sons enter into a solemn compact, whereby it was agreed between them, in their father's presence, that the sovereignty should pertain to Kabal and his descendants, and the Deanship or Lieutenancy, and leadership of the troops to Kajulfi and his progeny. A compact to this effect was drawn up in the I-churi language—which is said to be the same as was in use in Tibbat, and written in what are called Tüngüt characters, signed by them both, and deposited in the treasury. Abul-Ghazaf does not mention this circumstance at all. Aghuz Khan is said to have made a similar arrangement with respect to his six sons—styled the Bardz-üki and Udz-üki, but, when all perished but two persons, the compact terminated.

If I mistake not, we shall find that the people named Budziak, who dwell on the banks of the Borysthenes, W of the Black Sea, are offshoots of the Bardz-üki division.

VII. In accordance with the above compact, on the death of his father, Kabal—also Kabali—the Khan succeeded to the chieftain-ship, and his brother Kajulli, to the leadership of the troops. The Mughals style Kabal Khan Alan-jik—or Alan-jik—which signifies "the cherisher of his people." He is the great grandfather of the Chingiz Khan, and of Kajulli, who is the eighth ancestor of Amur Timur. All the tribes of the Mughals were in unanymity and accord with him, and stood in awe of his power and ascendancy, and the Altan Khan of Khiita sent an emissary to him and summoned him to his Court. Those, however, who desire to glorify the Mughals, say, he "invited him to his Court, in a friendly manner," but there is little doubt, even by their own accounts, that the Mughals were dependent upon, and paid tribute to the Altan or Altan Khan, as our author, Minhaig-ud-Din, likewise asserts.

Kabal, leaving his brother Kajulli as his Deputy or Lieutenant, set out for
might remain a memorial of the writer of this ṬABAḴĀT—

Khītā, and, having arrived there, was treated with honour and consideration; but, while in a state of intoxication, at an entertainment, Ḵabāl committed an offence which greatly displeased the Āltān Khān, so he presented him with a head-dress and belt, and sent him away. The glorifiers of the Mughals say "a crown," but crowns are not generally presented at such times; and Abū-J-Faqīl, not to offend his master's vanity, and Abū-I-Ǧhāṣf, who was himself a Mughal, and descended from Ḵabāl, leave out this little incident altogether.

After Ḵabāl had departed, the Āltān Khān was blamed for letting him go so easily, and messengers were sent to recall him. He refused to return, upon which the Āltān Khān sent a party after him to compel him to do so. They came up with him whilst he was stopping in the camp of a friend named Sānḫjūf. Ḵabāl was for going back with them, but his friend lent him a very swift horse he possessed, and advised him to fly. This certainly does not bespeak the powerful sovereign. He at once mounted and made off for his own yīrat or camp. The party still pursued, but only found him after he had reached his home and people. He then, with the assistance of Ḳājūl and the tribe, put the whole of the Āltān Khān's men to death. At this period also, the eldest son of Ḵabāl, whose name was Įkifn or Įkain-Barḵākh—َاوکین_ابن_بِرکاه—also written Įkifn-Barḵāk—بیکین_برکه_بیکین_bbox—while out on an excursion, was fallen in with, suddenly, by a tribe of the Tāṭṭār Ī-māk, their mortal enemies—some say Įkifn-Barḵāk was following the tracks of the Ghuzz Turk-māns at the time—who carried him off to the Āltān Khān, who put him to death. Here was a fresh cause of feud between the already inveterate foes, the Mughal and Tāṭṭār Turks.

Some few writers, as I have just noticed above, say he was called Ḫamangāh or Ḫamanāḵ, thus showing that it was merely one person who was thus put to death, and that those writers divided one event into two.

Besides Įkifn-Barḵāk, Ḵabāl had five other sons, two of whom were Įkibilah Khān and Bartān Bahādūr, but the others are not named, and the eldest of them, Įkibilah, succeeded on the death of his father.

VIII. Įkibilah—ālaj—he also written Įkibilah—āṣ was a man of prodigious strength, immense stature, and great valor. "His voice would pierce the seventh heaven, and his grip was like that of a bear. He could take a strong man, and with both hands bend him like a twig until his back broke; and one author states that he delighted in amusing himself in this pleasant way! During the cold nights of winter he was wont to go to sleep naked before a great fire made of the trunks of trees. He used not to care for the sparks of fire which used to fly out and touch him, for, if he chanced to awake, he would fancy the fleas had disturbed him, and he would scratch himself and go off to sleep again!"

In order to avenge the death of his brother, Įkifn Barḵāk, whom the Tāṭṭārs had carried off, and delivered over to the Āltān Khān, who put him to death by having him mounted upon a wooden ass and nailed to it with iron spikes, and kept there until he expired, Įkibilah led his forces against the Āltān Khān, and the Tāṭṭārs, overthrew them [1], and carried off immense booty.

Ḳūbilah Khān is not even named by Abū-I-Ǧhāṣf, whose work is much confused here; and, in several places, he relates events twice and even three times over, and differently each time.

This is the Kātula of Beresine and Kutlūh of Eīdmann, derived from this
Minhāj-i-Sarāj. He confidently hopes that, during his life-

word incorrectly written with two dots over the third consonant instead of one under.

IX. On the death of Kūbilah Khān, his brother, Bartān—بَرَّان—succeeded to the authority. The title of Khān was dropped with respect to him, and the new one of Bahādur was introduced. It is said that there was no one among their rulers who was endowed with greater valour and wisdom, and hence that title was assigned him. During his reign Kā-jūf died, and his son, Iridam-
chl, succeeded his father in his hereditary offices. “In the Turkish language, İradam or İridam—ایرادم—they call a Mīrzā—a secretary or writer—to which chl—چل [the shortened form of chlz—چلز] is affixed, indicating the actor or instrument, when applied to Turkish words.” From this explanation, however, İridam may mean writing, not a writer. He used to be styled Barlās, by Bartān, because he had no equal in valour, and hence he is known as Iridam-chl, Barlās, but some say Barlās signifies a leader of troops. He had twenty-nine sons, and the tribe of that name are so called after İridam-chl. The Bahādur, Bartān, had four sons, some say, several, one of whom succeeded him. “Baghatur,” I beg to remark, is an utterly impossible title, and shows how those, who cannot “dig out the gold,” are apt to vitiate the metal—the pronunciation of names.

X. Yassūkā—یاسوسکا—the Bahādur, whose name is also written Yassıkī—یاسوسکی—and Yassūkā—یاسوسکا—and, erroneously, Tasūkā—تاسوسکا—the most competent and sagacious of Bartān’s sons, succeeded to the chieftainship of the Mughal tribes, and ruled over 40,000 families. This last statement shows plainly, however, that these persons, whom chroniclers make out to be such mighty sovereigns, could only have ruled over a few tribes, or their power must have dwindled considerably. The rulership over 40,000 families was not considerable, since the Jalā’īrs alone were previously computed at 70,000. Yassūkā is the father of the Chingiz Khān, and, during his chieftainship, İridam-chl, the Barlās, died, and his eldest son, Sūghūj-chl—سُوقوجی whose name is also written Sūghūj-jījan—سُوقوجی jan signifies wise, succeeded to his late father’s offices. He is the fifth ancestor of Amīr Timūr, the statement of Mr. H. H. Howorth, in his “Mongols Proper,” notwithstanding.

On account of the ancient enmity which had come down from one generation to another, and still more recent causes of hostility between the İ-māks of the Tāttār and Mughal Turks, the Bahādur, Yassūkā, in concert with Sūghūj-jījan led an army against them, overthrew them, and made captive Tamū-chl, but more correctly, Tamur-chl, which is also written Tamur-chin—the meaning of which will be explained farther on in the account of the Chingiz Khān—and Karbūkā or Karbūghā, who were their rulers and chiefs, and plundered their property and effects. After this the Bahādur, Yassūkā, set out in great pomp, for Dilūn-Yulduzk—دیلون یولدوک—which is also written Dilūn-Yulduzk—دیلون یولدوک and, on reaching that place [which Petis de la Croix, in his innocence, says—Life of ”Genghiscan the Great,” page 13—was “his Country-House, where he commonly resided”], Yassūkā’s Khātein, who was named Ulūn-Ankah or Angah—ولان آنکه—but whom the Fanākatsī and Fāshīt call Ulūn-Kejūn—ولان چکین of the tribe of Ulūnunūt, who was pregnant, gave birth to a son, on the 20th of Zl-Ka’adh, 549 H. [25th January, 1167 A.D.], and to commemorate his victory over the Tāttārs, by Sūghūj-jījan’s advice, he named that son Tamur-chl, afterwards the Chingiz Khān. Yassūkā, the Bahādur, besides this son, had, by the same Khātein, three other sons—Jūfī Kasār—
time, he will be [considered worthy to be] remembered with pious benediction, and, after his death, with invocation

When Yassūkā died in 562 H., his son Tamur-chī was in his thirteenth year. About the same time Sūghū-jījan also died, and the Nū-yān, Karāchār, his son, was also young in years, and the Nūrūn or Nairūn tribe—their own—forsook them and went over to the Tājīfūt, and other tribes.

At this period the tribes of the Mughals, Tāttārs, and Turks, were ruled by seventy-one chiefs or ḫākims, each of whom ruled over one or two tribes; and this shows very clearly what I have before stated, that the chiefs I have been here giving an account of were not supreme rulers over the whole of the Mughal tribes even, but only over a certain portion of them, and that only a portion of the Nūrūn or Nairūn division of them were under the sway of the Bahādur, Yassūkā.

I have now brought down, in an abstract form, an account of the Turks, and the Tāttār and Mughal Īmāps, according to the accounts compiled by command of the Mughal sovereigns, and contained in the Histories I have named at page 869, to the point where our author begins his account of Tamur-chī, afterwards the Chingiz Khān. I have done it chiefly because he has confused events, and with respect to their earliest history he is in some error, and states contrary to all other authors who have written on the Mughals; but I also do so because European writers go on floundering and blundering with respect to these people, the descendants of Yāṣīg, while, at the same time, the matter lies in a nutshell. One of the latest specimens of this kind is contained in the "TIMES," whose special correspondent, writing from "Therapia," Nov. 7th, 1876, says: "The conglomeration of Eastern races, the Turks and Arabs, detest their enforced unity with their Tarāṇiās oppressors, their very existence culminating with a common feeling of unextinguishable hatred for the Osmanli." So the writer appears to have made the wonderful discovery that the 'Uṣmānī Turks are not Turks but Tūrānīs, and so, by the same logic, these Turks are not Tūrānīs. Who knows? perhaps he has discovered that they are Aryan, or even "Tartars," as some of the newspaper philosophers have lately discovered.

The Yarkand Mission [to the ruler of the State of Kāshgār] made some similar ethnological discoveries in that part of Central Asia, of which the following is one specimen out of many. At page 81 of the "REPORT," we are told respecting "the urban population," that they consist of "two typical forms," one of which, "the Mongolian," contains "the Manjhu, the Moghol or Mongol, the Kalmāk, the Kirghiz, the Noghay, the Kapchak, and the Usbak. All of whom are designated Tartar, together with the Kara Khitay, the Khitay, and the Tungani, who are excluded from the catalogue though of the same stock." This may be termed, confusion worse confounded, but two pages farther on we are informed that "all that can be distinctly stated is that Tartar blood predominates with a greater or less admixture of the Turk element," &c., &c.

The monkish travellers found, centuries ago, how incorrect it was to style Mughals by the name of Tartars. Dr Plano Carpini [A.D. 1246] says he and
of pardon, in the world-illumining opinion of the Sovereign of the people of Islam—Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māḥmūd Shāh—and other readers of his work.†

FIRST INROAD OF THE TURKS OF KARRAH KHIṬĀ.

Trustworthy persons have related after this manner, that the first irruption of the Turks was that the tribes of Karrāh Khiṭā issued from the territory of Chīn and land of the East, and came out upon the confines of Kāilīk† and Bīlāsāghūn, and withdrew their allegiance from the sovereign of Tamghāj,‡ and made the frontier tracts of Islam their dwelling-place, and their grazing-grounds. On agreeing to pay certain fixed imposts, for pasturage, to the Afrāsiyābī Malikṣ,§ who were Musalmān sovereigns, of the his party “came to the land of the Munghals, whom Europeans call Tartars.” Rubruquis also [A.D. 1253] says, “near them [the Mughals] are the Tartars, by which name the Muḥals cannot endure to be called.”

Turks consist of those branches and offshoots from Turk and his descendants before the time of Tāṭṭār Khān and Mughal Khān, who continued, and continue to retain the name of Turks, and of the two latter, who gave name to the two Ī-māks of Tāṭṭār and Mughul. Both are Turks, by descent, but Tāṭṭārs are not Mughals, nor are Mughals Tāṭṭārs.

† Here our author proceeds to give an account of the various predictions respecting the end of the world, which the irruption of the Mughals prognosticated, but which I need scarcely insert here.

‡ Kāilīk—Kāiālīk—or Kāilīk—with—instead of—Kāilīk—which is the correct name. In nearly every copy of our author’s work the copyists have written the word Kābālīk—Kabālīk—with—instead of—Kāiālīk—which is incorrect, as at page 154. These two letters which, in the middle or beginning of a word, differ in one point only, are very liable to be written one for the other in MSS. by ignorant scribes. In the oldest St. Petersburg MS., instead of Bīlāsā-ghūn, the name of the city is written with an extra—ā—Bilādsa-ghūn—as will be again noticed farther on.

Rubruquis describes Kāiālīk, under the name of Koylak. He says it was a great trading city in his time, and had three idol temples, the doors of which were always open to the south.

§ This country will be found referred to at page 933.

‡ At page 154 our author says “they solicited Sulṭān Sanjar to assign them lands,” but, although expressed in different words, the same thing, in fact, is there meant as is here related. Sanjar was the successor, and the Afrāsiyābī Sulṭāns or Malikṣ were subject to him, as is plainly indicated from the following account of them. Nothing is more dangerous or more likely to bring a writer into trouble than a superficial knowledge of Oriental authors derived from translations often made from a single and imperfectly written MS.

It will probably be well to give, however, a brief account of the Afrāsiyābī
Maliks, because our author, both here and in his account of the Sāmānīs, Saljūks, and Khwārazmī Sultāns, occasionally confuses their names in such a manner as to puzzle and bewilder his readers. Such brief account of them will also tend to make the preceding account of the Turks clearer, and throw light upon the previous account of the Khwārazmī dynasty and of the Gūr Khāns farther on, and correct some crude theories recently put forth.

The Muḥammadan writers make continual mention of the Turks and infidels of Māwarā-un-Nahr and Turkistān, from the time that the first 'Arab—Hākam, son of 'Umr, in the Khilāfah of Mu'āwiya, drank of the waters of the Amūfah, and 'Abd-ullah, son of Ziyād, was the first to cross it, but those writers give no consecutive accounts of the Afrāsiyāb Maliks until they come down to the year 367 H. It must also be borne in mind that the name of Afrāsiyāb does not occur in the Turkish traditions, although the 'Ajamīs style him "the Turk."

The first person with whom most Muḥammadan writers begin this dynasty is the Bughrā Khān, [No. IV. in this account] whose Musalmān name was Abū-Musā-i-Hārūn, and his title, Shihāb-ud-Daulah, and who, in 380 H., defeated Mardāwanj, the general of the Sāmānī forces, near Samrākand. Although this Bughrā Khān, "the Turk," is said to have been the son of Sulmān—whom some also style by the title of the I-lak Khān—son of the I-lak Khān, the meaning of which will be presently given, they do not include these two personages, among those rulers, although the latter, probably, brought the dynasty into greater notice, and splendour.

A few writers, however, including Abū-Sa'īd-i-'Abd-ul-Ḥaïy, son of Ṣuḥāk, a native of Gardez in Kārmān of the present Afghānistān—begin somewhat earlier, and, accordingly, I shall follow them. On reaching the time of the Bughrā Khān, Abū Musā-i-Hārūn, son of Sulmān, the different accounts agree. The Gardēr wrote about 441 H., in the reign of Sultān 'Abd-ur-Raḥīm, son of Maḥmūd-i-Sabūk-Tigin, the seventh of the Sultāns of Ghurān, and that writer is, therefore, a little before Abū-l-Fazl-i-Baihakī, who wrote in the reign of Farrukh-zād, the eighth of the Sultāns of that line, and who died in 470 H.

I. SATŪK-KUJAH, written Sātuḵ—サートゥー—by one author, was an infidel and the ruler of Turkistān; but, from a remarkable dream which he had one night, he, in the morning, became a convert to Islam, and induced his people to embrace it also. This happened probably about the year 315 or 320 H., but no dates are given. In Alī he is called Satuk-Karachār.

There is a History, so-called, of this personage, who, in recent times, has been regarded as a saint, and a tomb and masjid have been raised over him. The account is written by the Shaikh Najm-ud-Dīn, in Persian, and translated into Turkī; but, as might be expected, it is history burlesqued. It is quoted by Surgeon-Major Bellew, C.S.I., who was attached to the late Kāshghar Mission, who has composed a "History of Kāshghar, from the Tabariy Nisāri," etc., etc., which may be styled history in chaos. Shaikh Najm-ud-Dīn causes Ḥaפרat Sātuḵ to be born in 333 H., and to die in 430 H., at the age of ninety-six years. Unfortunately for such history, the IXth sovereign of the race, and the eighth or ninth in descent from the Sātuḵ in question, was reigning over Turkistān including Kāshghar in 430 H. The Doctor, however, "would identify" Sātuḵ with, whom he calls, "Iylik Māzī—as he is usually styled [I-lak-i-Mażī, probably—the past, or late I-lak, or of days of yore, as he is
[Khān], of days of yore—and who were subject to the

This is the Ī-lak-i-Māf referred to in para. 4, of the preceding note.

always called in the Persian, and who was not an "Uighur," son of the Bughra Khan, who invaded Bukhārā, where he died in the reign of the Amīr Sāid Abul Kāsim," etc., etc. The reign of the Sāmānī ruler, the Amīr-i-Sa'īd, or August Amīr, Abū-ī-Kāsim-i-Nūb, will be found at page 45 of this Translation, and, farther on, when and where Shihāb-ud-Daulah, Abū-Mūsā-i-Hārūn, entitled the Bughra Khān, died, which event did not take place at Bukhārā, neither did his dominions extend to the Caspian, but, on the west, adjoined the Sāmānī empire.

The Doctor, in several places, states that the Kāshghar territory, "from occupation," was styled, "Mogholistan, or the country of the Moghol," but this is wholly erroneous; and no History will show that Turkistān was ever styled Moghalistan, which Mīrāz Haider, the Mughal Prince, and others distinctly describe, as may be seen in the note at page 889.

The Doctor tells us that the name of the city—Kāshghar—only "came into use under the rule of the Chaghtay Khans," as referring to the territory, but this is also erroneous, as Histories written before their time sufficiently prove, and as may be seen at page 133 of this Translation.

II. After Satuḳ-Kūjāh's death, of which likewise no date is given, his son, Musā, succeeded him as ruler. The date of his death is not stated.

III. On the death of Musā, his grandson, Abū-Naṣr-i-Āḥmad, son of 'Alī, son of Musā, son of Satuḳ-Kūjāh, succeeded to the sovereignty, and became famous under the title of the Ī-lak-Khān. Ī-lak, in the Turkish language, is said to mean "prudent in counsel;" but some writers say that it is the title by which the rulers of Yughmā, that is to say, Turkistān, who are the lowest of the rulers of Tūrān, are known; and that, in comparison with Khān, it merely signifies a chieftain, or leader, the ruler of a tribe. The poet, Abū-Īl-Farah is also quoted, to show that a difference exists between the two titles, by the following couplet:—

This Ī-lak Khān bore the Musalmān title of Shams-ud-Daulah, and is evidently the same who entered Māwarā-un-Nahr from Turkistān in 367 H., just eleven years before Ālān-Kuwā gave birth to the three sons of light.

IV. We now come to Shihāb-ud-Daulah, Bughra Khān, whose name was Abū Mūsā-i-Hārūn, son of Sulmān, son of the Ī-lak Khān, and no doubt the latter is one and the same person with the one previously mentioned above, No. III.

The Bughra Khān entered Māwarā-un-Nahr, from Kāshghar, the city of which name was his capital, the first time, in 372 H. Subsequently, he was induced to invade it again, by Abū 'Alī-i-Sīmjūr, and Fāyīk-i-Khāṣah, the traitor nobles of Amīr Nūb, son of Mānsūr, the Sāmānī. [See their dynasty, page 45, and note 8, where, from the similarity of names, some slight confusion arises through our author calling Hārūn [Abū-Mūsā-i-Hārūn], "Ī-lak Khān," instead of which, the Ī-lak Khān was his grandfather's title.] On comparing our author's statement, at page 51, with the account of the Gardesf, I find he confirms that author's statement by mentioning "Amīr Abū-ī-Hasan, Ī-lak-i-
Saljūḵī Sultāns, they occupied those plains and pasture

During the reign of Abū-Mūsā-i-Hārūn, Shihāb-ud-Daulah, son of Sulimān, son of the ļ-lak, the Bughrā Khān, in 375 of the H., Saljūḵ, son of Luḵmān, and his family and dependents, entered Māwarā-un-Nahr from Karā-Khīţā for the sake of pasturage. In this same year a wonderful bird was seen to rise daily, for three days in succession, from the sea of Ummān, which was said to portend evil to Islām; and indeed, in the following year, 376 H., Ālān-Kuwāţ gave birth to the three sons “of the mysterious light,” as related in the Mughal tradition, one of whom was Būzānjar, the great ancestor of the Chingiz Khān. The Bughrā Khān was subsequently induced once more to invade Māwarā-un-Nahr by ‘Abū-All-i-Ṣīmjūr and Fayīk-i-Khāṣah, the traitor nobles of Amīr Nūḥ; and, in the year 380 H., he entered Māwarā-un-Nahr and defeated Mardāwaj, the general of Amīr Nūḥ, in the vicinity of Samrānt. Fayīk also became subject to him, and was allowed to hold Iṣfānjāb. In 382 H., accompanied by Fayīk, he appeared before Bukhārā, entered it in Rabī’-ul-Awwal, and Amīr Nūḥ fled. Whilst at Bukhārā, the Bughrā Khān was attacked with a painful disorder, and set out to return into Turkistān, but death overtook him on the way in 383 H.

Bughrā in the Turkish language signifies a stallion kept for breeding purposes, but, more particularly, a two humped stallion camel.

The Bughrā Khān was a just and well-disposed monarch, the friend of learning and the learned, and ruled over the vast tract of country extending from Kāshgār to Chīn. He was succeeded by his brother’s son, the ļ-lak Khān, Abū-i-Hasan-i-Naṣr, son of ‘All.

V. The ļ-lak Khān, Abū-i-Hasan-i-Naṣr, son of ‘All, brother of Hārūn-i-Bughrā Khān [this is the person our author mentions at page 51], marched from Uz-gand, and acquired predominance over Bukhārā on the 10th of Zīl-Hijjah, 389 H., seized Amīr ‘Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, the Sāmānī, and sent him away to Uz-gand—اژکر—in Farghānāh [a totally different place from Urganj—‘ژر],—as stated in note 8, page 52, through an error of the copyist in writing, for ʃ—ṣ—and from Gur-ganj—گوی—of Khwāzgī, and took possession of the whole of Māwarā-un-Nahr. He again came to Samrānt in 391 H.; and, in 393 H., Abū-Ibrāhīm-i-Muntasir, the last of the Sāmāns, with the aid of the Ghuzz, defeated the ļ-lak Khān, and compelled him to retire. With the help of the Ghuzz tribe, under their Mihtar, or Chief, Beḵū, Abū-Ibrāhīm re-took Bukhārā, and re-subdued all Māwarā-un-Nahr. It was but a temporary advantage however, although the ļ-lak Khān was a second time defeated by the confederates, for he returned soon after with a great host, and subsequently completely overthrew Abū-Ibrāhīm in 395 H., who, in the meantime, had been deserted by the Ghuzz tribe.

In Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 391 H., it is stated that an envoy came from the ļ-lak Khān to Sultān Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgin, proposing that all the territories of Māwarā-un-Nahr should appertain to him, and all Mādūm-un-Nahr[ Ma’dum (مادوم)-I have never noticed this term applied to the cis-Āmūzāb or cis-Oxus countries but in one old author: I shall refer to this again farther on] to Maḥmūd. Other writers state that a treaty to this effect was entered into between them in 396 H. There may possibly have been two treaties, the latter modified.

Whilst Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgin was at Multān, after taking it in 396 H., intimacy reached him that the Turks had broken the treaty, crossed the Āmūzāb in great numbers under Subāṣī-Tīgin, and had penetrated as far even as Hirāt and Nīshāpūr, but, that they had been driven back, and all Mādūm-
lands; and, being few in point of numbers, they there

un-Nahr cleared of them. In the following year, Sulṭān Maḥmūd marched to Balkh, in order to avenge this attack; and the I-lak Khān assembled 40,000 horse in Māwarā-un-Nahr, and crossed the river to encounter him. A battle took place in the plain a few miles from Balkh, and a charge of elephants decided the fate of the battle, and the I-lak Khān and his ally, Ḵadr Khān—his brother, probably—ruled of Khutam, were completely routed, on Sunday, the 22nd of Rabī‘-ul-Āḥār, 398 H., many prisoners were taken, and, in crossing the Āmūīh, the I-lak Khān lost a great number of his followers who were carried away by the current and drowned. The Khān nourished the hope of revenge, but Time did not permit him to gratify it, and he died in 403 H.

VI. Sharf-ud-Dīn-i-Tughān Khān, his brother, succeeded to the throne of Māwarā-un-Nahr and Turkistān. In the Turkish language tughān signifies a species of hawk—[४२५]—the Hawk or Falcon Khān. In the year 408 H., [began 29th May, 1017, A.D., old style], his dominions were invaded from the side of Chān, by a vast host of infidel Turks, who had been displaced from their former localities, to the amount of 300,000 khargaks—felt tents so-called by the Turks—and equivalent to that number of families. This must have been about the time of the Mughal ruler, Zūṭūmīn No. III., at page 894—which see. They certainly were not the people called Karā Khājī-i, or "KITĀN" of European writers, subsequently to be noticed. Tughān Khān, although suffering from illness at the time, rallied out against them; and, after much fighting, drove them back again. Vast booty, and a great number of captives fell into the hands of the Musulmān Turks [and their Musulmān allies?]. Tughān Khān died in the same year, and was succeeded by his brother.

VII. Abū-l-Muẓaffar-i-Arsalān Khān—also styled Ul-Aṣam, or "the deaf" brother of Tughān, succeeded him in the sovereignty. In 410 H., he is said to have fought a battle with Sulṭān Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgīn, and was overthrown; and, during his retreat across the Jīḥūn or Āmūīh, most of his troops were drowned, the incident which happened after the defeat in 398 H., above referred to. Maḥmūd, however, was engaged during part of this year in his expedition in Hind. The date of Arsalān Khān's death is not given; but, in 408 H., a princess of the family of the I-lak Khān, who had previously been betrothed to Prince Mas‘ūd, Maḥmūd's son, arrived at Balkh on her way to Ghaznī.

VIII. Ḵadr Khān, son of Yūsuf, son of the Buḥrā Khān-i-Hārūn, son of Sulīman—the Gardēzī, calls him Yūsuf-i-Ḵadr Khān—and states that he was one of the cousins of the I-lak Khān [No. V ?], and who had been made governor, on his part, over Samrākand—succeeded to the sovereignty on the death of Arsalān Khān. He was a prince of great justice and goodness. The Gardēzī states that, in 415 H., Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgīn reached Balkh with the intention of crossing the Jīḥūn into Māwarā-un-Nahr, to deliver the Musulmāns from the tyranny of 'All-Tīgīn, ruler of Buḫārā, and one of the Afrāsiyāb Khāns, upon which, Yūsuf-i-Ḵadr Khān, who was the Sālār of all Turkistān and the great I-lak Khān, hearing of Maḥmūd's having crossed, left Kāshghar and came to Samrākand. He then proceeded to meet Maḥmūd [see pages 116—118]; and they entered into a fresh treaty. 'All-Tīgīn [this is the person referred to at page 121, which see], hearing of this, fled to the desert [the steppes E. of the Sīḥūn]. Faṣīḥ-i, however, says this took place in 419 H. It was at this time that Maḥmūd seized Isrā‘īl, the Saljuḵ, and sent
continued to dwell, without violence or disturbance, in peace and tranquillity.

him off to Hind [Kālinjar in the Panjāb]. In 416 H. [Fāsīh-ī, 419 H.]; Jaghar Beg, Abū Sultāmān-i-Dā'ūd [also called Dā'ūd-i-Jaghar Beg. See page 116. Here are some more īsāfūs showing how they are used, and the necessity of their use], son of Tughrī or Tughrīl Beg, son of Mīkā',l, son of Saljūk [the Gardēz styles the Saljūks Turks and Turk-māns indiscriminately], broke out, left the Būkhārā territory and the Sughd of Samrānd, and retired into Khwārazm [see page 121], with the consent of Sultān Maḥmūd, but not the approbation of his ministers.

In 417 H., envoys came to Ghaznīn, to Sultān Maḥmūd, from Kāyā [?] Khān, and Bughrā Khān, requesting a matrimonial alliance. Maḥmūd replied that he was a Musalmān and they were infidels, and that it was not the custom to give the sisters and daughters of Musalmāns to infidels, but that, if they would embrace Islam, the matter would be considered. These chiefs were Kadr Khān's brothers. Subsequently it was agreed that Zainab, the Sultān's daughter, should be betrothed to the son of Kadr Khān, who was then styled Yughān-Tiglīn, and afterwards took the title of Bughrā Khān, and a daughter of Kadr Khān was betrothed to Muḥammad, but subsequently to Mas'ūd, Sultān Maḥmūd's eldest son. Kadr Khān died in the year 423 H., and was succeeded by

IX. Arsalān Khān, son of the Bughrā Khān [No. IV] who was, at that period, Lord of Kāshghar, Khutan, Khujand, and Bilāsā-ghūn, now succeeded to the sovereignty, but, between him and his own brother, Bughrā, hostility arose, and the latter overcame Arsalān, and made him captive. Arsalān is the person to whom Sultān Mas'ūd of Ghaznīn sent a despatch after the battle of Dandānḵān, mentioned in note 5, page 94.

X. The Bughrā Khān, son of Kadr Khān, who was Lord of Bānkī, or Tarāz, and Sinjāb [Iṣfānjāb or Sfānjāb, as it is also written. See page 28], after having overcome his brother, Arsalān, became absolute ruler. The mention of these provinces and countries sufficiently indicates the extent of country under the sway of the Aṛāsīyābī Maliks. The Bughrā Khān nominated his eldest son, Jaʿfar-Tiglīn, his heir, on which the mother of Ibrāhīm, the youngest son, poisoned the Bughrā Khān, together with some of his Amirs, and also put an end to Arsalān Khān, who was still in confinement, in 439 H.

Bughrā, also written with ā for ā—Būkhrā, is the same well-known Turkish name that is turned into Bagāra Khan by Stewart in his “History of Bengal,” and Baikara by others.

XI. Ibrāhīm Khān, son of the Bughrā Khān, succeeded to the sovereignty after the murder of his father. His mother sent him against Bināl-Tiglīn [one author has Nīāl-Tiglīn], who used to act rebelliously, and, in the encounter which ensued, Ibrāhīm was killed, and the family of the Bughrā Khān [No. X.], in the direct line, terminated with him. The year of his death is not mentioned.

In 453 or 454 H., Sultān Alb-Arsalān, the Saljūk, undertook the subjugation of Turkistān, but had to return from the frontiers of Kāshghar and Bilāsā-ghūn to the aid of the Khalfah. See page 134.

XII. Abū-l-Muzaffar-i-Taf-kāj [Iṣrā] Khān, son of another Ibrāhīm, son of Naṣr, who was likewise of the house of Aṛāsīyāb, and whose father had withdrawn from the world, succeeded to the sovereignty. He had previously been ruler of Samrānd, under the sovereign. He died of paralysis in 460 H.

XIII. Shams-ul-Mulk [some Mulūk] the Khākān, Naṣr, son of Taf-kāj
When the period of repose continued for a prolonged

Khan, succeeded his father, and the daughter of Sulthan Alb-Arsalan, the Saljuk, was married to him, and the daughter of 'Isa, his brother, was married to Alb-Arsalan's son, afterwards Malik Shâh. The Khâqân, Shams-ul-Mulk, died in Zî-Ka'dah, 472 H.

XIV. KHIRR KHÂN, brother of the Khâqân, Naqr, succeeded to the throne, but very soon after died.

XV. AHMAD KHân, son of Khîr Khân, succeeded to his father, but used to act in such a manner that Sulthan Malik Shâh had to march into Mâwarâ-un-Nahr, in 482 H. to coerce him. He defeated him, and sent him away to Isfahân, to the care of his aunt, Turkân Khatûtun, Alb-Arsalan's daughter. After a time Sulthan Malik Shâh restored him to the sovereignty; but in 488 H. he was put to death on being accused of heresy. The Raużat-us-Safâ states that Sanjar gave the throne to Ahmad's son, Naqr by name.

XVI. MAHMUD KHân, uncle's son of Ahmad Khân, succeeded to the throne of Mâwarâ-un-Nahr and Turkistan; and, in the year 490 H., Dabûlî—[دابلی]—Tughân Khân, son of Karâ Khân, marched an army against him and slew him. Who he was does not appear.

XVII. KADR KHân, son of 'Umr Khân, son of Ahmad Khân, succeeded him. In 495 H. he became ambitious of possessing himself of part of Khurâsân, and invaded it. In Shâbân of that year he was encountered by Sulthan Sanjar [this was long before Sanjar became supreme ruler of the Saljuk empire] near Tirmiz, and was defeated, taken prisoner, and put to death. He is called Kunduz Khân elsewhere. See note 8, page 147.

XVIII. MUHAMMAD KHân [some, by mistake, call him Ahmad Khân] to whom the title of ARSALAN was assigned, son of Sulîmân by a sister of Sulthan Sanjar, son of Dâ'ud, son of the Bughrâ Khân [No X.], and who, for a long time, had been an exile from Mâwarâ-un-Nahr, and dwelling at Marw, at the Court of that Sulthan, succeeded to the sovereignty in 495 H.

In 523 H., Sayyid Asârîf, the 'Alawi, and the men of Samarqand, slew Naqr, the son of Arslân Khân, and openly rebelled against him. Arslân Khân called upon his uncle, Sulthan Sanjar, for aid, who set out in person with an army to succour him. Before Sanjar reached Samarqand, Arsalân Khân had suppressed the outbreak; and he despatched an emissary to make apologies to the Sulthan [not wishing him to come seemingly]. This conduct did not please Sanjar, and he continued his advance towards Samarqand. Arsalân Khân was also accused of sending persons to assassinate the Sulthan. The latter invested Samarqand, took it in 524 H., imprisoned him, and sent him off to Marw. to his mother, Samarqand's sister.

Muhammed-i-Arsalan Khân, son of Sulimân, was restored to the sovereignty of Mâwarâ-un-Nahr by his uncle, Sulthan Sanjar, in 526 H. Most of the authors I have taken this account from style him Muhammed as before, and one calls him Mâhmûd [his son], but Faâshîf, and some others, distinctly call him Ahmad—and the context proves it correct—[see note 8, page 147], but they give 530 H. as the date of his restoration. This can scarcely be correct, as his son succeeded in 526 H. What subsequently became of him is not stated, nor is the year of his death recorded.

The Târîkh-i-Alîf, the accounts in which are generally derived from the best authorities, without mentioning who he was or where he ruled, states that Kadr Khân invaded Mâwarâ-un-Nahr, at the head of a large army, with the object of conquering it and Turkistan, and that Arsalân Khân, Muhammed,
IRRUPTION OF THE INFIDELS INTO ISLĀM.

time, and their offspring and posterity had become nume-

unable to cope with him, fled into Khurāsān to Sulṭān Sanjar for protection, and gave the Sulṭān a daughter in marriage. Sulṭān Sanjār marched into Māwarā-un-Nahr, overthrew Kadr Khān, put him to death, and restored Arsalān to his throne again.

After a short time, a number of the Khāns of the Turks became hostile to Arsalān; and, unable to resist them, he again fled to Sanjar for help, and again the Sulṭān restored him, after punishing his enemies. The soldiery of Arsalān Khān were principally of the two septs of Kārlūḡhā Turks, and Ghuzz; and the former, having been intrigued with, and gained over by Aṣḥaf, the 'Alawī, son of Muḥammad-i-Abī-Shuṭā, the Samrkhāndī, to combine with Naṣr Khān, Arsalān's son, the 'Alawī incited Naṣr Khān to dethrone his father. Arsalān Khān gained intimation of the plot, and forthwith put his son, and the 'Alawī to death. After this, Arsalān regarded the Kārlūḡhā with hostility, and they looked upon him with dread. At last, they combined to destroy him; and Arsalān had again to fly to Sulṭān Sanjar. He marched towards Samrkhānd to quell this outbreak, upon which, the Kārlūḡhā took to flight and retired to the mountains. Another version of these events is, that Arsalān Khān had located 12,000 kharghas, or felt tents of Kārlūḡhās, equal to that number of families, on his eastern frontier to protect it from the incursions of the Chinese (Khitā-īs), but he had latterly ill-treated them, and they had left his dominions, and retired into the territory of Bilāsāḡhān, the particulars respecting which will be found in the account of the Gūr Khāns, farther on.

Sulṭān Sanjar entered Samrkhānd, and remained there a short time. It was at this period that, while occupied in the chase, the Sulṭān perceived a band of armed men lying in ambush in the Shiḵār-gah, or preserve. These were seized; and, they having confessed that Arsalān Khān had sent them thither, the Sulṭān proceeded to invest the ingrate within the walls of Samrkhānd, captured him, and sent him away to Bālkh, where he died. Some say his death was natural, but others, that the Sulṭān had something administered to him.

During this reign, in the year 522 H., Aḵūz [Aḵūz], the Chīnī, with a host more numerous than ants or locusts, invaded the territory of Kāshghar. The Wālī of Kāshghar, Abīmad, son of Hasan, collected his forces to repel the invaders. The two armies met within the frontiers of Kāshghar, and an obstinate battle ensued, which ended in favour of Abīmad.

Who Abīmad was is not mentioned, but he was, doubtless, one of the Aṛāsiyāfī family, subordinate to Arsalān as head of the house, and has, evidently, from the discrepancies above noticed, been taken for one of the sovereigns of this dynasty.

Aḵūz, the Chīnī, after the slaughter of great part of his army, took to flight; and, after he had reached his capital, the name of which is not given, died of grief and chagrin. "The Gūr Khān," according to the same authority, "became his successor over the country of Chīn," as will be presently mentioned.

XIX. Ḥasan-Tīḡīn, son of ʿAll, son of ʿAbd-ul-Mūmin [Alī has, son of ʿAbd-ul-Mūmin, son of ʿAll], famous under the name of Abū-l-Maʿālī, Kūlij-i-Tamghā, who likewise was of the same family, was, by command of Sulṭān Sanjar, raised to the sovereignty, but he died very shortly after.

XX. Rukn-ud-Dīn, Mǎḥmūd Khān, Arsalān's son, and great nephew of Sanjar, who is mentioned in the Jāmī'-ut-Tawārīḵh and in Alī as the
rous, they began to act in a refractory manner. The

KHĀN, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Muḥammad, son of the Bughrā Khān (No. X. Yāfa’ī says he was his great grandson), with the support of Sultaṅ Sanjar was raised to the throne in 526 H., and, in Ramaḍān 531 H., he encountered the Gūr Khān of the Karā Khīṭā-ī in battle, within the limits of Khujaand, but was defeated, and compelled to retire to Sāmṛkand. Sultaṅ Sanjar advanced soon after to his assistance with his forces, but he also was overthrown [in 534 H., A.D. 1134. Guzīdah and others say in 535 H. Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh says in 536 H.] by the Khīṭā-īs under Āt Khān and Bānīko, as has been already stated under Sanjar’s reign, at page 154, but, since that portion of this work was translated, some further particulars, tending to throw light on this subject, will be found in the notice of the Gūr Khāns farther on.

Rasht-ud-Dīn, in the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh, further states, that Sultaṅ Itsuz [our author’s Utsuz], Khwārazm, Shāh, in 547 H., marched against Sāk-nāk—also written Sagh-nāk, which lies north of Utrār, and other tracts, and also against Kamāl-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, son of Maḥmūd, the Wālī or ruler of Jund, who fled to Rūbdār. Who he was is not said, but he is evidently one of the Afrāsiyāb family. He was induced to return, but was put to death; and Sultaṅ Itsiz annexed Jund, which he gave to his own son, I-yal-Arsalān. The year above-mentioned is that in which the Ghuzz acquired such predominance, but, according to some writers, and more correctly, the year previous to Sanjar’s falling into their hands.

Maḥmūd Khān, forsaking country and possessions, after the victory of the Karā-Khīṭā-īs, in 534 H., came into Khurāsān along with Sultaṅ Sanjar, and continued at his Court; and, subsequently, after the Sultaṅ was taken captive by the Ghuzz, he was raised to the sovereignty of Khurāsān, as a temporary measure. After his uncle’s escape out of their hands, and his death soon after, Maḥmūd, in 552 H., for a time, again obtained the nominal sovereignty over Khurāsān, but, after a stormy reign of five years and a half, in 557 H., he was deprived of his sight by Sanjar’s slave—Mu’ayyid-ud-Dīn, the Āf-nah-dār [See page 180], and died in 558 H.

XXI. Ṭamghāj Khān, son of Muḥammad Khān [but whether this is the same Muḥammad, who is called Aḥmad, and dethroned and again restored to sovereignty by Sultaṅ Sanjar, is not stated], became Wālī of Māwarā-un-Nahr after Sultaṅ Sanjar’s imprisonment by the Ghuzz, but he did not possess much grandeur or power, and his reign was a very stormy and agitated one. He was tributary to the Karā Khīṭā-īs, who continued to hold sway in those parts, after Sanjar’s captivity, until finally driven out and expelled by Sultaṅ Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh.

Ṭamghāj Khān was at length slain and his corpse cast into the desert by the Kārliqs or Kārliqshīs. This happened in 551 H., some say, in 550 H.

One author refers to a Ṭamghāj or Taghmāj Khān, named Ibrāhīm, son of Al-Ḥusain [Al-Ḥasan ?], as one of the Khāns of Turkistān, who, when he became absolute, came to Sāmṛkand, and dwelt there many years. He was a great patron of Ulāmā and other learned men, and wrote Kut’āns which were sold, and the prices realized therewith he subsisted on. He must be one and the same with the above, from the mention of Sāmṛkand, although there is a discrepancy with respect to his father’s name, and he too had a son, Khīṣr Khān, who is said to have been a Sultaṅ of great pomp. Probably, Nos. X and XI. are referred to.
period of the Sanjarí empire had nearly reached its termi-

I may also add that Tamghāj, the name of which often appears in this Section, is a territory of Turkistān, as well as a name given to rulers, and that some writers state that it is the name—dynastic name, probably—of the sovereigns of Tibbat and Yughmā, which last word is also the name of an old city and territory in Turkistān.

XXII. Jalāl-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī, son of Hasan-Tīgīn [Rashīd-ud-Dīn calls him Husain merely], son of ‘Alī, son of ‘Abd-ul-Mūmin, who bore the title of Khızr Khān—some say Jaghar Khān—with the support of the Gūr Khān of the Karā-Khitā-īs, after Sulṭān Sanjar’s defeat at Kāṭrān, succeeded to the sovereignty of Māwarā-un-Nahr. Khızr Khān, subsequently [in 553 H.] slew, in Khitā it is said, Beghū or Beghūn Khān, the chief of the Kārluks or Kārlūghs, and other chiefs of that tribe, then located in Māwarā-un-Nahr, such as Lā-chīn Beg, and, the sons of the slain Beghū, fled to the Khwārazm territory, and connecting themselves with Sulṭān I-yal-Arsalān, Khwārazm Shāh, instigated him to attack Khızr Khān, the Khākān, as he is also styled—an other title by which this dynasty is also called—of Samarkand, that is to say, Māwarā-un-Nahr. This is a sufficient proof that the rulers were not Kārlūghs, and that they were Īgūrs is utterly out of the question.

I-yal-Arsalān, Khwārazm Shāh, accordingly, in the same year [553 H.—A.D. 1158], in Jamādī-ul-Ākhīr, marched an army into Māwarā-un-Nahr, arrived at Bukhārā, and, from thence, moved towards Samarkand. On the news of his movements reaching Khızr Khān, he at once summoned to his standard all the Tarākamah nomads of those parts, from the Karā Kol or Black Lake, as far as Jund, and brought them to Samarkand. He mustered his forces on the bank of the Bagh-dād river in the Sughd, near the capital, and within the walls of the city. He likewise sought aid from the Karā-Khitā-īs, who despatched to his aid the Ī-lak of the Turkān, but the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīḵ, and Rauṣat-ud-Ṣafā, both style him the Ī-lak of the Tarākamah [plural of Turk-mān, which, since they also consider them Turks, or belonging to the Turk tribes, is much the same in signification], who, soon after arrived, with a force of 10,000 gallant men to the aid of Khızr Khān, and, through the Ī-lak’s endeavours, an accommodation was entered into, and the Khwārazm Shāh retired into his own territory again. These were one portion only of the Kārlūgh Turks, for Ibn-Dastah in his account of the Jīhūn, says, several rivers flow into the Jīhūn, among which is the considerable river called the Wakhsh river, which issues from the tract of country above the land of the Kārlūgh Turks.

The Beghū are often referred to by our author, after this period, in several places in this work, as being located in Wakhsh and Badakshān [see note 8, page 374, and page 493], and they are the tribe of this same Beghū, the Kārluk or Kārlūgh. The Ghuzz are also styled Beghū, as previously stated in the account of the Turks, but these Beghū Kārlūghs are totally distinct from the Ghuzz. There are no such people, I beg leave to say, as “Ghzzers,” or “Ghaz” or “Gusset,” nor do “we know that the Osmanli claim descent from the Ghozzi,” any more than they do from the “Kankulis,” but we know quite the contrary.

Khızr Khān, and his predecessor also, were tributaries of the Gūr Khāns, as was likewise ‘Uṣmān, Khızr’s successor; but the mention here, by different historians, of the Ī-lak of the Tarākamah or Turkān being sent by the Gūr Khān himself to the assistance of Khızr Khān is very important, proving, as it does, what I was quite cognizant of before, how crude and erroneous are
nation, and they broke out into rebellion. Sultan Sahjar

the theories put forward by a writer—Mr. H. H. Howorth—who has been writing largely of late on "Mongols," "Ghuzzes," "Gusses," and the like, and imagines that the "Ilk [sic] Turkan," of D’Ohsson, was one of the sovereigns of this dynasty I am here giving an account of, and that they were all styled "Arslan Khans," i.e. "Lion Khans," when, out of the twenty-three sovereigns here mentioned, but three were styled Arsalan, i.e. Lion. The I-lak-i-Turkan, or I-lak-i-Tarakanah, as he is also called, was certainly one of the descendants of Afsiyah, and that was why the Gur Khan sent him to the aid of his kinsman, Khizr Khan [and he had good cause to hate Kurluk], and there were several others, too, who claimed similar descent, as well as the dynasty of the Bughrã and I-lak Khans I have here given a brief account of. I-ghurs they certainly were not.

The I-lak-i-Turkan above referred to is most likely the very same person who, in 522 H. [A.D. 1128], gave up his authority to the Gur Khan, or otherwise his son or successor in that title. The former is the more probable. The length of his reign, which must have been considerable, is not given, neither the date of his son’s succession.

XXIII. Sultan 'Usman, son of Jalal-ud-Din, 'Alf, son of Hasan [Tigin] of the Bughrã Khans family, who, on account of the antiquity of his race, is styled Sultan-us-Salatin, is the last of this dynasty, but, at what period he attained the sovereignty, is not stated. As he had solicited a daughter from the Gur Khan, to whom he was tributary, in marriage, and been refused, Sultan Muhammad, Khwarazm Shah, for that very reason, to spite the Gur Khan, gave him a daughter of his own in marriage in 606 H. Great friendship and intimacy arose, in consequence, between Sultan 'Usman and his father-in-law, but it developed into great resentment. 'Usman abandoned the Sultan's friendship and was going to ally himself again with the Gur Khan. At last, Sultan Muhammad marched against him, took Samarkand, and secured the person of Sultan 'Usman. Sultan Muhammad was inclined to forgive him, but his own daughter, 'Usman's wife, whose name was Khan Malik, was against it, and, in 609 H., he was put to death, at her instigation, some say, by her command, and with him that dynasty became extinct. The length of his reign is not mentioned.

From the account of 'Usman in the notice of the Karã-Khi'ta-Is farther on, considerable discrepancy will be noticed respecting his again attaching himself to the Gur Khan after his alliance with the Sultan of Khwarazm, and the Sultan's occupying Samarkand, and the absolute contrary would appear to be the fact; but, that something unpleasant did occur between him and his father-in-law, 'Usman's being removed from Samarkand, and taking up his quarters at Khwarazm plainly show.

Sultan 'Usman—said to have been a second Yusuf in beauty—it was, who, when along with the Gur Khan's army, interceded with the Karã-Khi'ta-Is and saved Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Muhammad-i-Sam, Ghurf, from captivity, and enabled him to escape from Andkhud, after his defeat there in 601 H. See page 480.

Another proof that Turkistan was ruled by many petty princes is, that among the Malik's of the Dihf kingdom in Sultan Shams-ud-Din, I-yaltimishs reign, one was 'Ala-ud-Din, Jangi, a Prince of Turkistan—a refugee apparently—but of what family he came is not mentioned. He subsequently gave considerable trouble, and was put to death in 634 H. See page 640.
marched to coerce them; and Bānīko of Ṭarāz, from the side of Khiṭā [the Kārā-Khiṭā-i territory—from Ṭarāz] with a numerous army, advanced to encounter the Sultān, and a battle took place between that host of infidels and Sultān Sanjar. The army of Islām was defeated, and Turkān Khātūn, who was the Sultān's consort, became a captive [in the hands of the Khiṭā-īs]. After the Sultān retired, they [!] sought for peace, and sent back Turkān Khātūn, and they obtained immunity.

When the insurrection of the Ghuzz [tribe] of Khandān broke out and continued, and the dominion of Sanjar declined, as has been recorded, the Kārāh Khiṭā-īs acquired vast strength, and the Maliks of Turkistān, with their assistance, used to subdue each other, and were wont to send them riches, valuable gifts, and presents, in hope of their aid and help. Those Maliks continued to use their utmost endeavours in the subjection and destruction of each other for so long a time, that the Kārāh Khiṭā-īs became rulers over the whole of them; and, for a period of near eighty years and over, their power continued.

At first, when they became supreme, the chief men among them, in succession to each other, were several persons; and those who lived near unto my own time, and of whom I have heard from narrators, were I-mā, Sunkam, Arbaz, Tūmā, and Bānīko [of Ṭarāz], and their sovereign was a woman, and, at last, after that female, there was a man, and his title was "the Gūr Khān," and they were wont to style him "the Khān-i-Khānān." Some have related that

Another is mentioned as holding Utrār, and another Jund, during Sultān Ugmān's reign over Māwarā-un-Nahr.

6 See also the account of the rulers of Sijjestān and Nīmroz, page 188.
7 Some copies of the text, as in the account of Sultān Sanjar's reign, where the particulars of these events will be found [page 154], have Khatlān, some Khandān. Here, the former is correct: there the latter. The Ghuzz or Ghuzz—to or to—[it would require a good deal of "twisting" to turn their name into the impossible one of "Guzzes"] came into the Musalmaṇ territories from Khandān, which is on the frontiers of Chin or China, but, when they revolted against Sultān Sanjar, they were dwelling in Khatlān, whence the confusion, and only crossed the Jīḥūn towards the close of Sanjar's reign, prior to his defeat by them. See notes 4, page 374, 8, page 424, and 6, page 426.
8 Which is the Persian translation of the title "Gūr Khān." Mr. H. H. Howorth in his book on the "Mongols Proper," page 719, has the following:—
this Gür Khān had, secretly, become a Musalmān, but God knows the truth in this matter. It is agreed, however, that the first among them [the Karah Khītā-i rulers] were just sovereigns, and were adorned with equity, and ability, and used to treat Muḥammadans with great reverence, show respect unto ecclesiastics, and used not to consider tyranny and violence allowable towards any created being."

"Colonel Yule adds, 'the tendency to swelling titles is always to degenerate, and, when the value of Khan had sunk, a new form, Khān-Khānān, was devised at the court of Dehli, and applied to one of the high-officers of state.' Here we have the "new devised form" as early as 1259 A.D., nearly three centuries before the first Mughal Sulṭān of Dīlī appeared in India. The title of Khān-i-Khānān—Khān of Khāns—is not at all uncommon, and is frequently mentioned in histories centuries before any Mughals reigned at Dīlī.

Surgeon-Major Bellew, the Historian of the Kāshqar Mission of 1873, has fallen into error in his account of the "Gorkhān" from the "Tabadī Nāsari," and other works quoted by him, for he makes out, in the first place [page 132] that the "Kara Khītāy," who "came to the cities of Cubālīgh and Bālāsghūn, took the government upon themselves" from "the Afrāsīyāb Princes descended from Iylik Marzī [sic]," and "kept it for eighty and odd years," and then tells us that "their rulers in succession were Ayma, and Sangam, and Arbar, and Tana, and Tāyanko, and then a queen who was succeeded by Gorkhan." All this is different from the Tabakât-i-Nāṣīrī, of which this work is a Translation.

9 It would tend, probably, to elucidate the above statement, and to correct some of our author's errors and shortcomings, if I gave, here, a brief account of the dynasty known as the Gür Khāns of Karā-Khītā or Karah-Khītā.

The original country of these rulers is Khītā or Khītāe, which consists of several vast tracts of territory; and the designation of Khītā differs according to the different races who speak of it. For example, "that great and famous country which has always been the seat of government of powerful sovereigns, and is so at present [when the Fanākatī wrote 578 years ago], is called by the people themselves—خانزوج خان توی—Khān-jū Khān-ḵāū—and the Mughals call it جا،قوت—Jāḵūt or جاه،قوت—Jāh-kūt. The Hindūs call it Chīn, while we, in Māwarā-un-Nahr, term it Khītā and Khītāe.

"There is another country of great extent, to the east of Khītā inclining south—S.E.—which the Chīnūs [Chinese] call by the name of مئی or مئین [?]—but the Mughals style it تکنک— and the Hindūs, Mahā-Chīn [not Mā-Chīn], which is to say Chīn-i-Būzurg, or Great China." [That Khutan was ever called Chīn or Mā-Chīn, as Remusat is said to have stated, cannot be shown, but it formed part of the Chinese empire].

"To the north of Khītā there are certain tribes of Ṣahra-Nīshfnān [Nomads] whom they [the Khītā-i] call Jīdān or Jaidān, and the Mughals know them by the name of Karā-Khītā-i or Black Khītā-i. The great barrier or wall separates Khītās from the lands of the Turks and Nomads." It must be borne in mind that it is a custom among eastern people to distinguish countries, and sometimes people, by the epithets of white—ādh and chaghan—and black—karā or karaḥ, the former name being given to the most extensive or fertile countries, and most civilized people, and the latter to the poorest and least fertile countries, and the
Upon several occasions the armies of these rulers had less civilized people. The same may be remarked with respect to the term, sarfl-rū—red-faced, that is to say, honourable, of good fame, and siyāk-rū—black-faced, meaning disgraced or dis honoured.

"The dwelling-places or lands of the Jīdān tribe adjoin the plains, wilds, or steppes of Mughalistan; and, on one occasion, a person of the Jīdān tribe rebelled, seized the sovereign of Khiṭā, and became Bādghāh himself. For several generations his descendants reigned. They were afterwards ousted by another person, and the Altān Khāns, who were finally overthrown by the Chingiz Khān, and his son, Uktār Kārān, were his descendants."

The family of the person who afterwards rose to sovereignty with the title of the Gūr Khān ["Gorkhān," "Kawar," and "Gawer," and "Kur, a form of Gur Khān," and the like, of European authors, and some European translators, are entirely wrong] was named—Kūmīn or Kūmīn Tāgghū or Tāyā-gghū, also written—Kūshīn or Kūshīn Tāg-gū, or Tāyakū [the Yeilu Taishi probably of D'Ohsnon], which names might vary a little more according to the vowel points, but not the consonants, except that ယ and ց in the middle or end of a word are interchangeable, and that Turks, Tāttās, and Mughals, change ◀ and ◁ into ◀ and ◁ occasionally. I have read the above words according to the usages of the Persian language. Kūmīn Tāgghū's family was one of distinction in those parts, and, long before the time of the Chingiz Khān, and antecedent to the rise of the sovereigns of the Khurjāh or Khorjāh—duwir, dynasty [Corea of Europeans is here referred to], forced, through the vicissitudes of destiny, he left his native country along with 80 persons of different tribes or families, and took up his dwelling—pitched his tents—within the borders of Kirēz or Kirēz, respecting which see the account of the Turks at page 876. This tract is generally mentioned along with Tingkūt by most of the authors I have quoted in my note on the descent of the Turks, Tāttās, and Mughals.

Some again say that these 80 persons were his own family and kin, and that they were accompanied by their dependents and followers, who made up a considerable number, and, from their proceedings, this last statement appears the more correct of the two.

The Kara Khiṭā fugitives assaulted the people of those parts—Kirēz or Kirēz—and were themselves attacked in return, and hard pressed. On this account the Kara Khiṭā-is moved away from those tracts, and entered the territory of Imil—Jil or Imil—Jil—or the territory on the river of that name, and there founded "a city," in, and about which, the Gūr Khān being an exceedingly just and efficient ruler, some 40,000 families, Turks, and numbers of others, soon gathered around him. The remains of that city, the name of which is not given, were still to be traced at the time the Histories I take this account from were written, but, in the time of Mirzā Muhammad Haidar, the author of the Tārīkh-i-Rashid, who wrote subsequently—whose work I have partly translated—and of which more hereafter—neither traces of this place nor of the city of Bilāsā-ghūn were known.

Subsequently, the Kara Khiṭā-is moved from the territory of Imil, because it could not contain them, they had multiplied so greatly, and advanced towards the boundary of the Bilāsā-ghūn territory. This city—Bilāsā-ghūn—the Mughals, subsequently, but long previous to the days of Amīr Timūr, styled Ku or Ghū and Akū or Aghū—Balīgh, that is to say, according to the Habīb-us-Siyar, and some other works, the pleasant, good, or
crossed the river Jihun, and had made raids upon the fron-

beautiful city. The ruler of that tract of country was a person who claimed descent from Afrasiyab, but whose name is never once mentioned, and he possessed neither power nor grandeur; and the Turk tribes of Karlik or Karlugh—whose immigration neither has been recorded in the account of Arsalan Khan—and Kankul, who were dwelling in those parts (and also the Khichak tribes, according to another writer, only Khichak or Khichak is not the actual name of any tribe, but a tract of country), having withdrawn their allegiance from him, used to resist his officers, harry his people and followers, carry off their flocks and herds, "and were wont to act as wolf and fox."

This Amir of Bilasaghun, as previously shown, was a totally different person from either of the rulers mentioned in the account of the Afrasiyab dynasty of kings just recorded, for all the accounts given by different writers, and what has been stated respecting the IXth and Xth sovereign of that dynasty, tend to show that, besides that dynasty, there were several other Khans, who appear to have been, in some way, subject to them; and our author, in several places, as well as other writers, confirms this, as in the following examples.

At page 51, our author mentions "the rulers of the Afrasiyab dynasty of kings," and one as "the Great Khan," thus showing that there were lesser Khans. At page 84 he mentions, "Kadr Khan," and "the Khans of the Turks," and "the Khans of Turkistan." Saljuk also is said [see note 1, page 117] to have descended from Afrasiyab. Again, at page 118, our author says "all the Maliks of Turkistan and the Afrasiyab rulers" were afraid of the son of Saljuk; and, at page 121, "Ali Tigin, the late ruler of Bukhara, who was one of the Afrasiyab Khans," is referred to. At page 132, he informs us that Sulitan Al-Arsalan "led an army into Turkistan and Turan, and the Maliks of Turkistan, and the Afrasiyab Amir, submitted to his authority," and, on the next page, that he had reached the frontiers of Kishghar and Bilasaghun, in 453 or 454 H., when he had to hasten to the Khalafah's succour. At page 137 he says Malik Shah brought under his sway "the whole of the countries of Turkistan." At page 260 also, our author states that "the Sulitan [Mubammad, Khawrazm Shah] set out towards Mawarain-Nahr and Turkistan; and the whole of the Maliks and Suljans of the Afrasiyab dynasty, who held territory in the countries of Mawarain-Nahr and Farganah, presented themselves before him," and this was immediately before the total downfall of the Gur Khan and his dynasty. All this, and what has been already related, certainly does not show that "the Afrasiab dynasty is a mistake," as a recent writer, merely because he has not found anything about them in the foreign translations to which he alone has access, supposes.

The Amir of Bilasaghun, unable to coerce these Turks—the Karlugh and Kankul—hearing of the arrival in his vicinity of the Gur Khan, the plenitude of his power, and the number of his dependents and followers, despatched envoys to him to state his own weakness, and inability to keep the Karlugh and Kankul in subjection, and to invite him to move towards his capital, that he might cease unto him his territories, and release himself from the troubles and sorrows of his present state, and his people be protected.

Before I proceed farther it may be well to say something on the geography of these parts, as described by Oriental authors, and also to refer to some
tiers of Khurāsān, and had ravaged Upper Khurāsān lying

statements on the subject which have recently appeared in the Geographical Magazine, and in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, and more particularly because the geography of these parts refers as much to the notice of the Afrāsīyābī Malikṣ, of whom I have just given an account, as to the Karā-Khitā-Īs, and will tend to elucidate the history of both dynasties.

In the Geographical Magazine for December, 1874, page 389, is an article or letter on "Bala Sagun and Karakorum," referring to a "brochure of Professor V. Grigoreif, on the Khāns of Turkistān, who quotes the Chronicle of "Der- 
vish Akhmed Effendi" [probably meant for Darwesh Aḥmad Afandī,—there is no such a name as Akhmed] from a Turkish translation, in which it is said that "The capital of their dominions was at first the city of Balasagun, but afterwards Bukhara and Samarkand. They began to rule over Mavrennahr in the year 383 (993 A.D.), and their dynasty came to an end in 609 (1212 A.D.). Their main possessions were: 1. Bala Sagun, which was their capital, situated at the beginning of the 7th climate in 102° of Long. and 48° of Lat., not far from Kashghar, and considered from of old the old boundary city of Turkistān; 2. Kashghar, the capital of Turan, in the 6th climate in 120° of Long. and 45° of Lat.; it is also called Ardukend, &c.; 3. Khotan, in the most distant part of Turkistan, Long. 170°, and Lat. 42°; 4. Karakorum; 5. Taras; 6. Farāb; all three important cities."

This statement is tolerably correct, according to the Oriental geographers, with a few exceptions. They could not possibly have begun to reign over Māwarā-un-Nahr in 383 H., because "the Great Khān" did not take possession permanently of Bukhārā until the 11th month of 389 H., up to which time, the Sāmānīs ruled over Māwarā-un-Nahr [See page 52 of this translation].

In no histories, however, that I have met with, and they are not a few, is such a statement made as that, "at first, the city of Bala Sagun [What has the "Effendi Akhmed" done with the gh in the name Bilāsā-ghūn? He is not likely to have written it with simple g any more than he would write Aḥmad with k], was the capital," and afterwards Bukhārā and Samarkand. Bilāsā- 
ghūn continued to be the capital of a branch of the family up to 522 H., when it was given up to the Karā-Khitā-Īs. The Afrāsīyābī began to reign centuries before 383 H. Without referring at all to pre-Muḥammadan times, we find a Turk dynasty, the ruler of which is styled Khākān, as the Afrāsīyābī kings are also sometimes called, at Samarkand and Bukhārā when the 'Arabs first crossed the Jihūn, and they are, doubtless, one and the same. The first we hear of them in Muḥammadan times is during the period of the early 'Arab governors of Māwarā-un-Nahr, previous to the time of the Tāhirīs and Sāmānīs, but the earliest date mentioned is about the year 53 or 54 H., when Muḥallab made a raid on Bukhārā. In 77 H., the people of the Sughd of Samarkand are mentioned, and their Malik, Turkīhūn by name. Inroads were made into Farḡāhān by the 'Arabs in 87 H., and a treaty was entered into with the Turks. In 111 H., the Turks issued from the tracts north of Bukhārā and Samarkand, and invaded Khurāsān, but the Khākān of the Turks was routed by Junaid. Soon after, the Khākān again returned with a great army, and the 'Arab Amīr of Samarkand had to render aid to Junaid, but nothing decisive was effected. Then followed the rise of Abū-Muslim, when the tracts east of the Jihūn were little thought of, the rise of the Tāhirīs and Sāmānīs followed, who forced the Turks back from Māwarā-un-Nahr, but, in 367 H., Shams-ud-Daulah, the
on the bank of the Jihun, and the confines of Balkh.

I-lak Khan of the Turks, entered Mawar-sun-Nahr, as already stated in the account of them. In no history is Bilasa-ghun mentioned as their capital, but Kāshghar is constantly referred to as such. Ahmad, the first of the Samānids [See page 28], who died in 261 H., held Farghānah, Shāhī, and Isfānjāb—most of the people of which were Ghuzz, and Khalj Turks, who had embraced the Musalmān faith—together with Kāshghar and Turkistan to the frontier of Chih, and this shows where some of the Turk tribes were located at that period. In 280 H., Ismā‘īl, Samānī, made a raid upon the country of the Turks, took their chief town, the name of which, unfortunately, is not mentioned, and carried off great booty and a vast number of captives; but it appears that, the more the Samānids turned their attention to Khūrāsān, the stronger grew the Turks beyond the Shībūn. On disturbances arising in the Samānī empire, from the time of Amīr Nūh, the IXth of that dynasty, the Afrasiyābī Malikhs began to meditate conquests in Mawar-sun-Nahr, and, in 383 H., the son and successor of the I-lak Khan—Abū-Mūsā-i-Hārūn, the Bughrā Khan—determined to attack Bukhara, but he did not retain possession of it. Three sovereigns of the Samānī dynasty reigned after 387 H. The former date was about seven years after the widow, Ālān-Kuwā, gave birth to the "sons of light."

It is amusing to read the various theories put forth with regard to the site of Bilasa-ghun, and the derivation of its name.

In the Geographical Magazine for June, 1874, we are told, in a paper by Mr. Robert Michell, who quotes M. Paderin, that "Bela-sagun," as he styles it, is indifferently called Kara-Korum, Kara-Kherem, Kara-Koram, and Kara-Khelin, and that, "by Muhammadan writers, it is called Urdu Balik (D'Ohs-son, Hist. des Mongols, t. i, p. 76) or Belasagun, now written [by whom?] Balgasun, which M. Semenof explains is only a title."

This may be dismissed as simple nonsense. Bilasa-ghun and Karā-Kuram are totally distinct places.

In the same Magazine for July, 1874, p. 167, Colonel Yule, C.B., referring to the above, says "That Belasaghun was a corruption of the Mongol Balghassun, or 'city or royal residence,' as is intimated in the same passage, seems highly probable," but he thinks that it is "greatly to be questioned" whether "Belasaghun was the same as Karakoram. . . . By the story Belasaghun should lie somewhere between these (the Caspian, Aral, and Jaxartes) and Imil," &c.

Who is the authority that "Belasaghun was a corruption of the Mongol Balghassun" is not mentioned, nor do I think any Eastern author will be found to contain such a statement for reasons I shall mention farther on.

In the next month's Geographical Magazine Mr. Michell again informs us that the correct version of the previous quotation is taken from M. Semenof's Russian edition of part of Ritter's Asia as follows:—"Muhammadan writers call this ancient capital of the Turks [Korin, or Kholin, or Kara-Korom] Ordu-Balig [D'Ohs-son, Hist. des Mongols] or Belasagun [Balgassun], which, however, is only its title."

I certainly should like to know the name of any Muhammadan author who has made such an astounding assertion.

Farther on Mr. Michell says: "In conclusion, I would suggest that Pinjan, near Turfan, which is, too, situated near a lake [But who says the capital of the I-lak Khan, the Afrasiyab Malik, was near a lake?] may be the ancient
Tirmid, Amūd, Ṭāl-ḵān, Guzarwān [also Juzarwān] and

1 Probably Āmūf, or Āmūfah, a town on the banks of the Jīhūn, a place frequently mentioned in history, and which gives the name of Āmū, Āmūn, or Āmūfah to the river Jīhūn, which separates Khurāsān and Ī-rān from Tūrān and Turkistān, the signification of which words are, full, replete, running over, full to the brim.

The inroads of Karā-Khītā-Īs into Khurāsān refer to the time of the Khwārazmī rulers, particularly Sultān Shāh. See note 7, page 245.

Balga-sun (Balga meaning “guarded refuge,” and Sun being, perhaps, an objective case, and derived from Su, water,” &c.

Such a situation for Bilāsā-ghūn is scarcely possible.

In the next number of the Geographical Magazine, for September, 1874, Colonel Yule again writes, referring to the above, “Balghasun is a Mongol word apparently meaning city” (perhaps “walled city,” but I have no access to a dictionary), and, in a foot-note, adds: “It is, I presume, a derivative from Balīgh. Asun one sees in a common Mongol termination, but I do not know its force.”

We are not informed who says “Balghasun” is a Mongol word, but considering that we only hear of it through the Musalmān writers, who give us the account of the Gūr Khān, and the battle between the Sultān of Khwārazm and the Karā-Khītā-Īs, and before the irruption of the Mughals, is it likely to be “a Mongol word”? It appears also to have been entirely overlooked with regard to these theories, that the Mughals did not dwell in cities, towns, or houses, but in felt tents.

Asūn is certainly a Mughal, or Turkish name, as in Īr Asūn who was chief of the ʿŪrāf ʿUrāfī tribes, and some others.

I shall have something more to say respecting Karā-Kurām under ʿUktāe Kāʾān’s reign.

Surgeon-Major Bellew, of the late Kāshgār Mission, informs us that “Balasaghoum,” is “the Kūbalīgh of the Moghol”!

Mr. Eugene Schuyler, in the Geographical Magazine, for December, 1874, p. 389, is quite correct in supposing that Bilāsā-ghūn is not a Mughal name, but it certainly does not come from Persian “balā,” upper, as he supposes, because the second letter in that Persian word is alif—而非— whilst the second letter in Bilāsā— الاغون— also written with ۶— ئ—for ۶— which is pronounced, according to the vowel points mentioned in explanation of it—Bilāsā-ghūn— is ̄ lām— J—and, without doubt, this place was a long way west of Karā-Kurām, and more to the south.

Colonel Yule, in “a note” to Mr. E. Schuyler’s “letter,” says, Juwaine’s expression as given by D’Ohsson conveys the impression that the name “Gubalik” was given to the city by the “Mongols” of the “Chinghis age,” and that “Balghasun” alone could not have been the earlier name of the city, meaning as it does merely “city,” and that “Gubalik” may be a clerical error for Armalik, and may indicate Cobłek (or Gubalik) was the same as Almalīg;” &c.

It is very certain that the Mughals called Bilāsā-ghūn Ghū-Bālīk or Bālīgh with the guttural gh, and ۶ and ۶ being interchangeable—而非— and the Juwainī says so as well as many others, but neither “Gubalik,” “Armalik,” “Cobalik,” nor “Balghasun.” Bilāsā-ghūn was certainly its previous name, and by no other was it known, according to the histories avail-
Gharjistān, as far as the frontier of Ghūr. All Māwarā-un-
able, until the Mughals gave it a name among themselves, but I look upon the Mughal name as merely a by-name. The city did not lose its previous name in consequence of this by-name, but it is scarcely mentioned after its sack by the army of the last Gūr Khān, and it was subsequently destroyed by the Mughals at the time of the Chingiz Khān’s irruption into Islām. The meaning assigned to Ghū by Oriental writers is “good,” “fine,” “pleasant,” &c., and Bālígh signifies “city”—as Bīsh-Bālígh, Khān-Bālígh, Mau-Bālígh, and the like, but Ghū alone does not mean “good city,” “fine city,” nor “beautiful city.”

Mr. H. H. Howorth has been writing voluminous articles lately on “Avlie Ata,” the “Khāu Khitaīs,” “Balasagun,” and other kindred subjects, but, to judge from them, he appears to change his opinions, as well as his proper names, with each fresh one.

In the *Geographical Magazine*, for July, 1875, p. 217, he writes with reference to “Balasagun” that “Gu-Balik” is probably the literal translation of “city on the Chu,” and he follows one of the writers just referred to, and says that “Balasagun” [all three writers mentioned spell the word differently, it will be observed] “merely means city,” and that “Balasagun is a wholly indefinite term.” In this last opinion I do not by any means agree with him. What more definite name is required I cannot conceive: it is as definite as Samrukāl or Bukhārā. But in what tongue does “Gu-Balik” mean only “city”? This is diametrically opposed to Colonel Yule’s theory.

In the *Geographical Magazine*, for December, 1875, p. 378, Mr. Howorth makes a very “bold guess” indeed “that Kayalik is no other than Gu-balig [sic] i.e. Beautiful City,” and so—as he states above that “Balasagun,” which is “a wholly indefinite name,” and “only means city,” is “Gu-Balik”—Bilāsāghūn and Kayālik must, consequently, be one and the same place, while, on the very same page, Kayālik, the existence of which is undoubted, long before the Karā-Khītaīs were heard of in that part, is supposed to be “a city or town of their foundation.” In the map to his book, “The Mongols Proper,” however, “Bilasaghun” and “Kabali (Kayalik)” are some 500 miles apart!

On that same page it is also said that Kayalik is no doubt compounded of the well known Turkish particle baligh or town, but in the *J. R. As. Soc.*, vol. viii., part ii., p. 275, he writes: “The site of Balasaghun has been much debated. It was the capital of the ancient Turkish Khans of Turkistan. . . . It merely means city.”

Again, in the *J. R. As. Soc.*, p. 277, we have: “Another important town of the Kara Khitaes was Kayalik or Kabalik . . . which name is not probably a corruption of Kobilik or Kabalik,” and, “the present Russian station of Kopal” is supposed to be its site.

In the same paper, page 267, “Bish-balig” is said to mean “six courts,” which consisted of “six towns,” but what authority exists for this last statement is not said. At pages 6 and 21 of his “Mongols Proper” we are informed that “Urumtsi” is “Bishbalig,” and in the map prefixed to it we have “Bishbalig (Urumchili)”; but at page 737 it is stated that “Fiechipali is no doubt Bishbalig,” and at page 165 it is “Bish Balig, the capital of Uiguria.”

Another writer says the word signifies “five towns,” which is correct, for bish, in Turkī, means five.

The “Afrasiab dynasty” is also believed, by Mr. Howorth, “to be a mistake,” in reference to the Khāns of Turkistān [whom I have, I think;
Nahr, Farghānah, and Khwārazm, and some parts of

to be substantially palpable sovereigns], contrary to every Muhammadan
writer, who has written on the subject, without exception, although, in another
place [Geog. Mag. for July, 1875, p. 217], we have "the descendant of
Afrasiab, who was deprived of his title of Khan, leaving him only that of 'Ilk
Turkan'!"

In another place this very "Ilk" Khān, or "Ilk Turkan," is said to be
"one of the Lion Khans—Lion Hooi or Lion Uighurs of Visdelu, whose
northern capital was Almaligh, a well known city in the middle age history of
Central Asia, which is said to mean City of Apples" [there is no bālīgh, how-
ever, in the word], but in what tongue is not said. . . . "It is fixed on the
site of the modern [1] city of Old Kuldja, on the river Ŭli," but who fixed it is
not said. In Col. Walker's last Map (1875) Kuldja figures as Ŭli!

A line or two after we have, "I have no doubt, therefore, that it was its
chief [the chief of Ālmālīgh], the Lion Khan of the Uighurs," &c., . . . the
metropolitan city of the Lion Khans," &c., &c. See Nos. IX. and X. of that
dynasty, note to page 905.

Page 277, of the same paper, the writer says: "The deposed Khan of Turkis-
tan had his seat of empire at Samarkand," it was at "Bilasağun" before, and,
just above, p. 269, "Almaligh" was "the metropolitan city"; and, by way
of improving this, at page 272, I find that "At Khan" [At Khan—the
Karā-Khitā-t, who, with Bāñtko of Tārāz, fought the battle with Sultan
Sanjar] "is probably the dispossessed Khan of Turkistan," his "Ilk Khan," and,
at p. 282, that "the old royal race of the Turkish Sultans of Turkistan
still held subordinate authority at Samarkand"! In no History is the chief of
Bilāsā-ghūn ever styled Sultan, which was the title of the head of the
Afrāsiyyābī dynasty.

So the upshot of all this is that the Afrāsiyābī dynasty is "a mistake," and
yet they are said to have reigned at three different capitals—Bilasağ-ghūn,
Ālmālīgh, and Samarkand, and also to have "held sway at Kashgar," to be
"descendants of Afrasiab," also "Lion Uighurs" [I-ghiirs], and of "the
old royal race of Turkish Sultans," and yet also "Karlucks." What a
tissue of mistakes and inconsistencies have we here! See also the note on
Koshluk farther on.

I have already alluded to some of these statements in my account of the
Afrāsiyābī dynasty.

Mr. Howorth's latest theory [Geog. Mag. July, 1878] is that "Kenchak,"
which Mr. Schuyler has "identified" with Merke, "seems to mark the site of
the famous capital of the Kara Khitai, Balasaghun, which has been the
subject of much controversy!"

With respect to the situation of Ālmālīgh, I have found some scanty
particulars, which fix its position tolerably clearly. On the occasion of
Timūr's moving into Mughalāstān from Samarkand, in 791 H., he crossed the
Stūn at Tāsh-kand, and reached the Issī-Kol—or, Issīgh-Kol—
蹊.sīgh-Kol—where he was joined by the troops which had moved from Andīgān
thither. Having remained there for a time to perfect his arrangements,
the force set out by the 'Ubbah or Pass of Arjatū or Irjatū, plundering and
slaughtering the enemy on both sides of its route, until, having passed
Ālmālīgh, it crossed the river Ilīh—by swimming its horses, and
reached the Karā-tal, &c., and no river Chū is at all referred to. The Karā-
tal river rises about twenty or twenty-five miles west of Alten-imel [the Altān
Khurāsān also, used to send them tribute; and, upon
I-mil?] of Col. Walker’s map, in Lat. 44° 10’, Long. 78° 10’, and falls into the
Tin-ghez, or Din-ghez, or Lake Bālkaš. So Ālmalīgh is to be looked for, or
rather its site, to the west of the river-Iīlh, and nearer Almātī than “New
KHULJA.”

In looking for sites of such places, it appears to me that sufficient allowance is
not made for the physical changes which may have taken place during six
centuries. In one great tract of country, in particular, as I shall presently
show, a vast desert has existed for some centuries, where, previously, many
flourishing cities stood; but the sites even of the cities of Bilāsā-ghūn, Kayālik,
Bīsh-balīgh, and Ālmalīgh, were entirely unknown upwards of three centuries
since. Landmarks have disappeared, and hence people look elsewhere than in
this desert for lost cities, in many instances. I may also again mention here
that our author’s Ḳabālik—قابليه—at page 154 is incorrect. The copyists of the
different MSS. wrote بابل—and such an error has occurred in other
Histories than his carelessly copied. The city’s name is properly قابليه according
to other authorities, and the place certainly lay south of the Ulugh Tāgh,
or Thianshan mountains, but near them.

I will now give a few particulars as to what the Muḥammadan authors,
and some old travellers say, respecting the geography of the parts herein
referred to.

In Astley’s Collection Bīsh-Balīgh—بیشبالیح—is said to be 26° W. of Pekin,
and rather more than 44° N. of the equator, and about a degree N. of Tūrfān
—Turfan—while Ḳara-Ḳuram is said to be 10° W. from Pekin, and about the
same distance as Bīsh-Balīgh N. of the line. The I-ghūr country formerly
seems to have included the provinces of Tūrfān and Khamil, or at least the
middle portion near Tūrfān, within eight or nine leagues of which was their
capital called Ho-chew by the Chinese, but, as previously mentioned, the moun-
tain [range] of Ḳara-Ḳuram was about the centre of it. Whether Ho-chew is
Bīsh-Balīgh—which was a well known place long after the Mughal invasion—or
whether the last was another capital to the N. of Tūrfān, as Gaubil mentions,
is difficult to say. The I-ghūrs were masters of a portion of the adjacent
parts of Tattāry to the sources of the Ḳarīsh and Mount Altai [Altaï
mountains], as were the Karghiz.

Abū-I-Fidā says Bilāsā-ghūn is near Fārāb or Utrār—a totally different
place from Fār-yāb in the territory of Balkh, but Abū-I-Fidā blunders often.
The authors quoted in Astley say the correct name is Yalāsā-ghūn, or “Good
Town,” not Bilāsā-ghūn, and that B and Y in the Arabic are easy to mistake.
This is true, but the mistake here is their own. Bilāsā-ghūn is also said to be
“still in existence [its ruins?] in Little Bukharia—Kichik Bukhārā, or the western
part of the Kāshgar territory, as at present constituted—near the borders of
the Greater Bukharia and the country of the Kālimākṣ, and one of the principal
entrances on that side into Great Bukharia.” Others again say that it was
near Kāshgar, as Darwešgh Aḥmad, quoted by Prof. Grigoreif, also says, and
some, more to the N., near Utrār or Fārāb, in Turkistān.

Others again seem to consider that the town which appears in some maps as
“Turkistān”—a very unusual, and I think impossible name for either a town
or city, but not for a country—is no other than Bilāsā-ghūn, but this cannot be
right. I shall have something to say about this town of “Turkistān” farther
on Some call the former place “Turān which gives name to the country.”

That portion of the Great Desert of Kob, or Shāmo, W. of the Ḳara Muran
IRRUPTION OF THE INFIDELS INTO ISLĀM. 921

several occasions, they had made captive and carried off Musalmāns from those tracts.

or Hohang-Ho, is said to be called Karā-Khiṭān—because the Khīṭās dwelt so long in that part, and herein the empire of the Kin, or Western Lyau of the Chinese writers, appears to have been founded. It is farther east and farther south than what appears in some recent maps as "Karakhitai."

Another writer plainly states that "Fārāb is a city of Turkistān between Chāch, i.e. Chāj or Tāsh-kand and Bīlāsā-ghūn, both of which are cities of Turkistān, and that it is the name of the territory likewise in which it is situated," and, farther, that the word signifies "lands cultivated by artificial irrigation by means of rivers or kāřīses—subterranean canals—in distinction to lands irrigated naturally by rain." According to this, Bīlāsā-ghūn must be looked for to the northward of Tāsh-kand.

It may also be well to mention what the Oriental geographers mean by the term Māwarā-un-Nahr, the Great Bukharia of old European writers and travellers. The term is neither "equivalent to Doub," nor to "Mesopotamia," but simply "that which is beyond the river," i.e. the Jīḥūn, Āmūfah, or Oxus—Trans-Oxus. It has the territory of Tāsh-kand on the N., Balkh on the S., Khwārazm on the W., Farghānah on the E., and Samrakand is its capital.

"Farghānah, which is the name of a country [not of the city of Khokand as it is made to appear in Col. Walker's map], is bounded on the W. by Samarkand and its district, E. by Kāšghar, S. by the Kohistān of Badakhshān, and, although the parts bounding it to the N., previous to the ninth century of the 1st., were in a flourishing condition, and contained places such as Ālmālīgh—Bānikī—Alamūt—Almātū—Alāmār—Bānikī—and Bāntī—Δαράζ—Δαράζ—[no Bīlāsā-ghūn is referred to], yet now, through the passage of the Ūlāks, it has become desolated. The river Īžūn, also called the Ab-i-Khuja, flows through it, enters Turkistān, and becomes lost in the sands." There is no mention whatever made of the 'Aral Lake or Sea in the works I am quoting.

"In the territory of Farghānah there are seven large and small cities, five to the S., and two to the N. of the Ūzgūn:—1. Andīgān [Andiyan of the 'Arabs], a very strongly fortified place; 2. Ūz; 3. Marghānān [sic—Marghilān of the maps], seven farsaks h W. of Andīgān; 4. Khujand, N. of which is a mountain called Mughal-Tāgh in which much fīrūsah and other valuable things are found; 5. Akhshī, on the N. side of the Ūzgūn [the Aksī of maps], which, with the exception of Andīgān, is the largest place in Farghānah; 6. Shāsh, a very old place, now [old] Tāsh-kand. It is also called Chāch and Chāj [incorrectly Jaj]; 7. Ūz-gand." Khokand is not mentioned, it being a comparatively modern place.

Farghānah, Māwarā-un-Nahr, and Turkistān, are all separate territories.

"Turkistān is mostly in the sixth climate, including Fārāb, a small territory, the chief town of which is called Guzar—کُز; but some say it is the name of a city above Shāsh or Chāj, and near unto Bīlāsā-ghūn—بَلَدُ السَّاعُ. This other form of writing the name of this famous place—Bīlāsā-ghūn—might plausibly be supposed to be from bīlīd, only it is the plural form of balad, which means city, town, country.

Jund, or, correctly, Jand, was once a great city, but it has been in ruins for over 300 years.
The territory of Kaschgahr is bounded N. by the mountains of Mughalistan [the Ulugh-Tagh of the Turks—See note on the Turks, p. 875, and Thianshan of the maps], out of which several rivers flow. Its W. boundary is also a range of mountains which shoot out from the mountains of Mughalistan towards the S.—Bilaur [also written Billaur] Tagh—the name of which range does not require "to be abolished," since it has been known from the time of 'Abd-ullah-i-Khurshadibih down to Khushkal, Kashak, Afghan, and to modern times—and from these also issue rivers which flow from W. to E.; and the whole of the country of Kaschgahr and Khutan lies at the skirts of these two ranges of mountains. The E. and S. boundary is a great sahra or steppe—a plain, not naturally a desert—which is wholly jungle and wildfowlness, and hillocks of moving sand. In ancient times there were several cities in this tract, the names of three of which are Katak or Katuk—Tur—Lob-Kasal—probably Lob-Katal, between Turkhan and Khutan; but they have been all buried in the sands. There was another called Fulad-Sum—all is not recorded. It was a well-known place in the Chinigiz Khans time.

Yarkand, in former times, was a great city, but it had greatly decayed, and was becoming desolate, when Mirza Abu-Bikr made it his capital. It soon after had 12,000 gardens in and around the city, which was surrounded by a wall thirty cubits high. The people of this part of the territory are [when the author wrote] divided into four classes, the Tumän, cultivators or peasantries, the Kuchin, or soldiers, the I-maks, or nomads, and the officials.

Khutan was one of the most celebrated of cities and territories, "but of that rose, naught but the thorn remains at present." 'Abdul-Fida says it was a city of the Ighurs. In former times, before the desert just mentioned approached so near it, Chin could be reached in fourteen days, the whole way was inhabited and cultivated, and one or two persons could pass to and fro with safety, without being obliged to join Kaflahs, but now [when the author wrote], on account of the Kalmaks—Europeanized "Kalmucks"—the route is closed, and that which is now followed is 100 stages. Vast quantities of yashb or yashm, also called bijadah—jade or jasper—is found in the rivers of Kaschgahr and Khutan, and in those territories also the camel of the desert, which may be tamed, and the kutilash, kattas, or ghajis-gau [the Boa Grunniens. See page 68, and note 4].

The territory of Kaschgahr [Little Bukharia] appears the same precisely as that called Mangali-Suyah—which signifies "towards or facing the sun—sunny-side"—the boundaries of which are thus given. "On the N. Issig-Kol, S. Jirjan—Sarigh-i-Ighur—E. Kosan—and Tarbogor or Tarbogor—and W. Samghar—and Jakshman or Jaugham—present. This tract contains several cities, the greatest of which are Kaschgahr and Khutan, Izz-gand, Akhsikat or Akhsisak, Amilgan, Atpashi, Ak-su, and Kosan." This may be considered the territory peculiar to the Afsisyabi Maliks before they again obtained possession of Sarmkand and Bukhara on the downfall of the Saimanis.

An account of Kaschgahr and other places on the Shun, written by me some twenty years since, will be found in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society for 1857. At that period a Chinese Jang-Jang or Governor General resided at Kourah near Ilhi.

I now return to the history of the Gur Khans.
who used not to submit to them, all the rest of the Malik

Some say the first of this dynasty assumed the title of Gür Khan before Bilâsâ-ghan was given up to him by the Ahrâsîyâb Khan, but, certainly, it was not conferred upon him by Musalmân. Its assumption is said to have taken place in 522 H. [A.D. 1128], at which time Mûhammâd Khan [Abûmad of some writers], who bore the title of Arsalân Khan, ruled over Mâwârâ-un-Nâhr. See No. XVII. of the Ahrâsîyâb dynasty, who, certainly, is not the person referred to as surrendering his sovereignty and capital to the Gür Khan; and, from what follows, and what I have already stated, it is proved beyond a doubt, that there were several petty dynasties of Ahrâsîyâb Khâns in Turkistan, besides the rulers of Mâwârâ-un-Nâhr.

Alfi says that, at the period when the Kâdr-Khitâ-Is fought with Sultân Sanjar, the territories of Turkistan, namely, Kâshghar, Bilâd-sârâgân, Tarâz, Khutan, and other parts besides, were in the possession of great Khâns, who were Turks, who accounted themselves of the lineage of Ahrâsîyâb, and descendants of Sâtkâ Karachâr, and that, at that time, all had become converts to Islam.

The Gür Khan, having assumed the sovereignty over the Ahrâsîyâb Amir of Bilâsâ-ghan and his territory, now despatched Shâhnâhs [Intendants] into different provinces and districts, and, after a time, his dependants and followers increasing, and growing still more flourishing, and their cattle fat [sic in MSS.], reduced the Kânkûlûs to subjection, despatched an army towards "Kâshghar and Khutân of Turkistan, and subjected those territories." The Kârlûchs are also mentioned, but another division of that great tribe, not included in the one mentioned as being located on the eastern frontier of Arsalân Khan's dominions, appears to have moved, or to have been forced, farther south-west; for, about this period, or perhaps a short time previously, this portion of them had worsted the Ghuzz, and expelled them from their former pasture-lands, and compelled them to enter Chaghânânân and Khâtl, the plural form of which word, Khatân, is also applied to that district or tract of country [but Khutân is incorrect: the first vowel is fatâ, not zamnâkî], and it is also called Kol-i-âb, which is a dependency of Bâdakhshân, and famous for its beautiful damsels and fine horses. See note 1, page 374, and note 6, page 423.

Subsequently the Gür Khan despatched a great army towards the territory of the Kûrîkîz to take vengeance for the treatment he had suffered there, and Bûh-Bâlîgh was taken possession of. From thence the Gür Khan's forces were despatched towards the territory of Fârghânâh or Andîgân and Mâwârâ-un-Nâhr.

The situation of the land or territory of Khîrkîz, or Kûrîkîz, or Kûrâkîz, as it is also written, has been a puzzling subject hitherto, but its situation is apparent here, more particularly if we take the description along with what is stated in the Masâlik wa Mamâlik, and in Ibn-Haukal. Speaking of China, the former work says: — "If one desires to proceed from the east [Chîn] towards the west, by the country of the Nâmân, the territory of Khîrkîz, the Taghar-i-Ghuzz [see note on this subject farther on], and Khâm towards the sea, it is a journey of nearly four months. . . . The country of Tibbat lies between the land of Khîrkîz and the kingdom of Chîn. Chîn lies between the sea, the land of the Ghuzz and Tibbat," &c., &c.

The Sultân of Mâwârâ-un-Nâhr, "who were the father and grandfather of Sultân Usmân of the Ahrâsîyâb dynasty, also laid their heads upon the line of the Gür Khan's commands, and became his tributaries." See the dynasty of the Ahrâsîyâb Maliks, Nos. XIX. and XXIII.

3 N 2
of the confines had become subject to that race. On two

In 534 H. [A.D. 1137, but the Jami‘-ut-Tawārīkh, contrary to several others, says in 536 H.], his troops defeated Sulṭān Sanjar on the frontiers of Samrḳand, as already recorded at page 154; but, since that was written by me, I have elsewhere found some further particulars respecting that defeat which clear up so completely a most obscure passage in our author’s account there given, that I must relate them here. The identical passage in our author referred to is as follows. “After a great part of his [Sanjar’s] reign had elapsed, a body of people from Kārā-Khiṭās, from Tāṃghāj [see Afrāsiyābī Malik, No. XXI.], and the dependencies of Ghūn, entered the confines of Kārā-Kurum of Turkistān, and solicited Sulṭān Sanjar to assign them grazing lands; and, with the Sulṭān’s permission, they took up their quarters on those confines, in Bilās—a Ghūn, Kābālīk [Kābālīk—Kābālīk is the correct name], and Ālmālīk, and made those parts their grazing grounds.”

In an article by Mr. H. H. Howorth, entitled “The Northern Frontagers of China: The Kara Khitaï,” in the Journal Ro. As. Soc. for April, 1876, p. 271, the above passage from this Translation is quoted, and its writer adds, referring to our author, “The latter author is mistaken in supposing that Turkestan was then subject to Sanjar,” &c. Now, considering that Mr. Howorth is wholly dependent on foreign translations for his information on these matters, such a statement on his part, to say the least of it, is presumptuous. I need scarcely mention to those who can read the eastern Historians for themselves, that every author who has written on the subject in the Persian language agrees with our author, even the “great Raschid” himself, respecting Sulṭān Sanjar’s suzerainty over the parts in question, as well as to his father’s and grandfather’s suzerainty likewise.

“When their progeny became very numerous, during the Sulṭān’s reign, they rebelled against his authority, and fought a battle against him. Tāṃghāj, at the nomination of Sunkam and Ī-mā, was at the head of the Khiṭās. The Sulṭān’s forces, from a long period of inaction, and enervated by protracted ease and luxury, were unable to cope with or stand before the enemy, and were overthrown; . . . he [the Sulṭān] concluded a peace with them, and the pasture-lands of Turkistān and Bilās—gūn, along with the cities and towns included in those frontier tracts, were left in the hands of the Khiṭās invaders.”

The particulars I refer to, tending to throw light on the above, are, that, when Sulṭān Sanjur proceeded to Samrḳand and dethroned Muḥammad [No. XVIII. of the Afrāsiyābīs], a part of the Kārā-Khiṭās had a yūrat or camping ground in that part—on the frontier—the tracts assigned them by the Sulṭān in former years, for our author is, by no means, mistaken, as the author of “Mongols Proper” imagines, in stating that Sanjar’s authority extended as far as the confines of Turkistān, for his being at Samrḳand, on this occasion, proves it, and, moreover, as mentioned at page 133, the Malik of Turkistān, and the Afrāsiyābī Amīrs submitted to the authority of Alb-Arsalān, Sanjar’s grandfather. Some of the Sulṭān’s Amīrs persuaded him that this was a good opportunity for seizing their flocks and herds, and driving out altogether these Kārā-Khiṭās, whom they accused of contumacy. They implored the Sulṭān’s mercy, and offered, through those Amīrs, to present 50,000 horses, 50,000 camels, and 50,000 sheep, as a propitiatory offering to him to allow them to remain where they were. This was approved of by the Sulṭān, but, in the meantime, the chiefs of the tribes of those Kārā-Khiṭās
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or three occasions, the forces of the sovereigns of Ghūr, the

[Sunkam and I-mā apparently] fled to the urdū of the Gūr Khān, whose power was a drag upon the Sultāns of Turkistān [the Afrāsiyābī Malīka], and represented to him that the Sultān of Khurāsān had become enfeebled by the infirmities of age, and that the affairs of that country had fallen into the hands of slaves and boys, and urged the Gūr Khān to wrest Māwarā-un-Nahr and Khurāsān out of their hands. He accordingly put his forces in motion, and Sultān Sanjar and his troops, despising them, moved to encounter them without concert or precaution, or caring for immensely superior numbers, thinking to overthrow them easily. Sanjar’s troops however, who were but few in comparison with the enemy, were soon completely surrounded by the Karā-Khiṭā-Īs, and Sultān Sanjar had to attempt to cut his way out with a body of 300 men. He succeeded, but he came out with only ten or fifteen remaining. In this affair 30,000 Musalmāns were slain, and Tāj-ud-Dīn Abū-l-Fath, Malik of Sijistān and Nīmroz, who, with the centre, maintained his ground to the last [see page 188] was taken prisoner. The rest agrees with what our author has already stated under Sanjar’s reign.

The Tārīkh-i-Alīf gives another account of the origin of the war between the Sultān and the Gūr Khān.

The Kārūghihā families stationed on the frontier of Arafān Khān’s dominions had been harshly treated by him. He considered they multiplied too fast, and set overseers of his own over them to prevent them having intercourse with their wives. They endured this tyranny for a considerable time, not knowing whither to fly. At last, grown desperate, on the arrival on the frontier, which it was their duty to guard, of an immense kāfīlah of traders and merchants, consisting of Turks, Khiṭā-Īs, and people from all parts to the eastward, they attacked the kāfīlah, and seized all the property and effects of the merchants composing it. They then made known to them that, if they desired to get their property restored to them, they must put them in the way of finding a place beyond Arafān Khān’s dominions, provided with water and forage sufficient to enable them to subsist, as they were resolved to stay no longer under his rule. The merchants told them they knew of a tract of country well provided with what they required, sufficient for the subsistence of ten times their number, and that it lay in the territory of Bilād-sāghūn in Turkistān. The Kārūghihā Turks, on this, restored the property of the merchants, seized their overseers, and, taking them along with them, made for the territory of Bilād-sāghūn, and there took up their quarters.

They were, however, in constant dread of Arafān Khān, until the Gūr Khān, who had, by this time, arrived in that part, entered into hostilities with the ruler of Māwarā-un-Nahr and Turkistān, and the Kārūghihā entered into combination with him. At this juncture, Arafān Khān, as previously mentioned, died, and Ḥasan-Tīgīn, who had been installed in his place by Sultān Sanjar, soon followed him. The sovereignty then devolved upon the Kẖāḵān, Maḥmūd, son of Arafān. Shortly after, the Gūr Khān, with a vast army of Khiṭā-Īs and Turks, numbering, it is said, 300,000 men, advanced into Maḥmūd’s territory, and began to annex it. The Gūr Khān imposed one dīnār as a tax upon each house in every city he reached, but neither allowed his troops to enter the people’s dwellings, nor their cultivated lands, and did not further molest them. To such of the Malikis of Māwarā-un-Nahr as submitted, the Gūr Khān assigned a tablet of silver to be hung up at the entrance of their palaces. See Journal Roy. As. Soc., vol. v., for 1870, p. 29.
champions of which army were the Sipah-sâlar, Khar-jam

As previously mentioned, the Khâkân, Ma-hmûd, was defeated, and, at his urgent prayer, Sulṭân Sanjar prepared to succour him. Sanjar is said to have taken six months to complete his arrangements, and, in the month of Zi-Ḥijjah, 534 H., to have crossed the Jihûn with an army of 100,000 cavalry—an exaggerated number—and moved towards Samrâkand. Serving in his army were the Malikhs of Sîstân, Ghaznîn, and Ghûr, and the Hâkimhs of Mâzandarân.

When Sanjar reached Samrâkand Ma-hmûd complained bitterly of the conduct of the Kârlîghîfâh, and the Sulṭân resolved to chastise them first. On becoming aware of his intention, they sought the protection of the Gûr Khân, who sent a letter to the Sulṭân demanding what crime was laid to the charge of the Kârlîghîfâh. The Sulṭân’s reply, as may be imagined, was sufficiently haughty. The hostile forces moved to encounter each other, and, after an obstinate battle, the details of which have been already given, victory declared in favour of the Khîtâ-îs, who were immensely superior in point of numbers; and the Sulṭân, having cut his way out with a few followers, fled to Tîrmiz. The Wâlî of Sîstân was taken prisoner [see page 188], and Amîr Khîmî, who had charge of the Sulṭân’s haram, and the whole of that establishment, were also made captive.

It is stated in the Târîkh-i-Yâsâ’î, that nearly 30,000 Musalmâns fell in this battle, and that among the slain were 4000 women. “In some other Histories it is also stated that, after the flight of the Sulṭân, the Turks and Khîtâ-îs poured into the camp and began to plunder. On their approaching the part where the haram was, Turkân Khâtûn, the Sulṭân’s chief consort, and most of the wives of the Amîrs, and the soldiery who acted as their guard, defended it against the infidels, and slew a vast number of them; and it was only after 4000 women had fallen that the rest of the haram was captured, including Turkân Khâtûn. The Gûr Khân left the females in charge of those of their own people who remained, and would not allow them to be interfered with. They were treated with honour and reverence, and, soon after, were sent back to the Sulṭân in Khurâsân.”

Mr. H. H. Howorth has not quoted my translation quite correctly [Journal R. As. Soc. Vol. viii. p. 272]. Nowhere have I said that “At Khân was in alliance with the chief of Kara Khitai.” In my note 2, to page 154, I say “Sanjar fought a battle with At Khân,” which, as my authority related it, refers to one of the leaders of the Gûr Khân’s forces. Most certainly At Khân was not “the dispossessed Khan” of Turkistân, nor was he the dispossessed chief of Bilâsâ-ghûn, nor does Râghîl-ul-Dîn, in his Jâmi’-ut-Tawârîkh, anywhere state that the ruler of Karâ Khîtâfe adopted the title of Gûr Khân—not “Ghur” Khân—“after this great battle in 525 H.” because he says, [in the MSS. before me] that this battle took place in 536 H. [which began 5th August, A.D. 1141], while others make it one year, and some, two years earlier—534 H., A.D. 1139-40, and 535, A.D. 1140-41.

Amîr Timûr, I also beg leave to say, never adopted the title of “Emir Timur Gur Khan,” for the very significant reason that the title of the Karâ Khîtâfe chief consists of two words قرخان while the word applied to Amîr Timûr, which appears to have misled Mr. Howorth, is one and is written قرخان —Gûrgân, and in signification there is no connexion between them whatever.

To return to my story. After having gained this great success, the Gûr Khân overran great part of Turkistân and Mâwarâ-un-Nahr, acquired predominance over those countries, and made their rulers tributaries. He in-
CREASED his forces, and his war materials accumulated; and, shortly after, he despatched an army under the command of his general, Arbaz—ṣaḥ—[this name is also mentioned by our author: “Irmuz” is not correct] towards the Khwârâzm territory, in order to sack and devastate the rustâqs [a word particularly applied in Khwârâzm to villages or collections of huts or felt tents, in distinction from the words dih and ērāb used in Ṭrâk and Khurâsân]. His troops created great havoc, and Itsiz, Sultan of Khwârâzm, despatched an envoy to the Gûr Khân to sue for peace, and agreed to pay allegiance to him for the future, and a yearly tribute of 30,000 dimârs, besides cattle, flocks, and other things. On this accommodation having been entered into, Arbaz retired; and soon after, in 537 H. [A.D. 1142-3], the Gûr Khân died. He was of the Manûf [Manichean] religion himself, but his wife was a Christian.

It is stated in Aflî that he died in the month of Rajáb of the following year.

He was succeeded by his wife, as no son remained to him, but some authors distinctly state that his daughter succeeded. To judge, however, from the events which followed, it is very improbable that the daughter then succeeded her father, because the name of the husband of the female sovereign who ruled so long is given, and it is scarcely probable that the Gûr Khân’s wife married again, without some mention of it being recorded, nor was it the custom, I believe, for widows to re-marry.

The wife, whose name is not given, dying some time after her succession, but without any date being mentioned, was succeeded by the Gûr Khân’s daughter, Konîk or Konavîk Khâtûn, but whether the late sovereign was her mother has not transpired. The word is somewhat uncertain in some works, but I put the most trustworthy reading first upon all occasions, and that used by the majority of writers. It is written كونک which, according to whether c or k be used, may be spelt in various ways, and كونک which may be Koyûnîk, and كولن—Kolûn—but another author, in two copies of his work, has Komânîk or Gomânîk or Komânîg or Gomânîg—کومانک—according as to whether the Tâzî or ‘Ajamîë be meant.

In the seventh year of I-yal-Arsalân, Khwârâzm Shah’s reign [557 or 558 H.], because he was not punctual in the payment of his tribute, as stipulated by his father, his dominions were assailed by the Gûr Khân’s forces. The Sultan sent forward, in advance, Gâ-i Beg, the Kürlîg, a native of Mâwarâ-un-Nahr, with an advance force, towards the Amûlah, but he was defeated and taken captive before I-yal-Arsalân could come to his support, and the latter fell sick and returned to Khwârâzm where he died in the month of Rajab of the same year.

On the death of I-yal-Arsalân, there were two claimants to the throne—his two sons, Jalâl-ud-Dîn, Sultan Shah, and ʿImâd-ud-Dîn, Takîsh Khân, who was the eldest son; but he, not being sufficiently powerful to oust the former, who, with his mother—a strong-minded woman—was in possession of the capital, and being at that time absent in charge of the territory of Jaud, which his father had taken from Kamâl-ud-Dîn, Arsalân Khân, son of Maḥmûd, and annexed, entered the territory of the third Gûr Khân, and sought her help to recover his patrimony. She agreed to aid him, on the stipulation that, on his being put in possession of Khwârâzm, he should pay over a certain amount of treasure, and a yearly tribute afterwards.

A large army was accordingly despatched to support Sultan Takîsh, and put him in possession, under the command of her husband, Farmâ or Farmâh,
had caused the overthrow of the forces of Khiṭā, and, in
by name,  ١ ٧ ١٧- ٢ ١٧ ٠ ٣ ٠- ٢ ١٧ ٠ ٣ ٠— who conducted the affairs of her empire. In the
Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh he is styled Farmāc Ākā. Sultān Shāh and his mother
slept, and Takīsh was put in possession of the capital, in Rabī’-ul-Ākhīr,
568 H. [the end of December A.D. 1172].
It is evident, from this, that this female Gūr Khān must have reigned a
considerable time, since she was, at this period, living, and lived for a con-
siderable time subsequently, for, not long after, the Karā-Khiṭā-l ruler sent to
demand more tribute from Sultān Takīsh than had been previously stipulated,
and, her envoy having behaved in a manner it was impossible to overlook,
Takīsh put him to death, notwithstanding he was one of the most distinguished
of the Khiṭā-ls.
On this, hostilities broke out between Takīsh and the Gūr Khān, which
the former’s brother, Sultān Shāh, taking advantage of, left Ghūr, where he then
was, and hastened to the presence of the Gūr Khān, and sought assistance
from her. This was in 569 H. Our author distinctly states that the Ghūrīlān
Sultāns treated Sultān Shāh with honour, but plainly refused to aid him
against Takīsh with whom they were in alliance [see page 245, and also
note ١, page 239, para. ٢], and our author was certainly well acquainted with
Ghūrīlān affairs generally. Mr. Howorth [Journal Ro. As. Soc ], in the article
before referred to, quotes Visdela, but, if Visdela ever styled MU’AYYID-UD-
DIN—which title signifies “The Aider of the Faith”—the A’INAH-DAR, or
Mirror-Bearer, by the impossible and meaningless names of “Umayyid i
Aimakdur,” the value of his authority is clearly indicated.
The assistance sought by Sultān Shāh was granted by her [the Gūr Khān] in
574-5 H. [A.D. 1178-9], and again Farmāc was sent with an army, but the success
was only partial. The particulars will be found in note ٢, page 239, and note ٤,
page 246. According to the authorities from which I take this account, the
female Gūr Khān now began to violate the laws and ordinances of the state,
and to abandon herself to sensual desires, until matters went so far that the
late Gūr Khān’s brother, and the chief men in the empire resolved to rid
themselves of her, and they put her to death along with her paramour.
It is very evident, from this, that she must have reigned many years, for,
from the date of the first Gūr Khān’s death, viz. 537 H., to the year in which
she rendered aid to Sultān Shāh, 574-5 H., is no less than thirty-eight years
nearly, and therefore, had this been his wife, she must have been a very old
woman, and her desires must have cooled. It appears to me, therefore—
although all the Musalmān writers, without exception, mention but three
persons, two males and a female, as composing this dynasty, which lasted
altogether ninety-five years, and has greater credit for its mighty power than
it is entitled to—that the first Gūr Khān must have been succeeded first, by his
wife, and then by his daughter, Konīk or Konayik. The date of her being
put to death is not given, and, I fear, not to be discovered. Having put
Konīk or Konayik Khiṭān to death, they [the chief personages in the empire]
chose one of the two brothers of the first Gūr Khān, who were then alive, to
succeed her, and the other, who was wont to embarrass and obstruct the affairs
of the empire, was passed over.
Some authors state that it was the brother of the late Gūr Khān—named
Komān or Kümān—who accused her of living a dissolute life and thus brought
about her destruction, and that he became the Gūr Khān himself.
On his—Komān, or Kümān—becoming established in the sove-
[one of] those battles, the Sipah-sālār, Khar-jam, had

reignty, he sent out Shaḥnāhs [Intendants] into different parts, and appointed persons, with due discrimination, according to their different capacities, to various offices.

Sulṭān Takīsh, Khwārāzm Shāh, had, on his deathbed, enjoined his son and successor, on no account to embroil himself with the Gūr Khān if he desired to preserve the integrity and safety of his dominions, because, he said, he was a strong barrier between very powerful enemies, which should by no means be broken down. This refers to the Chingiz Khān, who, at this period, was becoming very powerful. When Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārāzm Shāh, came to the throne, he continued for some time to transmit the tribute regularly as before, and friendship continued to subsist between him and the Gūr Khān; and, when Sulṭān Muʾizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, Sulṭān of Ghūr, became hostile to Sulṭān Muḥammad, and invaded his dominions in 601 H., the Gūr Khān despatched 10,000 men to the Sulṭān's assistance under Bāṅktīk of Taʿārā [see pages 474 to 481 for our author's account of it]; and before the gate of Andkhūd [Indākhdūd] the Khitā-īs fought an engagement with the Ghūrs, and overthrew them. On this occasion, Sulṭān 'Ugormān of Samrkdand, the last of the Afrāsiyābs, was present, as a vassal, with the Khitā-ī army: he had not, at that time, withdrawn his allegiance from the Gūr Khān.

Now it was that Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārāzm Shāh, having been successful in all his affairs, considered it time to throw off the yoke of the Gūr Khān, to pay tribute to whom, as an infidel, he considered a blot upon his sovereignty, more especially since the insolence of the Karā-Khitā-īs had reached such a pitch, that their envoy, who is styled Tonshī or Tūnshī—تیئی— and, by some, Tūshī—توشی—probably Tāshī, was his title [See also page 732, and note at page 866], presumed to seat himself upon the throne along with the Sulṭān. He accordingly withheld the tribute for two or three years, and manifested great tardiness in paying it. At length, the Gūr Khān despatched, as his envoy, his Wazīr, Muḥammad-i-Tāe [تای—in some places written Nāe—نای], and others, to demand payment, including all arrears.

When the Karā-Khitā-ī envoy reached Khwārāzm [the site of this famous capital has for centuries been known as Urganj-i-Kabrī—عورنج کبری— at which place the Russians have erected a fortress to protect their "trade routes." Khiwāk, anglicized Khivān, as it appears in Col. Walker's last map is not Khwārāzm. What appears there as "Kunia Urganj," correctly, Kuhnah—old, ancient—Urganj, is the place], the Sulṭān had made his preparations for an expedition into Khīfchāk [our author, at page 254, says the Sulṭān's mother was the daughter of Kadr Khān of Khīfchāk—other authors style her tribe Īrānīn—but he does not refer, in the least, to this expedition; and, at page 260, calls the Gūr Khān, by mistake evidently, Kulīf Khān—unless Kulīf was another of his titles, or an error for Ḫomān—of Khitāe, whose general was Bāṅktīk of Taʿārā], and was unwilling, at the same time, to disobey his late father's last request, and, moreover, did not wish to give the Karā-Khitā-īs a pretext or an opportunity for molesting his dominions during his absence in Khīfchāk, while he felt it a disgrace even to acknowledge his liability to pay this tribute. On this account, he did not open his lips on the subject, but left the affair in the hands of his mother—the celebrated Turḵān Khāṭūn, whose subsequent misfortunes are so pitiable—and set out on his expedition into Khīfchāk, the particulars respecting which expedition are not related by any author with whom I am acquainted.
attained martyrdom. The last of their armies which

* Our author has not given any details respecting these events in his account of the Ghûrîs, nor has he referred to any but the last person here mentioned.

Turkân Khâtûn directed that the envoys should be received with befitting honour; and the annual tribute due was made over to them. A number of distinguished persons of the capital were likewise despatched, along with Maḥmûd-i-Tâe, to the presence of the Gür Khân, to apologize for the delay which had occurred, and they were charged with expressions of homage and fealty as heretofore. Maḥmûd-i-Tâe, however, "had witnessed the lofty bearing and stubbornness of Sulţân Muḥammad, knew his humour, and fathomed his thoughts, that he considered himself, in power and magnificence—he was master of some of the richest parts of Western Asia, west of the Āmûfâh—the superior of the Gür Khân, and that he considered it beneath him to show humility or flattery to any human being, being satisfied, in his own mind, that the Malik's of the world were his vassals, and that, in fact, fortune itself was his servant." Maḥmûd-i-Tâe represented these circumstances to the Gür Khân, and assured him that, after this time, the Sulţân would certainly never pay him tribute again, and, consequently, the Sulţân's emissaries were not treated with the usual respect or consideration.

Sulţân Muḥammad, having returned to the capital of his dominions, successful from his Khiṭâhâk expedition, began to make preparations for his campaign for liberating Mâwarân-Nahr from the yoke of the Karâ-Khiṭâ-îs. He had been constantly receiving communications in secret, with promises of support, from Bukhârâ particularly, as far back as 600 H., and from Sulţân 'Ugmân of Samrâkand, and other rulers of Mâwarân-Nahr to whom the protracted yoke of the Gür Khâns was affliction, and who groaned under the exactions, the rapacity, and the injustice, of the Gür Khân's representatives, who had begun to act contrary to previous usages. The Sulţân, accordingly, marched an army to Bukhârâ then held by an upstart, named Sanjâr Malik, and sent messages inviting the rulers above referred to to join him in his proposed enterprise. They were well satisfied to accept the Sulţân's offers; and, under the determination of commencing hostilities against the Gür Khân, in the following year, he returned from Bukhârâ. This was in 606 H.

Kojlak—also called Koshlak by some writers, and "Kashlîf, otherwise Koshtuk" by Yaftî, and Kashlî Khân-i-Sünkâr, the Tatâr, by our author—son of the sovereign of the Nâemän's, after the death of his father, and dispersion of his tribes, had, some time before, sought shelter with the Gür Khân from the power of the Chingiz Khân. He had entertained rebellious ideas towards his protector, previous to Sulţân 'Ugmân's becoming a partizan of Sulţân Muḥammad, and now that some of the Gür Khân's own nobles likewise, in the eastern parts of his territory, had rebelled against his authority [occasioned, no doubt, by the Chingiz Khân's proceedings], and, on the Chingiz Khân's [first] expedition against Khiṭâ [not against the dominions of the Karâ-Khiṭâ-îs], Kojlak pretended to the Gür Khân that, if permitted to do so, he would go and collect his wandering Nâemän's, from whom he had been so long separated, and who had been too long dispersed like sheep without a shepherd, and would bring them to his assistance, that he had many of his tribes at and around I-nil, at Bîsh-Bâlîgh, and in the limits of Kaâlîgh or Kaâlîgh who wanted a leader, and that, since the Chingiz Khân was then occupied in the country of Khiṭâ, he could carry out his plans with facility.
crossed the Jihun and passed over towards Khurāsān was

The Gur Khān took the bait, conferred great honours upon him, and gave him the title of Khān—Kojlak Khān.

Kojlak having departed, the Gur Khān, when too late, repented of having let him go, and sent out commands to have him recalled, but without effect. Kojlak assembled around him all the scattered Nāemān tribe, and his fame became noise abroad: all, who were in any way connected with him in the Gur Khān's forces, also joined him, and he found himself at the head of a large army. On reaching I-nil, and Kaialīk, he was joined by Tūk-Tughān, more respecting whom will be found farther on, the Amir or Chief of the Makrīṭ Muḥžals of the Kāiāt division [see note 4, page 268], who had fled on hearing of the power of the Čingiz Khān; and, in concert, they began to plunder and devastate the country; and the Tūmātā, another Muḥgal tribe, dwelling near the frontier of Khītā [on the S.E.], also joined in the outbreak. The Čingiz Khān had to despatch troops against them, the details respecting which, not being connected with the fate of the Gur Khān, I reserve for their proper place farther on.

Kojlak, having now become sufficiently powerful, showed open hostility to his benefactor, the Gur Khān, having previously instigated Sulṭān Muḥammad to attack his dominions on the side of the Sīhūn or river of Fānākat. Among others, to whom the Gur Khān had despatched messengers with instructions for Kojlak's arrest, was Sulṭān 'Uṣmān of Samrākand. He had asked the Gur Khān to bestow upon him a daughter in marriage, and had been refused; and this had completely alienated 'Uṣmān from his cause. He took no notice of the message, and forthwith entered into communication with Sulṭān Muḥammad, acknowledged his suzerainty, read the Khutbah for him, and began to coin the money in his name.

The Gur Khān, on becoming aware of this state of affairs, despatched a force of 30,000 men against 'Uṣmān, and again reduced Samrākand, but did not deem it advisable to injure 'Uṣmān further, as he looked upon Samrākand as the treasury of his empire, and, as Kojlak was acquiring great power, and making head in the other direction [i.e. in the E. and S.E.], and molesting his territories, the army was withdrawn from Samrākand, and sent against Kojlak, who made an attempt to capture Bilāsā-ḡūn; but he did not succeed, and, subsequently, was overthrown, details respecting which will be found farther on.

There is considerable discrepancy with regard to these last events in connexion with the Kariba-Ḥīfā-Īs and the Khwārazmīl Sulṭān, since it is stated by several authors, as already given in the notes on that dynasty, that the Gur Khān's troops appeared before Samrākand, and assaulted it several times without success, and were finally recalled to operate against Kojlak. This, however, seems to refer to the defeat of the force sent by the Gur Khān against Samrākand a second time, after the victory over Bānīko, narrated farther on, while the former happened before the Gur Khān's defeat by the Khwārazmīs, as soon as he heard of 'Uṣmān's disaffection, as the Tārifkhi-i-Jahān-ḡir confirms.

Immediately on the withdrawal of the Gur Khān's army to attack Kojlak, Sulṭān Muḥammad, who had been waiting his opportunity, now marched to Samrākand with an army. 'Uṣmān came forth to meet him, ceded his territory to him, and Turīfah, a relative of the Sulṭān's mother, was located there, as the Sulṭān's lieutenant. The Sulṭān and his troops, accompanied by
that which fought an engagement with the Sultan-i-Ghāzi,

Sultan 'Ugmann, and his available forces, probably, commenced his march to invade the Gūr Khān's dominions. Having crossed the Sīhun at Fanākāt, which is also called the Jīhūn—i.e. great river—of Fanākāt, by a bridge of boats, the Khwārazmī army advanced until it reached the Šahra—plain or steppe—of I-lāsh, in the territory of Tarāz, which is also called Tāliān, and Taliāsh, situated beyond the frontier of Shāsh [now Tashkand], on the side nearest to Turkistān.

In Col. Walker's map this place is called "Turkistan (Hazret)," and this gives me a clue to the probable reason how it obtained this name. Near it is the tomb of the Khwājah, Aḥmād, a Musalām saint of Turkistān, and, as the word Hazrat is applied to saints as well as to capitals, such as "Hazrat-i-Dihlī," or "Hazrat Husain"—this place which sprung up near it, as Tarāz declined, became known as the Mazār-i-Hazrat-i-Turkistān—the Tomb of the Saint of Turkistān, but Mazār, having been, by some means, dropped, Hazrat-i-Turkistān, Europeanized into "Turkistan (Hazret)," has been the result. Tarāz, in its day, was a large place, but was ruined, like many others, by the Üzghar inroads centuries since, as already stated.

Having reached the plain of I-lāsh—also written I-lāmish—Bāṅfo, who held that territory as his appanage, and was the leader of the Gūr Khān's troops, and who was then at Tarāz awaiting them, issued forth to encounter the Khwārazmīs; and, on the 22nd—some say the 7th—of Rabī-ul-Awwal, 607 H. [12th of Sept. A.D. 1210], a battle was fought in which the Karā Khitā-Īs were completely overthrown, and Bāṅfo wounded and taken prisoner.

For the remainder of the events which followed see my notes to the Khwārazmī dynasty, page 262, note 1, note 4, page 900, on the Afrāsiyābī Maliks, and other details farther on.

Surgeon-Major Bellow, who turns the Gūr Khān into "Gorkhan," after previously stating that "a Khan or Ruler of Afrāsiyāb descent" applied to "Gorkhan of the Karā Khitāy," immediately after turns "Gorkhan" into an "Uighūr," and his army into "Uighūr" as well; and makes Khwāhīrizm [where does the ē come from in Khwārazm?] Šāh "defeat the Uighūr army," and capture "Aṭṭar," in 620 H., four years after the Chingiz Khān captured Bokhārā, and more than thirteen years after the defeat of Bāṅfo of Tarāz and the army of Karā Khitā-Īs, which took place in the third month of 607 H.

"Gorkhan" is then "deposed by the Shūncar Tārtār [I wonder what sort of animal a "Shūncar Tārtār is"] Koshluk," who "destroys the Uighur empire." A little further on [p. 133] we have the same "Koshluk"—though probably unknown to the Doctor—made "chief of the Nīyman tribe of Christians" who "was a Buddhist!" Then we are told that "Gorkhan, now ninety-two years of age, at once took the field, recovered Aṭṭar," &c., and then that "Koshluk"—the "Buddhist Christian Nīyman," and "Shūncar Tārtār"—"captured Gorkhan, whom he consigned to an honourable captivity, in which he died two years later aged ninety-five!"

For an account of these events see page 260.

The Doctor, besides making "Uighūrs" of them, has skilfully turned all the Gūr Khāns into one "Gorkhan," and the period, during which the Karā Khitā-ī dynasty continued, into the years of the life of his one "venerable Gorkhan, 95 years old!"
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Mu'izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad, son of Sām; and, when the

A few lines further on the real Ī-ghūr sovereign, and successor of a long line of rulers, is turned into "another Buddhist chief, Aydy Cūt, Tārtār," who "had risen to power at Bālāsaghūn"!

To the "History of Kāshghar" above referred to, is appended a note, signed by Sir T. D. Forsyth, K.C.S.I., C.B., which states that "no one has gone into the History of Eastern Turkistan from the earliest times with such deep and careful research as Dr Bellew. He has spent many months in reading voluminous Persian and Turki manuscripts, &c., &c."

The History in question only came under my notice since this account was written, or I should have referred to many other errors. I merely do so now to correct a few of them, for history unless correct is worse than useless—nothing can be more pernicious, because it misleads.

I may also add that the Rażat-us-Ṣafā, which the writer refers to in his list of authorities, is quite correct in its statements, and agrees with other writers.

Before closing these remarks, I must say a few words on "the powerful dynasty of Kara Khitae," which is said to have "revived on a small scale when destroyed by Gingis Khan [I always imagined that Kojjak and Sulṭān Muḥammad destroyed it before the Chingiz Khān's advance westward, at least the Oriental writers say so, the "great Raschid" included]," and which Visdelu is said to have made such an incredibly ridiculous statement about [See Mr. H. H. Howorth's article in the J. R. As. Soc., before referred to], that the "Kara Khitae should have traversed Khurasan and the wastes of Central Persia, and found their way into Kerman without a hint from the Persian historians. Nor can we conjecture a reason for such a march, nor why he [the Gūr Khān is referred to] should have returned again into Turkistan if it had been made"! Here again is confusion worse confounded.

One of the Persian authors whose work, from a foreign translation, Mr. Howorth so often quotes, but whose name I will not at present mention, at the close of his account of this dynasty, adds: "The Gūr Khān, having been seized by Kojjak, in one or two years died; and, since the period of decay in the affairs, and the regression of the fortunes of that dynasty came about, that person, who was the captive of a prison [evidently referring to the brother of the third Gūr Khān], became the Amīr and Khān of that tribe or people, and the Gūr Khān of the grave of the house, home, and possessions of that race [a play upon the words gūr, also written gor, a grave, and khān wa mān, house, home, &c.], and his tribe became scattered and dispersed."

About the time in question, and subsequently, several persons of the race found their way into India, and some of the great nobles, mentioned in the preceding Section of this translation, were Kara-Khiṭā-īs. In the reign of Üktāe also, Jai-Tīmūr of the Kara-Khiṭā-ī tribe or people held the government of Khwārazm, and, subsequently, Māzandarān was added to his government.

The Kara-Khiṭā-īs therefore were not so utterly destroyed, but "the older and younger dynasty," as they are fancifully styled by Mr. Howorth, had no connexion whatever. Burāk the Ḥājib, a native of the Kara-Khiṭāe territory, and a relative of the leader of the Gūr Khān's troops, taken prisoner in the great battle in which they were overthrown by the Khwārazmī Sulṭān, had become a convert to the Musalmaŋ faith, entered the service of the Sulṭān, and rose to the rank and office of a chamberlain.
period of the sovereignty of that Sultān-i-Ghāzī elapsed, and Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, acquired sway over the territories of Turkistān, Bānīko of Ṭarāz fought a battle with him, was defeated, and taken prisoner, and, at the hand of Sultān Muḥammad, embraced the Muḥammadan faith.¹

Trustworthy persons have related in this manner, that Bānīko of Ṭarāz came out victorious in forty-five battles over sovereigns of his own time, and no one [ever] defeated him [before]. On the third occasion,² Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, made a dash upon the equipage of the Khitā-ūs, and captured the whole of it; and Kasḥlū Khān-

Fanākaḫīf and Alīf say that Burāk and his brother, Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Ḥamid-i-Būr, came into Khwārazm, with others, on the part of the Gūr Khān, in the reign of Sultān Takīgh, to collect the tribute, and were treated so well, and liked their reception so much, that they remained there, and became Musalmāns, and rose in the Sultān's service.

Some ten years afterwards, when the Khwārazmī empire had been overthrown by the irruption of the Mughals, and Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn was fighting against them, his brother, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Āk Sultān, was in Kirmān, the subordinate sovereignty of which his father had conferred upon him, Burāk, the chamberlain, joined him with some Karā-Khitā-ūs, his own private followers, and some of the late Sultān's dispersed soldiery. After Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Āk Sultān, had been defeated in an attempt upon Fārs in 620-621 H., Burāk, aggrieved on some account, left him, and set out for Hindūstān, accompanied by some other Khwārazmī leaders, to seek service with Sultān I-yal-tīmīgh, by way of Khīkh and Mukrān. On the way he was attacked near Jīraft by the governor of Gawāshīr, on the part of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Āk Sultān, near the eastern frontier of Kirmān, but chanced to defeat his assailant, through a party of Turks having deserted the latter during the fight. Burāk now resolved to take advantage of the distracted state of the empire, and set up for himself; and succeeded, by treachery and fraud, in gaining possession of Kirmān. At length, in order to secure his own safety from the Mughals, he sent the head of his master and benefactor's son to Üktās, son of the Chingiz Khān, who confirmed him in the government of Kirmān, subject, of course, to the Mughals. Burāk held it eleven years, and it passed to his descendants. Farther details will be found at page 283, and note ⁹, and page 295.

Burāk was in no way related to the Gūr Khāns, and was a mere successful adventurer. How therefore can his rule over Kirmān be possibly construed into a "revival of the Karā Khitāe dynasty on a small scale," without noticing the rest of the above grotesque statement as to the Gūr Khān's travels?

It may just as well be asserted that the dynasty of the Karā-Khitāe-i "revived on a small scale" in Khwārazm, at Dili, or at Mauṣīl, for the Atā-Bak of Mauṣīl was a Turk of Karā-Khitāe, as well as Jai-Timūr, and Sultān I-yal-tīmīgh.

¹ See note ⁸, page 261.
² See note ¹ to page 262, para. 8, page 264.
i-San'kur, the Tattär, fought a battle with the Gür Khān, took him prisoner, and the dominion of the Khīṭā-īs came to a termination, and passed away.

ACCOUNT OF THE OUTBREAK OF THE CHINGIZ KHĀN THE MUGHAL—ON WHOM BE GOD’S CURSE!

[The author begins here by mentioning the sayings of the Prophet, Muḥammad, with respect to the portents betokening the end of the world, that they would be observed about the year 610 H.; but, as the world has not yet terminated, I need merely refer to them with respect to the Ghūrī Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sam, whose assassination is considered by the author to be the first of those signs.]

The martyrdom of the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī, Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām—may he rest in peace!—happened in the year 602 H.; and he was the monarch who became the last of the just Sulṭāns, and the last of the conquering Bādshāhs. His sovereignty was a barrier against the troubles of the end of the world, and the appearance of the portents of the judgment-day. According to the indication of these sayings [of the Prophet, Muḥammad], in the same year in which that victorious Bādshāh was martyred, the gates of sedition, war, and tumult, were opened, and, in this same year, the Chingiz Khān, the Mughal, rose up in the kingdoms of Čhin and Ğamghāj, and commenced to rebel; and in all books it is written that the first signs of the end of time are the outbreak of the Turks.

A number of trustworthy persons, on whose statements reliance may be placed, have related on this wise, that the name of the father of this Chingiz Khān, the accursed, was the Tattār, Tamur-chī, and that he was the Mihtar [Chief] of the Mughal tribes, and ruler over his People.3

3 Ğamghāj is the name of a territory of Turkistān, according to the old geographers, and Ğamghāj Khān is the title or name of one of the Afrasiyābī Malikīs [see No. XXI.], but Ğamghāj Khān is the name generally applied to the “Bādshāhs of Tibbat and Yuγhmā,” and Ğamghāj and Yuγhmā are said to have been the names of cities giving names to countries also. Yuγhmā-ouλ is also said to be the name of a city or town of Turkistān, the same as the last-named place in all probability.

4 Tamur, with short a and short u, in Turki, signifies iron, and it is some-
On one occasion, whilst following the chase, a bird, the name of which is Ĥughrul, fell into his hands, and his surname [thereby] became Ĥughrul-Tigîn. No one, at any time previous, has shown that that bird has fallen into the hands of a sovereign; and they held him in veneration, in consequence.

Among the tribes of Mughal was another Turk of importance, a ruler and leader, and greatly venerated; and the whole of the tribes of Mughals were under the rule of these two persons. They, and all that people were subject to the family of the Altun Khan of Tamghaj, and paid tribute to that dynasty; but among them [the Mughals] depravity, robbery, and adultery, greatly prevailed; and, both in their words and deeds, save lying, iniquity, robbery, and adultery, naught went on. All the tracts of [inhabited by?] the Turk tribes, at the hand of their iniquity and sedition, were reduced to misery; and, for these reasons and acts, they [the Mughals] were wont to be treated

times written with ĕ for the first, and long ā for the last, vowel; chî is the abbreviation of chîz, and, when it occurs at the end of Turkish words, signifies a maker or agent, as top-chî, an artillery-man, bash mîk-chî, a shoe-maker, &c.

Our author has fallen into some confusion here, however [or the text, which is alike in all the copies collated, is defective], and has evidently mistaken the Tattar chief named Timur-chî, after whom Yassûkâ named his son to commemorate his victory over him, for Yassûkâ himself. Here Tamur-chî means iron-like, not that he was "a black-smith."

This is the Āwang Khân of after years. Ĥughrul, with short û in the last syllable, is described as a bird used in field sports, one of the falcon tribe, a jerfalcon, probably, and the above title is equivalent to the Hero [taker] of the Ĥughrul. Another name applied to men is written Ĥugrîl.

Writers on "Mongols" may be astonished to find our author saying that there was among the Mughals another Turk, &c. He is literally correct, and means a Turk of the Mughal I-mâk. This chief is called Baiss farther on.

Our author, like all other Oriental authors, very properly calls the Mughals and Tattars by the common name of Turks, according to their descent as already recorded.

It may be well to remember here, that our author is one of the two first Musalmân writers who wrote about the outbreak of the Mughals and the Chingiz Khân at the time it occurred, and completed his history just after Hûlakû, his grandson, had captured Baghâd and entered Asia Minor. He had considerable advantages over Ibn-Ãthir in many ways. He was nearer the scenes he narrates; knew many persons who were personally acquainted with the Chingiz Khân and his sons, and actors in the events he records; knew personally, and dwelt among, several Turk, Tattar, and Khîjâ-Y nobles at Dihîf, and in Ghâmîn and Ghûr, who knew how they spelt their own names and others of their people, and the names of cities and countries; and had no cause whatever to praise or make out Mughals to be greater than they were.
with great contempt by the Court of the Altūn Khān, and much money, and a great number of horses used to be demanded of them [as tribute].

When the father of the Chingiz Khān went to hell, and the chieftainship devolved on the Chingiz Khān, he began to act contumaciously and dis obediently, and broke out into rebellion. An army from the forces of the Altūn Khān was nominated to lay waste and exterminate the Mughal tribes; and the greater number of them were put to the sword, in such wise, that but a few of them remained.

The remnant of them that escaped the sword gathered together and left their own territory, and proceeded towards the north of Turkistān, and sought shelter in a situation so strong that, from any direction, it had no road leading into it with the exception of a single Pass. The whole of that tract was girt about with massive mountains, and that place and pasture-land they call Kalur-ān. They also say that in the midst of those pastures there is a spring of considerable size, the name of which is Balik-Chāk; and, in these pastures, they took up their abode, and dwelt there for a long period.

In the course of time, their offspring and progeny multiplied greatly; and among that body a great number of men reached manhood. They all assembled and took counsel together, saying: "What was the cause of our downfall and of our being plundered and ravaged, and from whence arose our being made captive and being slain?" All made admission [saying]: "These calamities and misfortunes have arisen through our great misconduct; and it is necessary that we abstain from thus acting, in order that Almighty God may grant us assistance, and that we may take our revenge upon the forces of the Altūn Khān."

---

7 Also, in two of the oldest copies, Kalūr-ān.
8 Bahāʾ-ān—in a few copies written Jāk, but it is only the fault of the copyists in writing ġ for ġ. A few copies, including the Printed Text, have Abalīk but the appears redundant. In the Türk language Chāk is said to mean rapid, fast, violent, sharp, &c., and Balīk or Balīgh and Balāk mean a spring.
9 The flight of Kalān and Nagūz into Irgānah Kūn, is here, evidently meant.
1 It will be easily perceived, from my account of the descent of the Turks and the i-māds of Tāttār and Mughal, that our author has lost himself here, and mixes up the overthrow and destruction of the Mughal i-māk by the Tāttārs.
Certainly, to carry out this intention, a firm ruler is neces-
and I-phur Turks, and the escape of the two fugitives into the fastnesses of
Irgänah-Kūn, with the affairs of the Chingiz Khan at the time when he
assumed sovereignty, and the title just mentioned was assigned to him. I will
therefore now give a brief account of Tamur-chi from the death of his father
up to this period, in order to make our author's account intelligible.

I brought my account of the Mughal I-mak to a close with the death of the
Bahādur Yassākā, in 562 H. [A.D. 1166-67], who usually resided at a place
styled Dīlīn-Yildūk, at which period the different tribes composing the
I-mak of Tāttār and Mughal were ruled by no less a number than seventy-one
different chiefs, independent of each other. Every two or three families had
separate localities, and feuds and conflicts went on continually among them.

Tamur-chi, or Tamur-chin—the n being nasal—was thirteen years old at
the time of his father's death, having been born on the 20th of Zi-Ka'dah,
549 H. [27th January, old style, A.D. 1154], about which some recent writers
appear to be in great doubt [neither the Persian 'Raschid' nor any other of the
'Persians' says he was born in 1155] and uncertainty; and his brothers were
still younger. About the same time, the hereditary lieutenant or deputy,
Sūgū-Jījan, whose care and counsel would have been so useful to young
Tamur-chi, also died, and Sūghū-Jījan's son, the Nū-yān, Kārāchār—the
great ancestor of Amir Tīmrūr—was young and inexperienced. This is the
'tutor' appointed for him according to Des Guignes!

Of the 40,000 families of the Nairūn sept of the Mughals over whom his
father ruled, and his own kinsmen and dependents, numbers now began to
desert him and go over to the Tānjiūts, until not more than a third remained
under his chieftainship.

He endured many hardships and dangers until he reached the age of thirty,
when fortune began again to smile upon him for a time, when, in 579 H.
[A.D. 1183], the Nairūn began to return to their allegiance, and Tamur-chi
succeeded in bringing some other Mughal tribes under his sway. In 584 H.
[A.D. 1187-88] he became a captive in the hands of Türkütā or Tūrğütāe
Karlıtuğ, the Bāğdāh as he is styled, [great grandson of Hamančā, see note,
page 895] of the Tānjiūt Mughals, who was descended, in the fifth degree,
from Kaidū Khan, the fourth chief of the Bū-zanjar dynasty, which see, and
to whom the other Nairūn attached themselves when they deserted Tamur-
chi, and against a confederacy headed by whom the latter was struggling.

It was not customary in those days among the tribes of Turkish descent to
put captives at once to death, and so Tamur-chi had a do-thākkah [a sort of
portable pillory, described as a block of wood with two horns, hence the term.
It may, in those days, have been formed out of two pieces of crooked wood,
but what was used in after-years, and continues to be used still, consists of two
flat boards with a hollow for the neck, a drawing of which may be seen in
Astley's and other Collections] fastened round his neck, and thus was he
detained in captivity. The Fanākāt, Abū-Sulṭān-i-Dā'ūd, who finished his
History, and dedicated it to the ninth of the Mughal sovereigns of Iran [what
would he have said had he been styled a 'Mongol' ?], 287 years before the
'sage-loving' writer who has been much quoted lately, Snan Setzen, was
born, gives the following particulars of Tamur-chi's escape, which several
other historians also relate.

Finding an opportunity, Tamur-chi made his escape from the Tānjiūts,
taking his do-thākkah along with him, and concealed himself in a lake in the
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sary, and a severe Amir is required, to restrain the trans-

neighbourhood of their camp, in such wise, that, of his person, nothing save his nose could be seen. A party of Tānjūs was sent in search of him, and among them there chanced to be a Sūldūs [also written Suldūr], named Sūrghān or Sūrghān Shīrāh, the tents of whose family happened to be pitched near that part, when, suddenly, his eye fell upon the fugitive’s nose. He made a sign to him secretly—but how Tamur-chīf managed to see, and notice this sign, with his head under water, the chronicler sayeth not—that he should conceal his head still more—but this must have been as difficult to do as to see, considering that only his nose was out of the water. He then said to the party, “Do you make search in some other directions: I will take care of this part myself,” and thus he managed to disperse them. As soon as night set in, Sūrghān Shīrāh took Tamur-chīf out of the water, removed the ḍeṣāḥkhāh from round his neck, and brought him to his tent, and concealed him in a cart, under a load of paṣhm—the fine wool or hair with which goats and several other animals are provided by nature in the cold regions of Central Asia; but, as the party had discovered some trace of Tamur-chīf thereabout, and as Sūrghān Shīrāh’s dwelling was near by, they began to suspect that Tamur-

chīf must be hidden somewhere by him. They accordingly made search, and even tried the load of paṣhm by piercing it with spits in various directions, and wounded him slightly in several places, but did not discover him. After they had departed, disappointed in their search, Sūrghān Shīrāh mounted Tamur-chīf on his own bay mare with a black mane, supplied him with a little flesh, a roasting-spit, a bow and arrows, and everything required for a journey, but some say he did not give him any tinder-box or means of obtaining fire. The mother of Tamur-chīf, and his wives, had given him up for dead, when he arrived in his yārāt on the bay mare with the black mane, from which time the Mughals held such an animal in great veneration. His son, Tūfī, was a child at the time, and, for some days before, had been continually saying that his father was coming mounted on a certain coloured mare. This event happened in 587 H. [A.D. 1191]. The descendants of this Sūrghān Shīrāh subsequently rose to high rank in the service of the Chingiz Khān and his sons, and, from him, the famous Amir Chaupān was descended.

Tamur-chīf had fought with the Jūrīs, also styled Jājār-āts, a sept of the Nairūns, the tribe of Jāmūkah, the Sājān, or the double-tongued [Abūl-Ghāf, Bahādur, styles him Jajan and Jachan, which, he says, signifies possessed of sagacity], and other Mughal tribes—the Tānjūs, Kunghur-āts or Kunghur-āts, as it is also written, Jālahs, and Dūrmāns [“Durbens” and “Durbans” are out of the question]; and the Bīg, Sūj, and the tribe of Barla, of the progeny of Īrdam-chīf, were in alliance with his enemies, but Karīchār, head of the Barla, remained faithful to him.

In the year 589 H. [A.D. 1193], when in the fortieth year of his age, finding his enemies had entered into a confederacy to annihihle him, and that they were too numerous and too powerful to cope with, Tamur-chīf determined on taking refuge with the Āwang Khān, Tughral-Tīghn, and throwing himself on his protection, considering the friendship which had previously existed between his father, Yassūkā, and that sovereign; and Karīchār accompanied him.

This is contrary to the statement contained in a recent work on the “Mongols Proper,” the authority for which appears to be Wolff or Ermann, and, considering what follows, on undoubted authority, must be diametrically opposed to the fact.
The Awang Khan was the ruler of the Karayat tribes, a sept of the Duragin Mughals, and one of the most considerable of the Turkish nation, and he was a monarch [BADSHAH] of great dignity and magnificence, and was in alliance with the Altan Khan, the sovereign of Khitae. It was this personage who, before he was styled by the title of " the Awang Khan," bore the name of Tughrul-Tigin, from his having captured one of those rare birds called a Tughrul. Tamur-chi was well received by the Karayat ruler, and his affairs began to prosper. The Khan was wont to consult him on the affairs of his state; and, at length, Tamur-chi rose so high in the monarch's esteem, that he styled him son, and assigned him a position of great dignity.

Surgeon-Major Bellew, in his Kashgar Mission History, previously referred to, quoting some other writer, informs us that "This Aong Khan or Unc Cham [1], the Chief of the Karait of Karakoram, is the Tuli [1] of the Chinese writers, and the Toghrul of the Persian. He got the title Unc [uncle perhaps], or Aong, or Wang, as it appears in different authors [1], and which is equivalent to Khan = "Chief," "Lord," from Kin [1], the sovereign of North China." This is History truly!

For a period of eight years Tamur-chi remained with the Awang Khan, during which time he did good service for him, and gained him several victories. Among these was his victory over Irkah Karâ, or Irkah Karâ [also called Ükah-Karâ], the brother of the Awang Khan, who was in rebellion, and resisted his brother's authority, and Yorkin [it is written by Abu-l-Ghâzi, Bahâdur, Portakfân, Bortakân, and Bortikân], and the Bigî, Tükta, the Peshwa, or leader of the Makrit tribe [also written Markit, but the first appears to be preferred] of the Kâïât sept, descended from Kâin; but some call them Nairûns. After these events, the tribes of Tânjût, Sâljût, Kung-hur-át, Dûrmân, Jâjar-át, Jalâf, Üir-át, also written Ír-át, Yorkin, and Kakhûn, or Kâtikân, and Tamur-chi's former opponents, the Makrits, and some of the Tattar i-mâh, entered into a confederacy against the Awang Khan and Tamur-chi. They came to a compact, and took oath according to the most stringent tenets of their religion, by sacrificing a horse, a bullock, a ram, and a dog, to be faithful to each other; and, among them, there is no other engagement more solemn. This was in 596 H.

On becoming aware of this, the Awang Khan and Tamur-chi got ready their forces; and, at a place near the Biyûr Nâwâr—the Lake of Biyûr—the hostile forces came to an engagement, and the Awang Khan and Tamur-chi completely overthrew the confederates, and brought their necks within the yoke of subjection. Hânûz Abrû states, however, that Tamur-chi fought a battle with the Bigî, Tükta, the chief of the Makrits, in 593 H., at a place near the Karâs Murân [i. e. river] before Kalûr-ân, and near the river Sâlingân; another, in concert with the Awang Khan, in 594 H., at Tûkû Kahrah; and, again, in 596 H., after the Bigî, Tükta, had escaped from the bonds of the Awang Khan, which is the battle near the lake Biyûr already mentioned above. Several other affairs in 597 and 598 H. are mentioned by the same author, which are too long for insertion here, but I may mention that Jâmûkâh—who had been set up as Bâdshâh by several of the tribes, such as Angrâs and Kûrlûs, Kungûr-át, Dûrmân, Kâgûn, Sâljût, and some Tattar tribes, with the title of Gûr Khan—was overthrown at Sâdî-Kûrgân in the former year, and the Kungûr-âts submitted to his authority.

After this, Bû-ûkû, brother of the Tayânak Khan, ruler of the Nâmân
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our enemies, and render the wreaking of vengeance upon

tribe, in concert with the Bādghāh of the Makrīts, the Bīkt Tūktā, being hostile to the Āwang Khān and Tamur-chī, assembled a large army against them, and the hostile forces having met at a place named Kazīl-Tāsh, in 595 H., but in 598 H. according to the Tārīkh-i-Allī, Bū-ākū directed a Jījan, or Sorcerer, to have recourse to his art, which they term yadah and bīl, which he effected by means of the sang-i-yadah, the jade or rain-stone, mentioned in the account of the descent of the Turks, which, on being thrown into water, forthwith brought on snow, mist, and wind; but these magical acts recoiled upon his own army, which was nearly destroyed by the cold. The few followers who remained with him were overthrown, a number were slain, and the remnant sought safety in flight. A curious anecdote respecting the Turks and their magical acts in this respect is related by Amīr Ismā’īl, son of Aḥmad, the third Sāmānī monarch, but I have not space for it here.

After Tamur-chī had passed eight years in the service of the Āwang Khān in various offices and duties, and had, through his intercourse and intimacy with him, acquired his confidence and esteem, and had been styled son by the monarch, the chiefs and kinsmen of the Āwang Khān became envious of Tamur-chī, and plotted together to bring about his downfall. Jāmūkāh, the Bāshlīch of the Jājar-āts, bore him great enmity of old, and he malignèd Tamur-chī to Sangūn, the son of the Āwang Khān, and convinced him that Tamur-chī sought to supplant him in his father's favour, and in the succession to his kingdom. Gузīdah, the Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, Tārīkh-i-Hāfīz Abrū, and some other works, however, state that the wrath of the Āwang Khān was raised against him through his asking of him a brother's daughter in marriage for his son Jūḫī, but some say it was on account of Tamur-chī not giving his own daughter, Kūŷīn Bīgt, to the Āwang Khān's son, Sangūn, that the negotiation broke down, and hostility arose. Jūḫī did subsequently marry the damsel, and Tūfī married another sister, and Tamur-chī, their father, married a third. Endeavours were now made to instigate the Āwang Khān against Tamur-chī, but without effect at first. By repeated importunity on the part of the son, for even the dropping water at last wears the rock away, the conspirators succeeded in alienating the old ruler's regard for Tamur-chī, and he entered into the design to seize him. These events are said to have taken place in 599 H. One of the Āwang Khān's chiefs, Jādān, by name, who could keep nothing from his wife, was mentioning the design to her, in his khargāh, or felt tent, only the day before it was intended to carry it into execution, when two boys, named Bātānī, or Bādānī, and Kāshīkā, came into the camp with the milk from the flocks, and, by chance, sat down near the tent, and heard the conversation. They at once made known his danger to Tamur-chī. He consulted with his kinsman, the Nū-yān, Kārāchār; and it was determined, as soon as night set in, to make for the skirt of the mountain (range) of Kālāchān with their followers and dependents, and to leave their tents standing; and this they did, after having first despatched the women and children to a place of safety, called Bāljūnāh Bulāk. That same night the Āwang Khān came to the tents with some of his forces, and, seeing the fires lighted as usual, ordered volleys of arrows to be poured into them, and then, finding all was silent within, entered the tents, but found them empty. He then determined to set out in pursuit of Tamur-chī; but how the Āwang Khān knew whither he had fled is not stated: the Karāyats probably tracked him. The Āwang Khān succeeded in coming up with him during the next day, when halted for rest, and a piker,
the Altūn Khān attainable.” As the Chingiz Khān had posted for the purpose, gave Tamur-chī timely warning of their drawing near the mountain (range) of Mū-āwand or Mū-āwandur, at a spot called Holānī Nūkāt, that is, the place where red canes or reeds grow. Notwithstanding the disparity of numbers, being sheltered by the hill skirt, he resolved to make a stand; and at last succeeded in beating off his pursuers. A great number of Karāyats were slain and disabled, and Sangūn—who is styled Shangūn by some, but the three dots over the—ω—seem over zeal on the part of the copyists—was wounded in the face by an arrow discharged at his father, whose person he shielded with his own.

This is the place where Mr. H. H. Howorth, in his “Mongols Proper” page 59, on the authority of some foreign translation says: “He now collected an army and marched against the Keraiti. His army was very inferior in numbers, but attacked the enemy with ardour,” &c. His “flight from the Āwang Khān” is not alluded to in the least, and he must have been exceedingly clever to collect an army, but, at page 552 of the same book, the story is told from another translation in a totally different manner.

Tamur-chī thought it advisable however to withdraw quietly during the night towards the source of the Bāljūnāh—some say, the Lake Bāljūnāh—Bāl-

jūnāh Nāwar—and others, Bāljūnāh Būlāk, Būlāgh, or Balīk, signifying a spring in Turkish, whither the women and children had been previously despatched. This lake was salt, and contained but little water, scarcely sufficient for his people to drink. If we consider that Karā-Kuram was the chief encampment or dwelling-place of the Āwang Khān, the retreat of Tamur-chī towards this lake of Bāljūnāh, in which there was scarcely enough muddy water to quench the thirst of man and beast, and his subsequent movements, are sufficiently clear. The people of those parts, of his own Nairūn tribes, who had remained faithful, and had become dispersed when he took shelter with the Āwang Khān, were dwelling in the tracts adjacent to Bāljūnāh Būlāgh, under his uncle Ū-tīghīn, also called Utichkin, and, when he reached them, on this occasion, they began to gather around him, as well as many others from the Āwang Khān’s territory. At this time, at the suggestion of the Nū-yān, Karāchār, Tamur-chī had a register made of the names of all those who had accompanied him in his flight from the presence of the Āwang Khān, and assigned certain ranks and offices to each of them. The two youths, Bātāe or Bādāe, and Kashlık, who had warned him of his danger, were made Tarkhāns. He was not “abandoned by most of his troops,” nor did he “fly to the desert of Baljuna,” as Mr. Howorth states (p. 59), nor was he “a hopeless fugitive at Baljuna,” as the same writer states in another place (p. 553).

The meaning of Tarkhān is thus explained: “The person so called is secure and safe from all trouble and annoyance; in every place in which he serves, whatever booty he may take is his own, and he is not deprived of it; he can enter the place of audience of his sovereign without being summoned, and without first asking permission; and he can commit or be guilty of nine offences—nine is a number, as I have already noticed, held in great veneration by the Mughals—without being questioned; and Tamur-chī decreed that, for nine generations, the offspring of these Tarkhāns should be exempt from all burdens and imposts.”

In the “General Description of Kashghar,” contained in the “Report” of the Yarkand Mission, previously referred to, we are told [p. 100], as to the “Ancient punishments before the 10th century (Moghul),” that, “Under the Moghuls, a noble was entitled to forgiveness nine times, but for the tenth was
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become noted and famous among that fraternity for

imprisoned," &c., &c. Something respecting the privileges of the Tarkhāns had apparently been mentioned to the writer, who straightway turned all the Mughal nobles into Tarkhāns! In another place we are informed that "the descendants of these Tarkhāns were still met with in Khurāsān in the fifteenth century," which is quite correct. They are also met with in several other centuries, and in this nineteenth century in many other parts besides Khurāsān.

The descendants of the two persons above referred to were the progenitors of two tribes, styled respectively Bādāe Tarkhāns, and Khashīk Tarkhāns. The Tarkhāns of the Daqht-i-Kibchāk and Khwārazm are the descendants of Bādāe, while those of Turkištān are the descendants of Khashīk. Several great Amīrs arose from these tribes, among whom was the Tarkhān, Hāji, who was the founder of a city on the Atīl, to which he gave his name. It was known as Hājī Tarkhān, which, in after-years, was styled Hašhtar Khān, but which European writers have "twisted" into Astrakhan, and not Orientals, as the author of the "Mongols Proper" imagines.

In the battle with the Āwang Khān, among other booty captured, was the khargāh of that sovereign, which was of cloth of gold. This Tamur-chī bestowed, with other things, upon Bādāe and Khashīk, and, in after-times, the distinguishing mark of a Tarkhān was a piece of the golden cloth tent of the Āwang Khān, which they used to wear hanging from their turbans.

Tamur-chī now marched from the head of the Bāljūnāh, and pitched his tents at a pleasant place on the bank of a river named the Ūr or Aor Mūrān [Ūn Mūrān?], at the foot of a mountain range on the frontier of Kalangī Kādā, or Kād, which is the boundary of Khitāe on that side, and there he mustered his followers, and they amounted to 4600 men. Leaving that spot after a time, he moved onwards, and reached a place where was a piece of water—the river Kalār [Kalār—Kalār of our maps]. Abū-I-Ghāzi, Bahādur, calls it the Kūlā Site or River Kūlā—and, there being plenty of grass thereabout, he determined to make some stay. On the way thither, with his forces divided into two bodies, one with the women and followers, and moving on either bank, he fell in with an Amīr, Turk-Īfī, by name, who had a considerable following, and, on inquiry being made of him as to who he was, and his intentions and objects, he turned out to be a Anghrsā, a Kunghur-āt Mughal, with a considerable body of that tribe, and he agreed to submit to Tamur-chī, and was treated with great distinction. Whilst encamped at this spot, Tamur-chī was joined by other smaller bodies of his other tribes, until, at length, his force grew formidable. Having marched from thence, Tamur-chī despatched from the banks of the river Kūrkān [Kūrkān—some say from the Kālā Nāwar], an emissary named Urkāe, or Urkāe Chūn, the Bahādur, to the Āwang Khān's presence soliciting an accommodation, and several times emissaries passed to and fro between them, but terms of peace did not result therefrom; and his brother, Jūjī Kasār, who had been taken prisoner, and carried away with his family to the Āwang Khān's presence, now joined him, having made his escape. On the last occasion, Tamur-chī despatched an agent of his own along with the Āwang Khān's envoy, to throw him off his guard, apparently, since he followed himself with all his forces, made raids upon that monarch's territory, reduced flourishing spots to desolation, slew great numbers of his people, and made others captive. After some time, wherein the Āwang Khān's people had suffered such misery, a battle ensued between Tamur-chī and his forces, and the Karāyats— who were vastly superior in numbers—towards
manhood, vigour, valour, and intrepidity, all concurred in
the close of which Karāchār encountered the Āwang Khān, struck his horse
with an arrow, and brought it head foremost to the ground. The Āwang Khān
then succeeded in mounting another horse, and took to flight—along with his son,
Sangūn, leaving his wives and daughters captives in the hands of the victor;
and such of the Karāyat tribe as saved their lives did so by submitting to
Tamur-čī’s yoke. The Āwang Khān had fled towards the territory of the
Nāmān tribe to seek shelter with their ruler, Tūbūkū or Taibūkū, the Tayān-
nak Khān, but, when he reached the Tayānak Khān’s country, some of the
latter’s chiefs, without communicating with their sovereign, and on account of
an old feud, put the Āwang Khān to death. Sangūn however managed to
escape out of their clutches, and succeeded in reaching the territory of Kīrkā
and Tibbat, and from thence got to Kāshghar—another writer states that he
proceeded towards Khutan and Kāshghar, thus indicating the whereabouts of
Kīrkīs—but he was subsequently put to a cruel death, in the Kāshghar
territory, by the chief of a branch of the Kāhaj tribe, of Kūlj Kārā, called
Karā Mā, who sent his family captives to Tamur-čī. The brother of the
Āwang Khān, whose three daughters were wives to Tamur-čī and his sons
Jūfī and Tūfī, escaped into Tingkūt. Of this person more anon.

As the whole of the Karāyat tribe, and the forces of the Āwang Khān, had
submitted to him, the mind of Tamur-čī being now at rest from anxiety, he
resolved on taking some recreation after his fatigues. He accordingly passed
some time pleasantly in the part, near which the battle took place, in pleasure,
and in enjoying the diversion of the chase, after which he set out for his native
yārat, or encampment. These events happened in the year 599 H. [A.D.
1202-3], when Tamur-čī was 49 years old, but some say he was 50.

After having gained this important victory, and as the greater number of
other tribes of the Mughal i-māk had bent the neck of subjection to him,
Tamur-čī assumed the seat of Khān-ship, at the camp or station named
Samān-Kaharah, which is also written Samān-Karah [Abū-l-Ghāzī, Bahādur,
has Namān Karah] which probably was near Dīlūn-Yūldūk, in Ramaqān
of that same year, and the sovereignty exercised by the Āwang Khān passed to
Tamur-čī; but, as soon as the Tayānak Khān, also written Tayān, and
Tayānak, son of Balikto Īnānaj, sovereign of the Nāmāns [a Turkish tribe,
but its direct descent is not certain], became aware of his predominance, he
set about organizing an army against him, and the tribes of Dūrmān, Kāghūn,
Makrīt, and Sāljūt, the Bāshāh of the Üfr-āt, Aīn Tālgh, and some other
Bāshīghs of the Karāyat, the Jājar-āt of Jāmūkāh, the Sājān, and some of
the Tāttār tribes, it is said, entered into a confederacy with the Tayānak
Khān for the purpose of making war upon Tamur-čī.

The Tayānak Khān also despatched an agent to Ulā-Kūsh-Tīgīn, the Bād-
shāh of the Ungkūts, a Turkish tribe who had charge of the Great Wall [According
to the ideas of Mr. H. H. Howorth, set forth in his “Mongols Proper,”
page 21, “Tigīn seems to be a form of the Turkish Tikīn,” and, at page 26, he
says, “Tikīn is a title borne by chiefs of Turkish tribes!” He fails to see that
“Tikīn” is only correct in the sight of those who do not know k from g
in the original. That it is a Turkish title there is not the least doubt, and
hence it is borne by Turks and Tāttārs], asking him to join the confederacy,
and aid in putting down the new claimant to sovereignty, which could be
easily effected, if he joined him, as two kings in one country could not exist,
nor two swords in one scabbard, and not to refuse his alliance, as he would
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naming him for the chieftainship [saying]:—"For, save
remedy matters with the sword himself, even if he should reject his offers. Ül-Kūsh-Tigfīn, also written Alākūsh, Tigfin Kūrfīn, however, was a sagacious man, and an experienced one. He consequently despatched one of his Amīrs named Nūṛddāh, but, in one work, he is styled Burānīdāh, and Kūrādāh, in Alīf, which is probably the most correct, to Tamur-chī, and made him acquainted with the message he had received, and assembled his Ungkūts for the purpose of joining Tamur-chī, as he was much annoyed at the Tayānak Khān’s message. Tamur-chī held counsel with his sons and Amīrs, and one of the Nū-yīns, some say it was Karāchār, but others, that it was Tamur-chī’s paternal uncle, Dāritāe Unghūktī, the Ülḵūnrū Ḳungzhur-āt, advised that if Tamur-chī took the initiative and attacked the Nāmāns he would be successful. That advice was approved of; and, in the middle of Jamādī-ug-Ṣānī, 600 H., [in March, A.D. 1204], he commenced his march, and set out to attack the Tayānak Khān.

He moved onwards until he reached the verdant tract of Kālangātī, previously mentioned, but, on this occasion, no fight took place. Subsequently, in the same year, Tamur-chī again set out to seek the Nāmān Bāḍāhāh, despatching a force in advance, under the Nū-yīns, Kūldīrā Sājīn, chief of the Mangkūt Nairūns, and Jabah. He then reached the banks of the river Altāe—
[now Siba?] in the territory of Kangtātlāe—Abū-l-Gharrī, Bahādur, calls it Altāe Sonlīng—in the neighbourhood of which was the Tayānak Khān, who had been joined by the Bīgī Tūktā, chief of the Markīts, and one of the chiefs of the late Āwāng Khān, the Karāyat. At this juncture a stray horse from Tamur-chī’s camp, with its saddle turned under its belly, entered the camp of the Tayānak Khān, who, when he beheld it, it being very lean, held counsel with his Amīrs, saying: "The horses of the Mughals are miserably lean while ours are fat and in fine condition. It is advisable that we should fall back so that the enemy may be induced to follow us, whereby their horses will get into a worse plight still. Then we will make a stand and engage them." Most of the chiefs approved of this counsel, but the Tayānak Khān had an Amīr, Kūrf Subājū, by name, who, from childhood, had grown up with him; and he said to him on this occasion: "Thy father, Balikto Īnānaj, was not at rest a day without battle, and never showed his back nor the crupper of his horse to a foe. Thy heart is enthralled with thy Khāṭūn, Kū-r-bāsū, and from thee the perfume of manhood emanateth not."

Stung to the quick at these taunts, the Tayānak Khān, filled with rage, "grew hungry for the fight, like a roaring lion for his prey." When the two armies came near each other, and drew out their lines, Tamur-chī entrusted the centre to his son Jūjī [some say Jūjū commanded the left wing, and Tamur-chī’s brother, Jūjī Kasār, the centre], and the two armies, having sounded their cows’ horns and kettle-drums, engaged in battle, and Jāmūkāh, the Jājar-āt, with his followers, having deserted the Tayānak Khān before the battle hegan, marched away to his own yīrāt. In the obstinate struggle which ensued, and which continued until evening closed in, the Tayānak Khān was wounded, and his body was so weakened from the effect of his wound as to be almost without a soul; and with a few Amīrs he retreated towards the top of a hill. His Amīrs complained of this, and urged upon him the necessity, for his own sake, of returning to the field, and renewing the conflict, but he was now too badly wounded to be affected with their taunts and entreaties. Then Kūrf Subājū said to the other chiefs: "Since the Bāḍāhāh dies thus deplorably in
hims, no one will be capable to undertake the carrying out

adversity, better let us show our fidelity, and turn our faces again against the
enemy, since we have given the Tayânak Khân to be slain," and, with one
accord, like lions, they descended, and rushed upon the enemy, and fought
valiantly while life remained, in such wise as to gain the encomiums even of
their foes. They all perished, but not before they had made great havoc
among the Mughals, who lost great numbers.

The Tayânak Khân having died of his wound received in that battle, his son,
Koşlûk or Koşlak, or Kcolak, as he is also styled, fled to his uncle, Bûe-
Rûk. The Ḥabîb-us-Siyar however says that the Tayânak Khân, after the
battle, was conveyed to a place of safety, but that he died from the effects of his
wound before the end of that same year 600 H.

The females of the family of the Tayânâk Khân fell into the hands of the
victors, and, subsequently, his favourite Khâtûn, Ko-rûsû, was brought to
Tamur-chî, who, in accordance with the custom of the Mughals, married her.
A daughter of the Tayânâk Khân's son, Koşlûk, named Liqûm Khütûn,
was given in marriage to Tûlû, Tamur-chî's youngest son. The Nämân and
Ungkût females are said to have been remarkable for their beauty, above all
the other tribes of Turk descent.

After Tamur-chî had been thus successful over the Tayânâk Khân, in this
battle, the tribes and families in confederacy with the Nämân sovereign,
being without a head, for the most part submitted to Tamur-chî's sway, but
the Nämân became dispersed, and the Bîgî, Tûkûtû, the Wûlî or sovereign of
the Makrîts, was still hostile. Tamur-chî marched against him, and speedily
overthrew him, and reduced the whole tribe of Makrît to subjection; but the
Bîgî, Tûkûtû, with Koşlûk, the Tayânâk Khân's son, sought an asylum with
Bûe-Rûk, the Nämân, elder brother of the latter, as detailed farther on.

Most of the accounts of Tamur-chî's proceedings, after the overthrow of the
Tayânâk Khân, are somewhat obscure and confused, but the authorities quoted
in the Tarîkh-i-Alîf throw considerable light upon these events. I must refer
to them briefly, leaving numerous details of the life of the Chingiz Khân, both
here, as well as elsewhere, in these notes, for some future day, when I hope to
give them in proper order, and detail.

About this time Jâmûkâh, the Sâjân, the Jâjar-ât, was seized by his own people,
bound hand and foot, and brought to Tamur-chî, his mortal foe. He, consi-
dering that, as the Jâjar-âts had not been faithful to their own chief, they would
scarcely prove faithful to him, commanded that the greater part of them should
be massacred; and this, as will subsequently appear, was the treatment traitors
generally received at Mughal hands. Jâmûkâh was made over to a nephew of
Tamur-chî, with orders to put him to death by dividing him limb from limb,
because this was the treatment he had reserved for his rival, in case he had fallen
into his power. He bore it without flinching, merely observing that he would
have treated Tamur-chî after the same fashion, and telling the executioners
how to proceed; and thus he met his end.

Tamur-chî, after this success, returned to his own yûrât, and despatched
agents to various tribes of the Mughals, and exhorted them to submit. Such as
did so were cherished, and such as refused were reduced and punished. In the
following year—601 H.—Tamur-chî moved against the Makrît tribe, which,
through their determined hostility, he sought to root out entirely. The Rauzâ-
us-Safâ mentions these events as taking place a year later. The Bîgî, Tûkûtû,
the Makrît chief, having fled from the forces of Tamur-chî, took shelter with
of these matters, and this affair will not be accomplished, nor succeed at the hands of any other except him."

another division of the Makrit tribe—the Úrhár Makrit—the chief of which was named Dā-îr or Tā-îr [the Turks, and the people of the different i-mâhs, use d for t and t, and vice versa] Asūn, who, with his division of the tribe, was then encamped on the Tāz Murān, or River Tāz, hoping to obtain support from them. When the Bigū, Tūktā, and his followers arrived there, Tā-îr Asūn told them that he had not the power to cope with Tamur-chī, and so, taking along with him his daughter, Kūlān Khatūn, he sought the presence of Tamur-chī, who received him honourably. He then represented that, for want of cattle, the whole of his people were unable to come and join his camp; but Tamur-chī, being somewhat suspicious of them, would not allow him and his followers to dwell in his own yūrāt, but placed an intendant over them, and, soon after, Tamur-chī set out for his own yūrāt, as before stated. After his departure, the Makrits, with Tā-îr Asūn, took to plundering the Mughals still remaining behind, but were resisted, and the plunder recaptured from them. After this, the Makrits went away. Tamur-chī, on becoming aware of their proceedings, resolved to uproot them. He invested one sept of them, the Údūkūt, who were in the stronghold of Bījand, which they call Wākkāl Kūrgān, took it, overcame several other septs of the same tribe, and then retired. The Bigū, Tūktā, with his sons and a few of his people, fled to Bū-e-Rūk the Naemān, the elder brother of the Tayānak Khān, while his own sept, with the rest of the Makrit tribe, along with Tā-îr Asūn, retired to the banks of the river Sālingāh, near the fortress of Kūrkah Kīngchān, or Kipjān [?] and there took up their quarters. Tamur-chī on this despatched a force under two of his Nū-yīns, against them. The Makrits were mostly destroyed, and the remainder of them were conducted to Tamur-chī’s presence.

In the month of Jamādī-ul-Akhir of this same year 609 H., Tamur-chī, having ordered his forces to be mustered, resolved to move into the country of Tingkūt—also written Tinghūt—Tukott—and Tingūt—which is described as a mountain country called Anksāē or Ankasāē, of great elevation, adjoining the country of Khiṭāē. The Mughals style the country, which contained cities, fortresses, and fine buildings, Kāshīn [this is the country about which Mr. H. H. Howorth, in his "Mongols Proper," quoting D’Ohsson probably, says, "Tangut, the Hia of the ‘Chinese,’ had been previously known as Ho Şu," and had been "corrupted by the Mongols into Kαshîn"]! Who is the authority that they or any one else corrupted it? On the very next page of the same work we find that "Tangut" is "Kansuh," and, further on, that "Kansu" is "dependent on the kingdom of Hia!" And, on the way thither, Tā-îr Asūn, the Úrhār Makrit chief was seized and brought to Tamur-chī. Having reached Tingkūt, otherwise Kαshīn, the chief place, which appears to have given name to the country—but an Uzbek writer says the country was called Anksāē—the fortress of Lankai was taken by storm and levelled with the ground, and the territory of Kαshīn was plundered and devastated. From thence Tamur-chī advanced towards Kαlangelūh—Kαnrōsh—or Kalankūsh, which was a vast city, and very strong. It was taken, and the greater part of the territory of Tingkūt was also plundered and devastated. From thence Tamur-chī returned, in triumph, to his own yūrāt again. Karā-Kuram, I may mention, is never once named in the histories I have been quoting from, up to this period.

Every tribe, however, which submitted, Tamur-chī ceased from oppressing and treating with severity, incorporated it with his people, and showed it
The Chingiz Khan bound the whole of the people of the
favour and kindness, but those which manifested contumacy, and refused to
submit, he brought under the sword, both chiefs and tribes, so that, in this
manner, he succeeded in bringing most of the Mughal tribes under his sway.
Those among them who were with him in his first encounter with the Æwang
Khân, whom he cherished, and to whom he had assigned certain ranks and
degrees, and given certain exemptions, as previously narrated, he now directed
should be formed into Tomâns—ten thousands—Hazârahs [there never was,
nor is there, a "famous tribe" so named]—Thousands—Sadâhs—Hundreds—
and Dahâhs or Dakehâhs—Tens: these words it must be remembered, are not
the Mughal terms, but the Persian translation of Un Mîng, Mîng, Yüz, and Ün
respectively; and these degrees have continued to be observed among them
down to modern times.

In the month of Rajab [the seventh] 602 H., corresponding to the Mughal
year of the Leopard—but the Mughal, Abû-l-Ghâzî, Bahâdûr Khân, says, the
year of the Hog—and to the month of February, 1206 A.D., when Tamur-chi
was, it is said, by several historians, in the 49th year of his age, but he was
really just 52 years and 7 months old, dating from the day of his birth, he
commanded that a pûrîdâh, or general assembly, of all the Mughal tribes in
submission to him should meet at a certain place, the name of which is not
recorded. It was very probably Samân or Samân Kaharâh, where he,
three years before, assumed the Khân-shîph, and this may have been the cause
why so many authors confuse these two different events, and make one of them.
There, accordingly, his sons, all his Nû-yîns and Âmîrs, from the parts around,
of the Tomâns, Hazârahs, Ñadâhs, and Dahâhs, assembled together, and a
great feast was made. He then set up a white Tûk or Tûgh—standard—consist-
ing of nine degrees, or tails, indicated by as many tails of the ghâjî gâu, or
bos grumnium, mentioned at page 68, and he was seated on a high throne with a
diadem on his head. Some authors, including the Fânâkâtî and the author of
the Târîkh-i-Jâhân-gîr, with slight variation, state, that the causer of his set-
ting up this standard was a Mughal, held in veneration by the people, clothed
in the guise of a recluse, who used to pass his time in devotion, and whom, from
exposure to the elements in a state of nudity, in his wanderings, neither heat
nor cold affected. He pretended to the knowledge of the secrets of futurity,
and asserted that he was sometimes taken up into heaven; and the simple-
minded Mughals believed him. On this account he was styled by them Tab or
Tub Tingût—ب ن ثكر The first word has been altered into or mistaken for But
and translated by several European writers, but not by the original
authors, "The Image of God." Tingût certainly is the Turkish for God, but
"but," signifying an idol, object of adoration, or image, is a purely Írânî, not
a Turkish word; and it would be strange indeed if purely Írânî words, in com-
bination with Turkish, were in common use among Turks, Tâtârous, and Mughals,
at the period in question. For these reasons I think we are not at all certain of
the true meaning of Tab or Tub [This, very probably, is the proper name of
Malik Saîf-ul-Dîn, the Khîṭâb, the XVI. of the Dihlî Malikîs, mentioned at
page 757, whose name is written in precisely the same doubtful way, and
without vowel points.] Tingût, though, I should suppose, the Devotee of, or
Devoted to, or Chosen of God, or something similar, is much more likely to
be the correct signification.

His correct name was Kûkji,—نوكچى—or Kûkchû [turned into "Gueukdja,”
and "Gukju" in the "Mongols Proper"] though some write it Kûkchah.
tribes by pledges and oaths to obey him in all things, and

Kükjah, and Kükçü, and he was the son of Mingïk Ichakah, the Künakçümär—also written Künakçümär—who married Tamur-
čhi’s mother. He stepped forward and said: “Last night a person of
a red colour, seated on a grey horse, appeared unto me, and said: ‘Go
thou to the son of Yassuká and say: ‘After this they shall not style
thee Tamur-čhi any more; for, in future, thy title shall be “the Chingiz
Khan”;’ and likewise say thou to the Chingiz Khan, ‘Almighty God hath
bestowed upon thee and thy austerity, the greater part of the universe.’”

All present repeated it, and with acclamation hailed Tamur-čhi by that title,
because its meaning, in the Türel language, signifies in the Iraní, Sháh-an-
Sháh, King of Kings, or Emperor. The signification, however, is somewhat
differently interpreted by authors into the Great King or Emperor, Khán-i-
Khánán or the Chief of Kháns, and the like. From that time this was his title.
Knowing how cunning Tamur-čhi was, several writers have stated that the
appearance of Kükjü or Kükçü upon the scene was preconcerted between
him and Tamur-čhi. It will be noticed from the foregoing that his proper
title is the Chingiz Khán, as in the case of the Great King, the Great
Napoleon, etc., and not simply “Chingiz.” Another writer well informed as
to the Turks, Táttárs, and Mughals, says that Ching—کیز—is signifies in
the Mughal dialect, firm, confirmed, established, and the like, the plural
form of which is Chingiz—کیز. The impostor was so puffed up with his own
importance, after the success of his pretended revelation, that he began to
terrain ambitious views for himself, until, one day, he entered into an angry
dispute with Tamur-čhi’s brother, Jújí Kasár, when he took him by the throat
and dashed him to the ground with such violence that Kükjü never rose
again.

After this kuríldás, those who were in the secret of this pretended revelation
began to spread the report all over the countries round, and among the peoples
who had submitted to him, so that they began to believe that the Almighty
had really given the world to the Chingiz Khán, and future war and conquest
were chiefly considered.

The first victim of these pretended predictions was Búe-Rúk, brother of the
Tayának Khán, to whom Koshlük, the latter’s son, and the Makrlt chief,
the Bigi, Túktá, had fled for shelter. Búe-Rúk, after he had made such
preparations as he was able for resistance, aided by the Makrlts, was surprised
by a body of Mughals whilst engaged in the chase, in the neighbourhood of
Awaj Ták or Tágh (Habít-us-Siyar has Ulúgh Tágh) at a place called Sújá—
Sújá river?—like the quarry in the net of the fowler, and carried off to the camp
of the Chingiz Khán, and was forthwith put to death. Some say he was killed
in the Sáikár-gáh, or hunting-ground. Rasgúd-ud-Dín says he was surprised
“after making a slight resistance,” which is rather improbable. His tribe on
this dispersed, and Koshlük, and the Bigí, Túktá, after directing their
followers to disperse and rejoin them, with as many others as possible, at a
certain rendezvous in Arífah, fled also to a place on the frontier of the Na-
mán country.

The ruler of Tingkút, Shídärkü, also called Shídäskü, now began to
manifest hostility again, upon which the Chingiz Khán, being then near to that
country, determined to invade it. He entered it with a portion of his immense
forces in 603 H. [A.D. 1206-7]. The capital named Kšhín—the Akgín
of Abü-l-Ghází, Bahádur Khán—which formerly, it is said, gave name
submit to his command; and, in conformity with the usual
to the territory, was surprised, and Shīdarḵū and his people submitted. He
was left without further molestation, it is said, on agreeing to pay tribute,
and permitting the Mughals to occupy his capital. Abū-l-Ğārī, Bahādur
Khān, says he was an aged prince or ruler, and that his capital was taken by
assault after a long investment, and its walls thrown down. From our
author's accounts farther on, however, it will be found that Shīdarḵū had
often boasted of his defeats of the Chingiz Khān, and was, at last, treacher-
ously put to death by him. Kāshīn city was the point at which the great
Kāruwins of traders met from the west and south in their trade with Khītā or
China. It was a very rich city, and the abode of learned men. It is evident
that it was a city of the Buddhists, but few would recognize Kāshīn under the
vitiating name of Campion given to it by the old European travellers. In the
Kāshghar Mission Report the route is referred to, at p. 114, as the Chachān
route, but, at page 139, of the same Report, Kāshīn is turned into "Cash-
mīn."

At the same period the Chingiz Khān, having returned from the subjugation of Tingkūt, subdued the Kirghiz territory.

In the winter of the before-mentioned year [603 H.], but some say the
winter of 604 H.; which appears to be most correct, the Chingiz Khān set
out in order to attack the Bigī, Tūkta, and his Makrics, and Koshlıuk and his
Nāemāns, who had again acquired considerable strength on the frontier of the
Ardīsh territory, which some connect with Tibbat, whilst others say that it is
also the name of a stronghold on the frontiers of the territories of the Makrics
and Nāemāns; but that it was a fortress is very doubtful. Ardísh apparently
extended to Tibbat on the south.

In Shaw's account of "High Tartary," Artush appears as the chief town
of a district, watered by a river of the same name, lying north of Kāshghar
city on the northern frontier of the Kāshghar state. It appears under the
name of Artish in Colonel Walker's last map, and, in the Kāshghar Mission
Report, under the name of Artosh and Artyshe. It is probable that this
name, correctly written Ardīsh or Artīsh [with d or r], applied to a much larger
extent of country, now buried in the sands, extending S.W. as far as the
frontier of Tibbat, as ancietly constituted, but the sands of the desert have
buried former landmarks in this direction.

Mr. H. H. Howorth, however, straightway, transfers this tract, in his
"Mongols Proper," to "the land watered by the Irtish," about 10° farther
North than the part indicated, even according to the map of "Mongolia" in his
own book! West of the Yellow River it certainly was.

Although the cold was intense and the water frozen, the Chingiz Khān set
out with a vast army, and on the way the Bigī Kolūkah, also written Kūnū-
kah, of the Mughal tribe of Ürūrt [ůrūrt] with his people, unable to resist,
submitted to the Chingiz Khān, and they were incorporated with his army,
and conducted it into Ardīsh, where they came upon Koshlıuk, and the
Bigī, Tūkta. An engagement ensued between them, and the confederates
were overwhelmed by superior numbers, and Tūkta was killed by an arrow
in the action.

Kōdū, the brother of Tūkta, and the latter's three sons with him, endeavoured
to carry his body off, but, finding this impossible, they cut off the head and
carried it with them. They, in company with Koshlıuk, fled from the territory
of Ardīsh into that of the I-ğhūrs, the situation of which has been already
customs in force among that people, these important matters
indicated, and sent an agent of their own to the Yiddi-Küt, whose capital
was Bish-Ba‘iligh, and asked for shelter. He slew the agent, and cast his
body into the Khān [in some MSS. the point has been left out altogether,
and in others put under instead of over—hence it has been incorrectly styled the
Jam] Murān. This river is said to rise in the hills crossing the Gobf or
Shāmo desert, to run S.S.W., and to fall into the Hoang-ho—the Karā
Murān—on the borders of Tibbat, and I believe, from the context, that this
is correct. I shall refer to it again farther on. This desert of sand has
destroyed many landmarks, and overwhelmed many cities, hence writers
are led to look farther north, east, and west for places, and to make
rash guesses respecting them, while they lie buried under the sands of the
Gobf. The explorations of the Russian Colonel, Prejevalsky, throw
considerable light on the parts about Lob Nāwar, and the mountains to
the south.

The Yiddi-Küt, having slain the agent, turned out with his people to expel
them, and the fugitives, tired and worn out from the hardships they had
endured in their flight, after a slight skirmish, being unable to cope with the
Ī-ghūrs, went off, and the Yiddi-Küt sent the news of their repulse and flight
to the Chingiz Khān. Kooshluq retired, by way of Bish-Ba‘iligh, into the
territory of the Gur Khān of the Karā-Khitā-i, while the Makrīts retired to
Kam-Kunchak [written in the Rauqat-ūṣ-Safā], which has, by the
carelessness of copyists been turned into Kibchak and Kibchak,
and, consequently, the most absurd errors have arisen, and no wonder “the
country to which he went is not known.” This must not be mistaken for
Kam-Kamjiūt—about which I shall have more to say farther on,
but as the tract east of Lob Nāwar.

Kooshluq was well received by the Gur Khān, who gave him his daughter
in marriage, the details respecting which, and his subsequent ingratitude, have
been given in a previous note, on the Karā Khitā-i dynasty, page 930.

After the overthrow and death of the Bigf, Tūktā, the Chingiz Khān
despatched two agents to the Kirghiz or Kirkiz tribe, calling upon them to
submit. The Bādshāh, as he is styled, Urus I-nfāl, by name, finding himself
unable to offer any opposition, sent back with them an agent of his own with
presents, including a rare bird—the Ax-Šunqār—probably a white eagle,
or some bird of the same species, and made his submission. This event is
said to have happened in 603 H., but, as it certainly happened after the over-
throw of the Makrīt chief, which, as already mentioned, some say took place
in 604 H., the submission of the Kirghiz may have happened in that year also,
for, in consequence of the Bigf, Tūktā’s finding shelter in that part, the
Chingiz Khān called upon them to submit to his yoke.

The next accession of strength gained by the Mughal sovereign was the
homage, in 605 H., but some say in 604 H., of Bāürchik—a ruler
of other tribes of I-ghūrs, which belong to the Mughal I-nāk although they are
neither Ka‘itās, Nagūz, nor Dūrāl-gins. They consisted of over one hundred
and twenty different septs, and were descended in a direct line from Mughal
Khān, brother of Tattār Khān, which former was grandfather of Ğughūz Khān,
and the I-ghūrs were the first to join him against Karā Khān, his father, as
already related. In religion, the I-ghūrs were Lamaists, and, in times previous
to those here referred to, the Bāürghs, or Chiefs of the Ūn I-ghūrs, used
to be styled Ił-Iltār, and those of the Tūkūz I-ghūrs, Kol-Irkīn, or Ił-Irkīn,
were caused to be ratified. He said: "If you will be obe-

and, in after-times, when about a century of their sovereignty had passed, those titles fell into disuse, and the title given to their ruler was Yụddī-Kūṭ—

—which, as regards the first word, in some MSS. is written in such a manner that the two points of the first letter ū— are run into one, and made to appear as, ū—which alters it altogether. The proper mode of writing it is evidently the above, with the ū doubled, which I have taken from a work written by an Uzbak Mughal. In writing words of this kind beginning with āl—is sometimes substituted, thus Abū-l-Ghāṣf, Bahādur Khān, writes āl—Īddī. It signifies "the Lord of Sovereignty," but some writers say, "the Reining Prince," and his territory lay in Turkis-

tān. At the time in question, he was a tributary to the Gūr Khān [The "Aidy Ĉūt," of "Balasaghūn," as Surgeon-Major Bellow styles him at p. 140 of the Kāshghar Mission History, had nothing whatever to do with Bilāsā-chūn: that was the Gūr Khān's capital. The Yụddī Kūṭ's chief town was Bīšh-Bāflg], whose Shāhnah or Intendant, named Shāu-kam, dwelt at his court. Having occasion to complain to this Intendant about his illegal and oppressive acts towards the Ī-ghūr people, and receiving naught but insolence and threats in return, the Yụddī-Kūṭ, having heard the noise of the Chingiz Khān's invincibility, and being himself, with his tribe, descended from the same t-māk, slew the Intendant of the Gūr Khān at Kārā Khwājah, —a place still well known in Ī-ghūr-fistān—and flung the body into the Khām Murān, saying, at the same time, that no one was safe who was the enemy of the Chingiz Khān, and he determined to despatch an agent to him. The latter, who was, by no means, friendly inclined towards the Gūr Khān for giving shelter to Kōshlūk, the Nāemān chief, on hearing what had happened, despatched an agent named Dūrbā, with a friendly message to the Yụddī-Kūṭ, and invited him to come to him, for the Ī-ghūr ruler is said to have previously informed the Chingiz Khān that he had driven Kōshlūk, and the Bīgt, Tūktā's brother and sons out of his territory. A few writers say the Ī-ghūr was the first to negotiate. Be this as it may, according to the majority of the most trustworthy historians, the Yụddī-Kūṭ, dreading the resentment of the Gūr Khān, was well pleased to seek the protection of the Mughsals. He accordingly set out from the Ī-ghūr territory bearing rich presents—for he was a very wealthy prince—consisting of gold, silken garments, cattle, and horses, among which were 1000 of high breed, and slaves both male and female. This was in 605 H. [A.D. 1208-9]. When these negotiations began, the Chingiz Khān was in the territory of Tingkūt, whither he had gone, in that same year, to chastise the ruler of that country, Shīdārkū, who, with some other chiefs, had revolted, and among whom was the Khān of Kīrkīz whose country was utterly ruined. The Mughsals then appeared before the city of Irīkī [Polo's Egrigaia, i. but, in a work written by an Uzbak, it is Ārkey], the ruler of Tingkūt, thereupon made his submission, and is said to have sent his daughter to be espoused by the Chingiz Khān. These events took place in 606 H. On his way back the Yụddī-Kūṭ reached his presence with befitting offerings. He was well received by the Chingiz Khān, and a liberal appanage was assigned him. He solicited that he might be considered as the Great Khān's fifth son, being himself the son of a Khān. This was consented to, and one of the Chingiz Khān's daughters was given him to wife, and he became his fifth son—his son-in-law.
dient to my mandates, it behoveth that, if I should command the sons to slay the fathers, you should all obey," and they entered into a solemn promise accordingly; and the first command he gave was that they should slay the sons of the great Amīr Baḯsū, who had been the associate [in the chieftainship] with the Chingiz Khān’s father. He [the Chingiz Khān] brought the whole of the tribes under his own sway, and set about making preparations for hostilities, and employed himself in getting ready war material and arms. As the numbers of the Mughals had largely increased and become very great, and an account of this determination of the Chingiz Khān had reached the hearing of the Altūn Khān, he nominated [a force of] 300,000 horse in order to guard the route against the

There is a different version of this matter, and, from the circumstantial manner in which it is related, it bears the impress of truth. The Yūdīf-Kūt served under Ģuktāe and Chaghātāe Khāns during the invasion of the Musalmān territories, and was at the siege of Utrār. After returning from that campaign, when he presented himself before the Chingiz Khān, on the latter’s return homewards, the I-ghūr king solicited an alliance, and one of the Chingiz Khān’s daughters was betrothed to him, but the nuptial knot was never tied during the Chingiz Khān’s lifetime. When Ģuktāe succeeded, the Yūdīf-Kūt solicited that the marriage might be completed, but, in the meantime, the lady died. On this Ģuktāe betrothed him to Ulāf Bīf, his own daughter, but before that marriage could be carried out the I-ghūr ruler was removed from the world. On this, his son proceeded to the Khān’s presence, and was married to Ģuktāe’s daughter, but he too soon followed his father, and was succeeded by his own brother in the rulership of his people, by command of Tūrākhnah Khātūn, during the time she administered the government, after her husband’s, Ģuktāe’s, decease.

After the Chingiz Khān had gained so many victories, and acquired such power, the chiefs of other tribes and their people now began to submit to him, and among them was Arsalān Khān, the most prominent of the chiefs of one portion of the numerous Turkish tribe of Kārlūgh [or Kārlūk: it is written both ways] who submitted to him, and joined him with all his people. This was in 607 H., when the Chingiz Khān was encamped at Kalūr-ān. There were several divisions of the Kārlūk or Kārlūgh Turks or Turk-māns, as they are likewise called by several oriental writers, as may be gathered from what I have mentioned in the account of the Afrāsiyāb Malik, pages 907 and 925, and in note 4, page 376.

I have now briefly noticed the most prominent events in the life of the Chingiz Khān up to the time of his revolt against the Altūn Khān, where our author’s account takes its proper place.

4 In a few modern copies— lā 9 and fathers to slay their sons —in addition to the former part of the sentence.

The Printed Text has Baḯsū also in a note, but in the page itself the particle lā governing the oblique case, of, is so printed as to appear like part of the word, thus— lā lā
Mughals, and hold the pass [leading out of the tract then occupied by them].

The Chingiz Khān despatched a Musalmān, named Ja'far, who was among that people [the Mughals], among the forces of the Altūn Khān under semblance of traffic;* and the Altūn Khān commanded that he should be imprisoned; and he detained him for a considerable time. The prisoner [in question], by some good contrivance that became practicable, fled from that confinement; and, by a secret route, made for the presence of the Chingiz Khān, and related the matter to him, and informed him respecting the road by which he had come. The Chingiz Khān determined upon the design of rebelling, got his forces ready, and first directed so that the whole of the Mughal families assembled together at the base of a mountain. He enjoined that all the men should be separated from the women, and the children from their mothers: and, for three whole days and nights, all of them remained bare-headed; and for three days no one tasted food, and no animal was allowed to give milk to its young. The Chingiz Khān himself entered a khargāh [a felt tent], and placed a tent-rope about his neck, and came not forth from it for three nights and days; and, during this period, the whole of the people [there assembled] were crying out, Tingri! Tingri!

After three days, at dawn, on the fourth day, the Chingiz Khān issued from the tent, and exclaimed, "Tingri hath given me victory. Now we will get ready that we may wreak our vengeance upon the Altūn Khān!" For the space of another three days, in that same place likewise, a feast was held. At the end of those three days, he led forth his troops; and, following the route by which that fugitive, Ja'far, had come through the mountains, they issued forth, and assailed the country of Ṭamghāj, carried their inroads into it, and put the people to the sword. When the news of the Chingiz Khān's outbreak became spread abroad, and reached the Altūn Khān, he imagined that, perhaps, that army of 300,000 horse, which were holding that pass* and the high road, had been overthrown;

In a few copies—on a mission to demand peace or war—but he was evidently sent as a spy.

* Pass or Defile. Thus in the text, but one of the entrances in the Great Wall
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and put to the sword; and the heart of the Altān Khān,
is meant—that of Sallū-ling-kīw—which, according to Háfic
Abrū, "having once been passed, the country of Khīṭār may be considered
as subdued."

I must here also briefly relate what other more modern writers, who
wrote however under Mughal influence, state; because our author's account
contains much that no others have related, and he was contemporary with the
Chingiz Khān, knew many of the actors in these events, and was not influenced
by the patronage of Mughal sovereigns.

Now that the Chingiz Khān, through the submission of the Yādī-Kut of
the I-shūrs, had reduced, nominally, or partially, at least, all the tribes
between the Gūr Khān's dominions on the west, and Khīṭā, or Northern
China, on the east, and most of the Mughal tribes, and had become exceed-
ingly prosperous, and his forces countless, he resolved to make an attempt
upon the territory of the Altān Khān of Khīṭā, Shūdai-Shīr-o-shīr—the
"Ninkiasu" of some European writers—to whom, for many ages, his fore-
fathers had been tributary. He wanted a plea, like the wolf in the fable, and
found one as easily, and certainly more justly, than another descendant of
Yāshī has lately manufactured one against the 'Ugmānlīl Turks: only the
Chingiz Khān acted openly, not perfidiously, or hypocritically: so, what had
happened seven and four generations before respectively, he now adopted as
an excuse for invading the Altān Khān's dominions. The Altān Khāns of
by-gone times had put to death two chiefs' sons of the Nairūn Mughals, as
already related in the account of the Turks, namely Hamanghā or Hamankhā,
and Ükūn-Barjāk.

Oriental writers differ considerably in their accounts of these events. It
appears that the Chingiz Khān continually conferred with his chiefs and
tributaries on the injuries and wrongs their forefathers had sustained at the
hands of the Khīṭā-īs, by reason of which the Mughal people were looked
upon with scorn by other nations, their neighbours. He recalled to them the
prediction [the imposture of Tab Tingri, previously referred to] that they were
always to be victorious over their enemies.

On this, the Khwājah, Ja'far—the very same as mentioned by our author—a
Musalmān of sagacity, as he is called, who had long been in the Chingiz
Khān's service—as being a more respectable agent, probably, than a barbarian
Mughal—was despatched to the court of the Altān Khān, to intimate to that
monarch his accession to the sovereignty of the Mughal tribes, and calling
upon him to render allegiance, and pay tribute to his former vassals, the
Mughals, in which case he might continue as heretofore to rule over Khīṭā!
The Altān Khān treated the messenger and his demands with utter contempt,
and sent him away.

The author of the "Mongols Proper," who disdains all who wrote in Per-
sian (while his information is derived from translations from them), with the
exception, I suppose, of the "great Raschid," as mere "second-rate au-
thorities," "muddy streams," &c., &c., turns this Musalmān, whose name
plainly indicates his religion, and who was not a Mughal, into "Jafar
Khodahā," and adds that he was "one of the principal Mongols"!!

Then occurred the tent and fast scene related by our author, but in much
greater detail. More particulars respecting the impostures of the Mughal
ruler will be found farther on.

After this, in the eighth month of 607 [March, 1211 A.D.] H., the Mughal troops
and of the whole of the inhabitants of the country of Tamghāj, became much afflicted.

were assembled; a portion, amounting to 10,000 horse, under Tughbāchār, also styled Dālān, was left behind to guard the Chingiz Khān’s own camp and territory, and keep the conquered tribes of Karāyat, Nāmān, and others quiet, while, from the remainder, two armies were formed: one was despatched under the Chingiz Khān’s three sons, Jūjī, Chaghataī, and Üktā, and some of his Nū-yīn, into Khūrjah [Corea of Europeans], passing through the country of the Kūl-ānak, who had already acknowledged the supremacy of the Mughals. There they committed great devastation, and sacked cities and towns without opposition, the troops of that country having gone to join the Khītā-ī forces.

The country of Khūrjah, or Khūrjat, is said to have been computed at seventy tomāns—700,000—that is to say, such was the number of fighting men it had to furnish—and the city of Sūkīn [Swat] or Sunkīn [Sevk], as it is also called, and the great city of Kūlking [Kilta] or Kūlāking [Kielta], which was one of the greatest in the empire, was captured by Jabhāh [our author’s Yamah], the Nū-yīn, and destroyed.

Subsequently, Jūjī, and his brothers, advanced in another direction, and wrested out of the hands of the Khītā-īs, the cities of Tūng—[possibly eln—Kūng]—Chīw—[possibly lir—Sūk-Chīw—Sūk-Chīw—Kū-Chīw—Um-nf—Um-nf—Um-nf—Um-nf—Lung-Chīng—Um-nf—Um-nf—Lung-Chīng—[one MS. Um-nf—Um-nf—Um-nf]. I may mention that no languages are worse than the Persian, and such others as use the ‘Arabic characters, for recording foreign proper names, unless the scribes are very careful to point the letters correctly; and no language is so bad, probably, for vitiating the pronunciation of foreign words as the Chinese; and, therefore, the absolute accuracy of these Chinese names cannot be vouched for: I have added the originals as I find them, but after comparing and authenticating them as well as possible. I have, among other helps, used four copies of Aliff.

The Chingiz Khān himself, with his army, received further reinforcements near the river Til, also written Til, of Karā-Khītāe; and the cities, which lay on the banks of that river, such as Baisūc—Baisūc—Baisūc—and others, were taken.

After that, Īlā-Kūn or Alākūn, Tigīn Kūrīn, chief of the Ungkūt Turks, the same who betrayed the Tayyān Khān’s proposals to Tamur-chī, again betrayed the trust reposed in him. He and his tribe were subject to, and in the pay of, the Khītā-ī sovereigns, and located in the part now approached by the Mughals, for the purpose of guarding that part of the Great Wall or Barrier called Ulīn-Kūn—Ulīn-Kūn—Ulīn-Kūn—Ulīn-Kūn—Ulīn-Kūn—by the Turkish tribes, and which was built for the purpose of restraining the Karāyats, Nāmān, and Mughals, and preventing their molesting the Khītāe territory. He had a grievance against the Altān Khān, and admitted the Mughals within the Great Wall, and provided the invaders with guides.

The name Ung-kūt or Ulīn-kūt is said to signify the guards of the Wall or Barrier. It is also written Unkūt—Alūb-Ghāzī, Bahādur Khān, says the Turks call this Wall or Barrier Tür-kūrgah or Tür-kūrgah—Tür-kūrgah—Tür-kūrgah—and the Khītā-īs, Ungū—Ungū—Ungū—Ungū.

The Chingiz Khān and his hordes having been admitted within the Great Wall, and having gained a footing there, he despatched bands of troops in various directions to ravage and subdue the Khītāe territory; and two hundred cities, towns, and fortresses, they destroyed or captured, including the cities of Nūkāh—Nūkāh—Nūkāh—Nūkāh—Nūkāh—Nūkāh—and Kun-Chīw—Kūching Chīw—Kūching Chīw—Kūching Chīw—Kūching Chīw.
When the news of that disaster, plunder, devastation,
cities, which submitted without resistance and furnished supplies to the
invaders, were spared, but that all others were destroyed.

He then turned his face towards the Altan Khan’s capital, and metropolis
of Khitai, which, in the Tarikh-i-Jahân-grî, Ḥâfb-us-Siyar, &c., is named
Chingdû [غندو] or Chingtû [قينتو], where the Altan Khan then was. This
must be our author’s city of Tamghây, that is to say, the chief city of the
country of Tamghây.

When the Altan Khan became aware of the advance of the Mughal host,
he marched with his army, reinforced by the forces of Khûrijah—a numerous
host—and took up a position to guard one of the strong entrances leading into
his empire, detaching a considerable body of troops in advance to watch the
frontiers and harass the Mughals if opportunity occurred. This could have
been of little effect with the Mughals within the Great Wall, and, evidently,
is the same circumstance as our author refers to; but he says, more probably,
that the Altan Khan sent 300,000 horse to guard the entrance into his territory.
The sovereigns of Khitai did not usually accompany their armies, and Ḥâfiz
Abrû also says that he was not present. Our author also mentions the same
Ja’îr; and the latter’s return, by a secret route, evidently refers to the route
by the Great Wall, betrayed by Ali-Kûsha, Tîghn Kûrin.

To return to the accounts of writers who wrote a century or more after our
author. The force detached from the Altan Khan’s main army, commanded
by the Amir of Khûrijah, was so far successful that, information having
reached it that the Mughals, after capturing one of the cities in the vicinity,
were then engaged, unsuspicious of the near approach of enemies, in dividing
the spoil in their camp, the Khitai leaders thought this an excellent oppor-
tunity, and determined to endeavour to surprise them. They came upon the
Mughals when cooking their food, but the Chingiz Khan was speedily on the
alert, and his troops, dropping their cookery, were soon mounted, and they
speedily put the Khitai to the rout.

The main army of the Altan Khan, which had advanced to meet the
Mughals, when within a few marches of them, was found to be so much
fatigued that it was deemed advisable to halt to give it some rest. Its camp
was fortified by a deep trench in front, and the wagons or carts of the army
were placed on either flank. Hearing, however, that the Mughals were
advancing in search of them, they foolishly left this secure position, and,
despairing the Mughals whom they had so often coerced in former times, sallied
forth to meet them. The battle was obstinate and bloody, but ended without
any decisive result; for, although the Khitai were lost nearly 30,000 men, the
Mughals lost even more. The Chingiz Khan thought it advisable to retire
with his spoils towards his own borders, and the Khitai did not deem it
advisable to follow, as they were much worn out with long marches and their
exertions in the late battle.

Ḥâfiz Abrû says it was one of the Chingiz Khan’s most famous battles,
that the Khitai were nearly annihilated, and that it took place towards the
end of 607 H. [about the end of May, 1211 A.D.], while some writers leave it
out entirely. If the Khitai were nearly annihilated, it is strange the
Mughals should have retired. The Ḥâfb-us-Siyar also says the Khitai
were overthrown, and that the Altan Khan fled in dismay to his capital.
Fearing for the safety of that city, if the war continued, the Altan Khan now
summoned his minister and his two principal generals, to deliberate on the
and slaughter, reached that [great] army which was guard-

state of affairs. It was agreed that a temporary accommodation should be entered into, if possible, in order to get rid of the Mughals for the present, trusting to what events might happen hereafter; and to give themselves time to make preparations for the future when once rid of them. An ambassador was despatched to treat with the Chingiz Khan, and the Altan Khan’s daughter, Konji by name, was offered him in marriage. This offer was at once accepted for some cause—probably because he had lost so heavily in the great battle, and because he found the conquest of the Altan Khan’s country, at that time, and under present circumstances, was not so easy as he had expected. For these reasons, and flattered with the condescending offer of the Khan’s daughter, and such an imperial alliance, the Chingiz Khan accepted the offer of peace; and accompanied by the Khitaj princess withdrew from the Altan Khan’s dominions to his yurats in the country of Karakuram.

According to the Chinese historians quoted by Gaubil, the great battle just referred to, took place in A.D. 1212 [= 609 H.], near the mountain [range?] Yenhu, seven or eight leagues W.N.W. of Swen-wa-fu; and, in an attack upon Tai-tong-fu, the Chingiz Khan was dangerously wounded, upon which he thought fit to return home. The Khitaj-Is on this retook several places, among which was Kuyang-quan.

These historians also state that, on the subsequent return of the Chingiz Khan, in A.D. 1213, a still more bloody battle took place between the Khitaj-Is and the invaders near Whayley, four or five leagues W. of Kuyang-quan, and that the field was strewed with dead bodies for four leagues together. This coincides exactly with what our author describes as page 965, which see.

As soon as the Mughals had withdrawn, the Altan Khan left his son at Ching-dü, with several distinguished nobles as his counsellors, along with a considerable army, and withdrew himself from the capital, which was situated a little to the north of the city, called, in after-years, Khan-Bailgh by the Mughals, and is said to be the Yen-king of the Chinese, situated a little N. of the present Pekin, and, doubtless our author’s city of Tamghaj, by which he does not mean to say that such was its name, but that it was the city—the capital—of the Tamghaj country or empire. The Altan Khan retired to Taiming—sic—a the Pyen-lyang of the Chinese, and called also Nan-king, and still called Pyen-lyang. Its site is just where Kai-song-fu, the capital of Honan now stands, which his father had founded, and which they likewise call Anta or Inta-I [ lãl], which is somewhat doubtfully written. It is said to have been forty leagues in circumference, surrounded by a triple wall, and situated on a river which they call the Chang or Ching-Khu [ lãl and some the Ira—la—Murian], and “in which [on one side of which ?] its foundations were laid. The breadth of this river is so great, that, between early morning and evening, a boat passes from one side to the other, and returns with considerable exertion.” On the way to this city, some of the Altan Khan’s troops deserted him, and went away and joined the Mughals; and the Chingiz Khan, on becoming advised of the Altan Khan’s retirement from Ching-dü, despatched an army under two Amirs of Tomans—the Bahadur Samaika—[Häif Abrü has Sajukah], the Säljut, and another Nû-yân, to invest Ching-dü, which they did.

The Habius-Siyar gives a different account of these events, which agrees more with the Chinese statements, which affairs are said to have happened in 608—10 H. [A.D. 1211—13], that the whole of the northern part of the Altan Khan’s
ing the high road, through panic, on account of the state of
dominions was in a disturbed and disaffected state, and that disloyalty and
sedition prevailed, so much so that the Altan Khan's son, through these disaf-
flections, withdrew from Ching-du, and went and joined his father, and that
intelligence of the forsaken condition of that capital conveyed to him through
the governor of Khurjah, who tendered his allegiance to him, induced the
Chingiz Khan to invade Khitai a second time.

Another account is that the Altan Khan had given orders to ravage some
parts of Karai-Khitai [i.e. north-west of, and beyond the Great Wall], on
which the people sent agents to the Chingiz Khan at Karai-Kuram, and sought
his protection, and the Khan of one of the disaffected parts, having gained pos-
session of one of the fortresses guarding one of the entrances through the Great
Wall, offered to admit the Mughals thereby. This statement is confused, and
refers to the first, not the second expedition, as I have shown. However, it
is farther stated that the Chingiz Khan thought the time propitious, and
determined on invading the Altan Khan's dominions again, and that he
proposed that his I-ghur and Karlugh allies should take a part in the expedi-
tion; but, being unable, through sickness—caused by the wound perhaps,
referred to previously—to proceed himself, the command was given to
Samukah, the Saljut, his oldest Nu-yan.

The Chinese authors tell us that the Chingiz Khan, having retired from
Khitai, after the accommodation with the Altan Khan, and, having received
his daughter in marriage, in 1211 A.D., set out, accompanied by Jufi, to conquer
Kibchak—an error for Kam-Kunchak previously referred to—in order to reduce
several tribes which had been subject to the Wang Khan, who had nought to
do with "Kipchak," that the tribes inhabiting Jatah [European Getes]
submitted, and that, leaving half his forces with Jufi, who defeated the
Koms, Walaks, Bulghars, and Hungarians, the Chingiz Khan retired to
Karai-Kuram. Now this is wholly incorrect, and caused apparently through
mistaking Kam-Kunchak for Kibchak. The Chingiz Khan never entered
Kibchak, and Jufi was not sent into Kibchak until several years after—he
never went against either Walaks, Bulghars, or Hungarians—as will be seen
farther on; and it is quite certain that the Awang Khan had nothing to do
with their country.

The same writers also state that the Chingiz Khan determined to invade
Khitai again in consequence of certain threats of the Altan Khan, and, at the
instigation of the Gur Khan, who had been provoked by the Altan Khan's
ravages on his territory, and who had, by help of some rebels, seized a con-
siderable fortress which opened the way into China. Here they have terribly
confused matters. The Gur Khan dynasty had already terminated, and the
Ungkut Turks betrayed the passage through the great mound or Wall on the
occasion of the first invasion.

The Raukat-us-Safait also states that another Mughal army was despatched
into Khurjah to prevent the forces of that territory from going to the aid of the
Altan Khan, and several places in it were taken. Meanwhile, the other army
is said to have been met, on its advance, by the army of the Altan Khan,
which was pushing forward to meet it; and it is related that the advance of
the Mughals was defeated, but that, the main army coming up, the Khitai-Is
were overthrown and routed, and their troops took refuge in different cities.
The capital was strongly garrisoned, and the Altan Khan's son is said to have
been there in command [this is totally contrary to the Habib-us-Siyar, written
affairs, they became dispersed, and were slain, and made captive.

The Chingiz Khan acquired domination over the countries of Saghar, and Tingit, and Tamghaj, and he came by the son of the author of the Rasat-us-Safā, and the Mughals are said to have been induced to endeavour to take the city by assault, but to have been repulsed, and the investment continued for a long time. The defenders being numerous and the inhabitants likewise, the besiegers determined to starve the city into surrender, and subsequently it was taken by stratagem; and, this being reported to the Khita-i sovereign, he was so affected that he destroyed himself by poison.

The Ḥabib-us-Siyar says an attempt was made by a body of troops, each carrying a portion of grain, as well as the followers of the army, to conduct a convoy of provisions, to relieve the capital, but that they were intercepted on the march and defeated; and the convoy was taken. On this two of the Khita-i generals destroyed themselves by means of poison, and others escaped to Tayming; and these disasters were followed by the submission of the capital and country.

The details of the capture of the city in the Rasat-us-Safā, and in the work of the Turkish author, Abū-l-Khair, are somewhat similar to our author's account, the details of which he had of persons who, shortly after its capture, visited it, and therefore his account is of the utmost value. The date of its capture is 610 H. [A.D. 1213-14].

I have now brought up the events in the career of the Chingiz Khan, as briefly as possible, to where our author begins to give his narrative in greater detail. Ḥāfiz Abrū gives most elaborate accounts of these events, but I must, for want of space, leave his particulars for another occasion.

* This is the same name as occurs at page 267 and 270, and in the second para. immediately under, and in the account of Tūshi [Jüji] Khan farther on. The word varies in the different copies of the text from -شاغر- to -شاغر- and -شاغر—without any points. When I wrote the notes to the account of the Khwārazmī Sultan, I concluded, from the mention, invariably, of Tingit and Tamghaj along with it, that the I-ghūr country must be meant, from the third form of the doubtful word as given above—ئ—Then again I thought the word must be-ئ-شاغر—an 'Arabic word in common use, signifying the frontier of an infidel country, but this, too, is, I think, from what is mentioned farther on, also untenable, although Tingit and Tamghaj are still used in connexion with it. As, in Turkish words, occurring in the histories of this period, the letters ī and ā are interchangeable, I was inclined to consider that the word here might be Saghar, or Şakar, or Şaghir, or Şakhir, and that it referred to the place which the old travellers call, and what appears in the Jesuits’ maps as, Sukker, and Saker, and Sukquier, Sukuir, Suchur, and Sucuir, in as many copies of Polo’s work, but this idea must also be abandoned, for this reason that Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, never penetrated as far east as the limits of Turkistan, in that quarter, in his pursuit of Kadir Khan, with respect to whose pursuit in 615 H., it is first mentioned at pages 267 and 270, and there it is stated as being in or part of “Tatār,” and “Turkistan.” But it is also distinctly stated, on the former page, that, in reaching this identical part—ئ—as far as Yighur [I-ghūr]—that is supposed—ئ—was correct—the Sultan penetrated so far northwards—I leave out the “North Pole”—that the light of twilight never left the sky all night; and,
before the gate of the city of Ṭamghāj and seat of government of the Altūn Khān [and invested it]. He continued from note 3 to that page, even were the time midsummer, the Sultan must have reached as far north as the parallel of 49° or 50° of north latitude, for such a phenomenon to occur, and, consequently, Sakir or Saghir—the Sukkier, &c., of the old travellers, between Kāshgār and Khīšā, is out of the question. Sibir—سیبریا, likewise, will not do, as the word is written very differently.

In the notice of Tūshī [Jūjī], farther on, referring to the same place and event, it is said that, "in the year 615 H., the Sultan had gone to make a raid upon the tribes of Kadr Khān of Turkistān, who was the son of Ṣafāktīn the Yamak," and that "Tūshī, from the side of Ṭamghāj, had advanced with an army"—at page 269 it is said that "Tūshī had come out of Chīn in pursuit of an army of Tatārs," and that refers to Tuk-Tūghān, the Makrit chief, a totally different person from Kadr Khān, the son of Ṣafāktīn-i-Yamak, but who, at page 267, is called Yūsuf [his correct name apparently is Yūsuf, and Kadr Khān his title], the Tatār, whose father's Turkish name was Ṣafāktīn, and his tribe the Yamak. According to our author, Ulugh Khān, afterwards Sultan of Dīhilī, was connected with the Yamak.

In the lines of poetry with which our author closes this History, he styles his patron, Ulugh Khān-i-A'ṣam "Khān of the Ibarī, and Shah of the Yamak;" and Sultan I-yal-timīlah is also said to have belonged to the Ibarī tribe, which, at page 796, is mentioned as being obliged to fly before the Mughals, "when they acquired predominance over the countries of Turkistān and the tribes of Khīšchāk." Yamak or Yamāk is described as the name of a ruler and of a city or town, and also of a territory of Turkistān; and some add that it is also the name applied to the sovereign of the Ighūr, but that was, as already stated, Yīḍdī-Kūt. Respecting the Ibarī tribe, which I believe to be that which ancient authors call the Abars, or a part of them, I shall have something to say before closing these notes.

In 'Abd-ullāh-i-Khūrdādbih's work there are some items of information which may throw a little light on this difficult matter, but, still, a deal remains to be cleared up; and the copy of his work which I have referred to, unfortunately, has been damaged by damp in the middle of each page for some thirty or forty pages, in the very portion I wanted most to be perfect. He says, with reference to the Ghuzz tribe, that "the Ghuzzān are a people, the Malik of whom they style the Taghār—تاغر—Khākān [خاکان] is one of the words in some copies of our author's text, and may easily be mistaken for كهکان by a copyist], and the capital of the Taghār Khākān is the city of Aral—ارال. There are Tarsāh [Christians—Nestorians] there as well as Buddhists, and others. The people are nomads and live in khargāhs [round felt tents] and tents [different to the khargāh], but their Malik wears dresses of silk brocade, and silk, with wide sleeves and long skirts." He moreover says that the routes from that territory lead to Barsakān—بَرمسان—which is said, by another writer, to be a place between I-rān and Türān, not a very satisfactory explanation, and from thence to—سول—which, being without points, may be read many ways, where the routes [or where other routes] meet. From thence to Sakīt [سكيت], and then to Kaghmi—کاغمی—and from thence to Ḥakat [it appears to be Ḥakat, but Jakut seems more probable, but I can only give the original word as I find it], is a day's journey. It is farther added, that this vilayat or country—Taghār—is less in extent than Kujā—کوجـا—described by another author as a place within Chīn. Now all this, it appears to me, tends to
before the city for a period of four years, in such wise that
every stone which was in that city they [the defenders]
used to place in the catapults and discharge against the
investors; and, when stones, bricks, and the like, ceased to
be available, everything that was of iron, brass, lead, copper,
tin, and pewter, all was expended in the catapults, and then
bālishṭs' [ingots] of gold and silver they continued to dis-
charge in place of stones. Trustworthy [persons] have
narrated on this wise, that the Chingiz Khān, during this
period, had issued a mandate that no person in the Mughal
army should take any notice of that gold and silver, nor
remove any of it from the place where it might have fallen.

After a period of four years when that city was taken,
and the Altūn Khān had fled, and his son and his
Wazīr became captives in the hands of the Chingiz Khān,
he commanded that, from the records of the treasuries and
the Muhṣīfs [auditors] of the treasuries of the Altūn Khān,
a copy of the account of gold and silver should be procured.
They brought it to the Chingiz Khān accordingly, showing
how many bālishṭs of gold and silver had been discharged,
show that the tract indicated in the text is no other than this Taghār [the
part indicated is described as a wilāyat by our author] of the Ghuzz, prob-
ably as far north as the Aral Nawar, and that, from the two words having been
mistaken in M.S. for one, the puzzling, but incorrect, I believe, subject of
"Taghārazī" has arisen [تاغراز], the chief of which, like several
others in Turkistan, bore the title of Khān.

Ibn-Haukal says, speaking of Chin, if you wish to proceed westward from
the east, you come by Kharkhīz [this has no reference to the Kargāhīz], and
Ghazzghuzz—ةقزغحذز Taghār-i-Ghuzz?]—, and by Kīmāk to the sea, a four
months' journey. Again he says, in another place, that Ghuzz is the boundary
of the land of the Turks, from Khurz and Kīmāk, and to Khuranjāh—خورانجة
—and Bulghār, and the boundary on the land of the Musalmāns from Gurgān
[Jūrjānīah of the 'Arabs] to Bārā [i.e. Fārāb] and Isfanjāb.

I was in hopes that M. Barbier de Meynard's edition of 'Abd-ūllāh-i-Khur-
dādbih, published in the "Journal Asiatique," for 1865, would help me here, but
the names of places are so fearfully incorrect as to render it perfectly useless for
the purpose. For example: the well-known city of Nīghāpur is written with
— instead of ـ; Isrāštah—آشتاه—is written Iahrūnah—أرناه; ʿUlā, in the
same way, although so well-known, is printed ʿAl-Ghūr—عور Al-aʿz, and so on.

A bālish or bālishī signifies a pillow or bolster for the head, but, here, an
ingot of gold or silver in the form of a pillow or bolster, which, in former days,
was current among the the Turks. A bālish of gold is said to have weighed
eight miskāls and two dāṅgs, and a bālish of silver, eight dirams and two
dāṅgs, but the bālish here referred to must have been of far greater weight to
have been of any effect on this occasion.
and, according to those records, he required the whole of the gold and silver: and he obtained it so that not a single bar thereof was missing.

From the Sayyid-i-Ajall [most worthy Sayyid], Bahā-ud-Din, the Rāzī—on whom be peace!—who was a Sayyid of noble nature, and of manifest lineage, this servant of the state, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, who is the compiler of this TABAḴĀT, heard, that Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh—on whom be the Almighty’s mercy!—despatched him on a mission to the Chingiz Khān, and the reason for sending it was, that, when the account of the outbreak of the Chingiz Khān, and the predominance of the Mughal forces over the territories of Ţamghāj, and countries of Šaghar and Tingit, and the regions of Chīn, from the extreme east, was brought to the hearing of Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, he was desirous of investigating, by means of trustworthy persons of his own, the truth of this statement, and to bring certain information respecting the condition and amount of the Mughal forces and their weapons and warlike apparatus. The writer [of this book] who is Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in the year 617 H., which was the first year of the Mughal forces’ crossing the Jihūn into Khurāsān, heard, whilst within the fortress of Tūlak, from the lips of the Īmād-ul-Mulk, Tāj-ud-Din, the Jāmī, the Dābīr [secretary], who was one of the ministers of state of the Khwārazm-Shāhī dynasty, that the ambition to appropriate the countries of Chīn had become implanted in the heart of Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and he was constantly making inquiry respecting those states, and used to ask comers from the territories of Chīn, and the extreme limits of Turkistān, about them. “We [his] servants” [continued

---

8 This name varies just as before in the different copies of the text. According to our author’s statements at pages 268 and 270, and in his notice of Tūshī [Jūjī], between the seizure of the Chingiz Khān’s merchants and envoys and the Sulṭān’s return from ‘Irāk, that is to say, in 615 H., the Sulṭān had penetrated into this part in pursuit of Kadr Khān, the Tājīr, son of Šafātīn, the Yamaq, referred to at page 961, but his accounts are somewhat confused, wanting detail, and other writers do not refer to this particular affair.

9 The idiom varies considerably in different copies here, as in other places previously mentioned.

1 A few copies have “Hind and Chīn.”
Tāj-ud-Dīn] “used to make representation in order to lead him from entertaining that resolution, but in no manner was that thought to be removed from his mind until he despatched the Sayyid-i-Ajall, Bahā-ud-Dīn, the Rāżi, for that important affair.”

Hamd-ullah, the Mustawfi, in his Tārīkh, says [see also note 4, page 265] that, before this catastrophe, the Chingiz Khān sent an envoy into Irān, and entered into a treaty with the Sulṭān of Khwārazm, that compacts were entered into, and letters passed between them, and that the treaty was ratified. Merchants are said to have proceeded to the urdu of the Mughal ruler, without hesitation, on this understanding between the two rulers; and it is stated that the Chingiz Khān sent envoys and merchants of his own, a second time, along with them. This cannot be correct from the statement of the Sayyid, Bahā-ud-Dīn, who went thither, as our author relates; and the one despatch of envoys and merchants on this single occasion has evidently been made into two. It is also asserted that, as early as 614 H., after his return from Ghaznīn, the Sulṭān began to show less respect towards the Mughals, but the Sulṭān came to Ghaznīn two years before that date, and in 615 H. invaded the northern parts of Asia. [See preceding note 4.] In the year 614 H., the Khalfīfah, Un-Nāṣir, is said to have instigated the Mughal to attack the Sulṭān, as previously related in the note first referred to, to which the Chingiz Khān is said to have replied that the restless nature of the Sulṭān would soon afford a plea for attacking him.

Rashīd-ud- Dīn and Mîr Khāwind state, that one cause of ill feeling on the part of the Mughal ruler towards the Musalmān Sulṭān was, that the latter had despatched bodies of troops occasionally into parts under allegiance to the Mughals, and ill-treated the people, as though war had actually commenced, and, at last, overran a territory belonging to Koshlūk, the Naemān sovereign, which the Chingiz Khān considered his by right of conquest. Notwithstanding all this, it is said, the Mughal ruler was still inclined to keep on good terms with the Sulṭān. This statement is not correct, however, as may be seen from note 4, page 268, and in the account of Tūshī [Jūji] farther on. The invasion of the territory in question—Arwīsh [turned into “Arwīsh” in the Kashghar Mission History]—they say, was when the Sulṭān fell in with a Mughal army under Jūji, and compelled it to fight, but, on that occasion, the Sulṭān’s intention was to protect his own territories from invasion by fugitives flying from the Mughals, not to attack them.

Petis de la Croix in his “Genghiscan,” pages 158 to 164, causes Abū-l-Khāir and Rashīd to make a terrible blunder respecting the battle which took place between the Mughals under Jūji, after the defeat of the Makrīfs, and the Sulṭān, which he has previously correctly mentioned as having taken place in A.D. 1216 [H. 613], and makes out that a great battle was fought between the Sulṭān and the Chingiz Khān in person, in A.D. 1218 [H. 615], while they never once met. He says the Sulṭān made secret levies of troops, and all those available from “Corassan, Balc, the Borders of India, and other parts of Iran,” were directed to assemble at “Feraber,” a town of “Bocara;” that the Sulṭān’s army amounted to 300,000 or 400,000 men, but yet was far inferior to the Mughal host. The Sulṭān is then said to have found the enemy at “Carcou,” and an indecisive battle was the result. The details, however, are simply those of the battle which took place between the Gür Khān and the
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The Sayyid, Bahā-ud-Dīn, related after this manner:—

"When we arrived within the boundaries of Tamghāj, and near to the seat of government of the Altūn Khān, from a considerable distance a high white mound appeared in sight, so distant, that between us and that high place was a distance of two or three stages, or more than that. We, who were the persons sent by the Khwārazm Shāhī government, supposed that that white eminence was perhaps a hill of snow, and we made inquiries of the guides and the people of that part [respecting it], and they replied: "The whole of it is the bones of men slain." When we had proceeded onwards another stage, the ground had become so greasy and dark from human fat, that it was necessary for us to advance another three stages on that same road, until we came to dry ground again. Through the infections [arising] from that ground, some [of the party] became ill, and some perished. On reaching the gate of the city of Tamghāj, we perceived, in a place under a bastion of the citadel, an immense quantity of human bones collected. Inquiry was made, and people replied, that, on the day the city was captured, 60,000 young girls, virgins, threw themselves from this bastion of the fortress and destroyed themselves, in order that they might not fall captives into the hands of the Mughal forces, and that all these were their bones.

When we saw the Chingiz Khān, they brought in bound,

Sultān referred to in note ¹, page 262, and note ¹, page 980, which see, and thus a sad confusion of events is the result.

² This worthy official is, I find, a totally different person from Badr-ud-Dīn, referred to in note ⁷, page 270. I think therefore that such testimony is to be preferred to statements written about a century after by writers in the employ of Mughal sovereigns.

³ It is said that the number of killed in the great battle referred to in para. eighteen, of note ⁸, page 954, was so great that the beasts of the field and fowls of the air enjoyed their obscene feasts for more than a year, on that battle-field.

⁵ Other, but much more modern writers, state that the Chingiz Khān, after his successes in Khīṭā, whither he did not proceed in person on the second invasion of that country, as already noticed, returned to his yirāl, and sent officers in command of numerous troops to guard his conquests. From our author's statement above, contrary to all others, and derived from the Sayyid, Bahā-ud-Dīn, an eye-witness, the Chingiz Khān was himself at Tamghāj when the Sultān's agents had this interview with him.

Surgeon-Major Bellew tells us that "Changiz," leaving strong garrisons in "Tughūr" [!] and its frontiers, returned to his Yurt or "country seat" [sic] at
where we were, the son of the Altān Khān, and the Wazir of his father; and, at the time of our return, the Chingiz Khān sent a great number of raredies and offerings with us for presentation to Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and said: 'Say ye unto Khwārazm Shāh, "I am the sovereign of the sun-rise, and thou the sovereign of the sunset. Let there be between us a firm treaty of friendship, amity, and peace, and let traders and kārwāns on both sides come and go, and let the precious products and ordinary commodities which may be in my territory be conveyed by them into thine, and those of thine, in the same manner, let them bring into mine."' Among the raredies and presents that the Chingiz Khān sent to Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, was a nugget of pure gold as big as a camel's neck, which they had brought to him [the Chingiz Khān] from the mountain [range] of Ṭamghāj, so that it was necessary to convey that piece of gold upon a cart. With us also he despatched five hundred camels laden with gold, silver, silks, khass-i-Khitāe [a coarse kind of woven silk of Khitā], targū [a silken fabric red in colour], kundūs [beaver], samūr [sable], and raw silk, and elegant and ingenious things of Chīn and Ṭamghāj, along with merchants of his own; and the majority of those camels were laden with gold and silver. When Utrār was reached, Kadr Khān of Utrār acted in a per-

Shāman Garā = "The Shaman's home." 1 I wonder what a barbarian Mughal's "country seat" may have been. The Shaman's home—in what language "Garā" may mean "home" is not stated—refers probably to the place called Șamān-Kaharah, where he was chosen Khān. See previous note, paragraph twenty-five, page 937.

6 Abū-l-Fidā says the envoys and merchants came from Mughūlīstān through Karā-Khitāe, and Turkistān. No doubt, they took the ordinary caravan-route by Ṭurfān.

7 In some copies of the text, "a piece of beaten gold," in others, as rendered above, which is doubtless the correct version.

8 This word also means any description of fur made up into garments, but here the meaning is as above. Khitā-i, in itself, is, I believe, the name of a fabric, also called nankeen by Europeans.

9 According to some writers who explain the word, the animal is something like a fox, and some say, like an otter. It may mean the fur of the black fox or of the beaver.

1 Our author has made this same mistake before. His title was Ghā-ir Khān, not Kadr Khān, and his name was Anfāl Jūk. 2 See note 7, page 271.

In the Geographical Magazine for June, 1877, Mr. H. H. Howorth, who
fidious manner, and sought permission from Sultan Muhammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and, out of covetousness of that large amount of gold and silver, had the whole of the traders and travellers, and the emissaries [from the Chingiz Khan], slaughtered, so that not one among them escaped with the exception of a camel man who was at a bath, who, during that occurrence, managed to get out by way of the fireplace of the hot-bath, adopted a contrivance for his own safety, and, by way of the desert, returned to the territories of Ghīn and Tāmghāj.

When he acquainted the Chingiz Khan with the particulars of that perfidy, and as Almighty God had so willed that this treachery should be the means of the ruin of the empire of Islam, it became evident that "the command of God is an inevitable decree," and the instruments of the predetermined will of fate became available—From Thy wrath preserve us, O God!"

This servant of the victorious government, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, heard from the son of Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn of Khaesär of Ghūr, who heard [the particulars] from Shāh 'Uṣmān of Sistān, who was one among the Princes of Nimroz, and a favourite of Sultan Muhammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and the Shāh [Uṣmān] swore that, for every treasury in which was makes rash guesses and assertions on Turks, "Mongols," etc., says, referring to this person, that he was named Inaljuk and entitled Ghair Khan, "which is probably a corruption either of the Gur Khan or, as the author of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri makes it, of Kadr Khan." In his "Mongols Proper," on the other hand, we are told in one place, that he was named "Inaljek," and, that Sultan "Muhammad ordered that he was no longer to be styled Inaljek but Ghair Khan (a form of Gur Khan); in a second place, that he was called Inallsig; and, in a third, that he was named Inalzik, and "had been granted the title of Gur Khan by the former chief of Kara Khitai!" Now "Ghā-īr Khan" is no more a form of Gur Khan than this Kānṣulf Turk was a "Ghos," or an "original Ghuse." Ghā-īr is a purely 'Arabic word, derived from the same root as ghairat, and signifies the Khan jealous in point of honour or love, the high-minded Khan: it was his Musalman title. The "Tabakat-i-Nasiri" quoted, if my translation is referred to, certainly does not make Ghā-īr Khan a form of Kadr Khan, for Kadr has a totally different meaning, and is in no way connected with Ghā-īr.

1 Kū`ān: Chap. xxiii. verse 38.
2 Shāh 'Uṣmān, grandson of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Uṣmān-i-Harab, ruler of Sijistān and Nimroz, also styled Nūṣrat-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, by our author at pages 193 and 196, which see, also pages 200—201. He was related, on the mother's side, to Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, of Khaesär of Ghūr.
a bit of that gold or silver belonging to the traders of the Chingiz Khan, the whole of such treasury, sovereignty and country fell into the hands of the Chingiz Khan and the Mughal forces.

May Almighty God preserve the kingdom of our Sultan of Sulthan from calamity such as that!

HISTORY OF THE EVENTS WHICH HAPPENED IN ISLAM.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that, when that fugitive [camel-driver] stated to the Chingiz Khan, the accursed, what had befallen his traders and emissaries, the Chingiz Khan issued commands so that the forces of Turkistan, Chin, and Tamghaj, assembled. Six hundred banners were brought out, and under each banner were one thousand horsemen, and six hundred thousand horses were assigned to the Bahadurs: they call a warrior, Bahadur. To every ten horsemen three head of tuk-lis sheep were given, with orders to dry them; and they took, along with them, an iron cauldron, and a skin of water; and the host proceeded on its way.

From the place where the Mughals then were, on the frontier of the Chingiz Khan's territory, to Utrar, was a three months' march, entirely through wild and uncultivated tracts; and it was commanded that it was necessary to perform that march of three months, and subsist upon this

4 In some copies a dang—a bit, &c., and in others a diramak, the diminutive form of diram.

5 The number given at page 273 is 700,000. The Calcutta Printed Text has 800,000, a few modern copies 300,000, but the above number is confirmed by other authors.

6 Surgeon-Major Bellew, in his Kâshghar Mission History [page 141], does not quote the "Tabdai Nasard," as he styles it, correctly. There is nothing in our author's work, as may be here seen, about "horses for the baggage of the army, its carts, and families, &c.," not even in the Calcutta Text, nor does our author make any such statement as that, "just at the time he ['Changiz'] was preparing to set out against Khwârîzma Shah, he received envoys in 615 from the Khâlif [sic] Nasir of Baghdad urging him to do so." The Doctor must have been thinking of some other work.

7 تکلیس—tuk-lis—or تگلیس—tagh-lis—a sheep of six months old—a half-grown sheep. At page 273, our author says Mughal sheep, which is, doubtless, an error on the part of the copyists for tuk-lis.

8 The Calcutta Text is always incorrect with respect to the name of this well-known city, which was situated on the Sîbûn. Its ruins are still to be seen on the east bank.