THE TABAKât-I-NÂSIRÎ:

INTRODUCTORY,

BEING AN EPITOME OF THE FIRST SIX SECTIONS.

The following is a brief summary of the contents of the first six Sections of the work as an Introduction to the Seventh with which my translation begins.

SECTION I. Account of Adam, the Patriarchs and Prophets, the ancestors of Muhammad, and the latter's history to the date of his decease.

SECTION II. The four orthodox Khalifs, the descendants of 'Ali, and the 'Ashârah-i-Mubashîrah, or Ten Companions or Apostles of Muhammad.

SECTION III. and IV. The Khalifs of the house of Ummiyah and 'Abbâs, to the downfall of the latter.

SECTION V. The Maliks [Kings] of 'Ajâm to the rise of Islâm, consisting of five dynasties:—I. The Bâstâniâh or Pesh-Dâdân. II. The Kai-ânîân. III. The Ashkhâniân. IV. The Sâsâniân. V. The Akâsirât.

The author, quoting the Tawârikh-i-'Ajâm from which he says the Shâh-Nâmah of Firdausî was taken, and the statements of the Fire-Worshippers, and other authentic information, states that, when Kâbil slew his brother Hâbil, Adam had another son born to him who was named Shîš, which signifies "given by God." He was inspired, and became ruler over Adam's descendants. The Persians say this [Shîš] was Gâiû-mart, son of Adam; but the Musalmâns say that it is Unnush, son of Shîš, who is here referred to. In Unnush's time a son of Adam named Nabatî, with his children, retired to the mountains of Jarmûn, and devoted themselves to religion, and many others joined them. From the death of Adam to this period, according to Abû-l-Ma'ashar-i-Munajjîm, in the Kânûn-i-Mas'ûdî, was 432 years. After some time elapsed, Nabatî and his descendants came down from the mountains and joined the
descendants of Kābil, who had taken possession of the hills of Shām, and parts around, and who had increased beyond computation. Iblis [the Devil] had taught them the worship of fire; and drunkenness, and all sorts of other grievous sins prevailed among them. A thousand years had elapsed since Adam's death, and the rebellious sons of Kābil and Nabaṭi began to act tyrannically. They chose one of their number to rule over them, who was named Sāmiārūsh; and between them and the other descendants of Adam, who were just persons, hostility and enmity arose.

The sons of Shīṣ, and others of Adam's descendants who acknowledged Shīṣ' authority, assembled, and chose one of the Kārānīān Maliks, who are styled the Bāstānīān Maliks, to defend them from the wickedness of the sons of Kābil and Nabaṭi; and this, the first person among the upright and just kings whom they set up, is styled Ilū-rūs in the Yūnānī language; and the Yūnānīs say, that he is the same as he whom the 'Ajamīs call by the name of Gaiū-mart. He was entitled Gil-Shāh, and was the first king of the Gil-wānīān dynasty, which is also named the Pesh-Dādiān, and Bāstānīān dynasty. When this Ilū-rūs became king, 1024 years had passed from the fall of Adam, and the land of Bābil became the seat of his government, and the just sons of Shīṣ, and other just descendants of Adam obeyed him. When 1162 years had passed away, the countries of 'Arab, 'Ajam, Shām, and Maghrab became settled; and, according to the Kānūn-i-Mas'ūdī, previous to Nūḥ's flood, eleven kings of the Gil-wānīān dynasty had reigned.

FIRST DYNASTY: THE BĀSTĀNĪĀH.

I. GAIŪ-MART, or Gil-Shāh, surnamed Pesh-Dād, or I-rān Shāh. Reigned 30 years. II. HOSHANG, who was born 223 years after Gaiū-mart's death, reigned, according to different accounts, 1400, or 400, or 40 years. III. THA-MŪRAS-I-DĪW-BAND, great grandson of the preceding. Reigned 30 years: some say 1030. IV. JAMSHED, grandson of Hoshang, but Ṭabārī says brother of Thamūras. Reigned 700 years. V. BIWAR-ASP, the infidel, who dethroned Jamshed, and was swallowed up in the Flood. For 1000 years after the death of Nūḥ there was no king
on earth, but, after that, one arose of the seed of Hām, son of Nūḥ, named Żuhāk. VI. Żuhāk, the Tāzi [i.e. 'Arab]. He was a great sorcerer, and reigned 1000 years.

VII. Afrīdūn, entitled Mihr-gān. Ibrāhim, the Patriarch, Ţabarî says, lived in his reign, which was 500 years, but Ibrāhim lived in Žuhāk’s reign, when Nimrūd reigned over Bābil. VIII. I-raj, son of Afrīdūn, reigned 40 years.

IX. Nimrūd, the Tyrant. He was great grandson of Nūḥ, and the first to assume sovereignty after the Flood. He perished after reigning 400 years. A son of his, Kubt, an idol-worshipper, succeeded, and reigned 100 years. After him, a son of his reigned 80 years, when the sovereignty again passed to the former kings of 'Ajam.

X. Manū-chihr, son of I-raj. Reigned 120 years, in the 60th year of which the Patriarch Mūsā appeared. XI. Afrāsīyāb, the Turk, who invaded I-rān and overthrew the dynasty. XII. Zau, son of Ţhamāsib, son of Manū-chihr, who reigned 30 years.

SECOND DYNASTY: THE KAI-ĀNĪAH.

I. Kai-Kībād, sixteenth in descent from Manū-chihr. Reigned 100 or 120 years. II. Kai-Kā-ūs, his son, reigned 150 years. Mihtar Sulīmān lived at this period. III. Kai-Khusrau, grandson of Kai-Kā-ūs. Died aged 150, but the years of his reign are not given. One of his champions was Rustam. IV. Kai-Luhrāsib, the Tyrant. Reigned 120 years and abdicated. The Prophet Ashā’yā [Isaiah] lived at this time, and Bukht-un-Nāsšar was leader of the forces of Sanjāri, Malik of Bābil. V. Gushṭāsib, son of Luhrāsib. Zartushṭ arose in this reign, Rustam died, Bukht-un-Nāsšar became Malik of Bābil, and Jerusalem was sacked. Reigned 120 years. VI. Bahman, son of Isandiyār, son of Gushṭāsib, surnamed Arda-Sher-I-Dīrāz-Dast [Artaxerxes Longimanus of the Greeks]. The Bani-Isrā’īl carried into captivity. Bahman marries an Isrā‘īlī woman, who bore him a son. The Bani-Isrā’īl set free. Reign 22 years. VII. Hūmā-I [also Humāc], daughter of Bahman. Married by her father and bore him Dārā. She abdicated after reigning 30 years. VIII. Dārā [or Dārāb]-I-Akbar [Great or Elder]. He made captive the king of Rūm, and imposed tribute of 100,000 eggs of
gold, each as large as an ostrich egg. Failakūs, Iskandar's father, was king of Yūnān. Dārā reigned 12 years. IX. DĀRĀ-I-ĀṢGHAH [Less or Younger]. Iskandar, son of Failakūs, brought all Rūm under subjection. Invaded and subdued I-rān. Length of reign not given. X. ISKANDAR, son of Failakūs, who is said to have been the son of Dārā's sister married to Failakūs. Iskandar died in I-rān after 12 years' reign.

THIRD DYNASTY: THE ASHKĀNIĀN.

I. ASHK [Ushk = Hūshkā?], styled ARFA'WĀ, ninth in descent from Dārā-i-Akbar. Ashk reigned 10 years. II. ASHKĀN, his son, reigned 10 years. III. SHĀPŪR, his son, who totally destroyed Jerusalem. In his reign Mihtar 'Isā [Jesus Christ] was born. Shāpūr reigned 60 years. IV. GUDARZ-I-AKBAR, son of Shāpūr. Reigned 10 years. V. GUDARZ-I-ĀṢGHAH, his son, reigned 21 years. VI. NARSI-UL-ASHGHANĪ, who reigned 40 years. VII. KISRA-UL-ASHGHANĪ, son of Narsi. He is styled also, ARDAWĀN-I-AKBAR, and reigned 44 years. VIII. BALĀS-UL-ASHGHANĪ, who reigned 24 years. IX. ARDAWĀN-I-ĀṢGHAH, who reigned 13 years.

FOURTH DYNASTY: THE SĀSĀNIĀN.

I. ARDA-SHER-UL-JĀMI' or BĀBĀKĀN, son of Bābak, son of Sāsān, descended from Kai-Luhrāsib. He rose to power 266 years after Iskandar, some say 270, but the Christians, 550 years after. He reigned 14 [40?] years and 6 months. II. SHĀPŪR, his son, reigned 30 years. III. HURMUZ [HURMĀZ or AORMAZD], who reigned 1 year and 10 months. IV. BAHRĀM, his son, reigned 3 years. V. BAHRĀM, son of Bahram, who assumed the title of Shāh-an-Shāh [King of Kings]. He reigned 4 months: Tabari says, 4 years. VI. NARSI, son of the elder Bahram, succeeded his brother, and reigned 9 years. VII. HURMUZ, son of Narsi, who reigned 7 years and 5 months. He left one of his wives pregnant, who, after six months, gave birth to Shāpūr. VIII. SHĀPŪR-I-ZU-L-AKTĀF, so called because, when at war with the 'Arabs, he had the shoulder-blades of all those who fell into his hands removed. He defeated and took prisoner the Kāiser of Rūm. Shāpūr
reigned 72 years. IX. ARDA-SHER, son of Hurmuz, Shāpūr's brother, a great tyrant; and after 4 years he was dethroned. X. Shāpūr, son of Shāpūr-i-Zūl-Aktāf, who was put to death by his troops after reigning 5 years and 2 months. XI. Bahrām, son of Shāpūr, styled Kirmān-Shāh before his accession. He was slain by his troops after reigning 11 years, but Tabari says 15 years. XII. Yazdaajird-ul-Aṣim [Evil-doer], also styled Kaw-khash [moroose]. Killed, after reigning 21 years, by the kick of a mysterious horse, which suddenly appeared, and as quickly vanished again. XIII. Bahrām, his son, styled Bahrām-i-Gor, so called from having, when hunting, discharged an arrow at a lion which was about to tear a wild ass, and pierced both through. He reigned 60 years. XIV. Yazdaajird, his son, who reigned 18 years, 4 months, and 18 days. XV. Fīrūz, son of Yazdaajird, who reigned 27 years. XVI. Balāsh, son of Fīrūz, reigned 4 years. XVII. Kubād, his son, was dethroned by his brother, Jamāsib, but recovered the sovereignty again. Reigned 42 years.

FIFTH DYNASTY : THE AKĀSIRAH.

I. Nūshīrwān, son of Kubād; famous for his justice and equity. Reigned 47 years, in the 40th year of which the Prophet, Muhammad, was born. II. Hurmuz, his son, reigned 11 years and 7 months, and was deposed. III. Khusrau Parwīz, son of Hurmuz, was one of the most magnificent monarchs of I-rān, and reigned 38 years, when he was put to death by his son. In the 20th year of his reign, Muhammad began to propagate his religion, and, in the 30th, fled from Makkah to Madīnah, which year is called the Hijrah or Flight. IV. Sherwaijah, son of Khusrau Parwiz, who died of poison 6 months after putting his father to death. V. Arda-Sher, his son, a mere child, succeeded, who was put to death by his Wazir, Shahr-ārāē, after he had been 1 year and 6 months on the throne. VI. Shahr-ārāē [or Shahr-yār] usurped the throne, but was assassinated after 1 month. VII. Turān-Dukht, daughter of Khusrau Parwiz, was raised to the throne. She sent back to Rūm the Cross, which her father had
carried away. She died after reigning 1 year and 6 months. VIII. ĀRZŪMĀN-DUKHT, another daughter of Khusrau Parwiz, succeeded, but was cruelly murdered after reigning 6 months. IX. KISRĀ, son of MIHR-JAISH, a descendant of Arda-Sher, Bābakān, was then set up, but was soon after dethroned and put to death. X. JUNAID, a descendant of NUSHIRWĀN'S, was then raised to the throne, but immediately after dethroned. XI. FARRUKHZĀD, son of Khusrau Parwiz, who was deposed and put to death after 6 months' reign. XII. YAZDAJIRD-I-SHAHR-YĀR, son of Khusrau Parwiz, who, after a nominal reign of 20 years, was assassinated by a peasant of Marw, in the 21st year of the Hijrah [A.D. 642]. In his reign the Musalmāns overthrew the I-rānī empire, and with Yazdajird the dynasty terminated.

SECTION VI.

THE TUBBĀ-YAWA', AND MALIKS OF YAMAN.

The author states that he copies the account of the kings contained in this Section from the Tāriḵh-i-Muḵaddasī, and from Ẓabari.

After Ḵaḥṭān, son of 'Ābir, son of Shāliḵh, son of Arfakhsad, son of Sām, son of Nūh, came into Yaman, Y'rāb, his son, became king; and he was the first who used the 'Arabic language. Fifteen kings are said to have reigned for a great number of years, up to the time of Ḥāris-ur-Rāyish, who is the first of the Tubbā-yawa' dynasty.

I. ḤĀRIS-UR-RĀYISH. He was contemporary with Manū-čhihr, sovereign of 'Ajam, and was subject to him. He reigned 120 years.

II. ABRAHĀH-I-ZŪ-L-MANĀR, son of Ḥāris. He was subject to Manū-čhihr, and reigned 180 years.

III. AFRIḴIS, son of Abrahāh. He also was subject to Manū-čhihr, and reigned 164 years.

IV. MUNDAZ, styled ZŪ-L-ADGHĀR, son of Abrahāh. He was subject to Manū-čhihr, and reigned 25 years.

V. HAILĀD, son of Sarākхиl, grandson of Ḥāris. He was cousin of Mundaz, and son of Balkis [Queen of Sabā], but
by some he is said to have espoused the daughter of the
king of the Jinn, and that Balkis was their daughter.

VI. BALKIS, daughter of Hailad, became sovereign of
Yaman and Maghrab. She reigned 40 years.

VII. UN-NASIR-UN-NA'AM, son of 'Umaro, son of Sara-
khil. He reigned 75 years.

VIII. SHAMAR, son of Afrikis, son of Abrahah, styled
Ra'ash—the Palsied. He was a great king, contemporary
with Gushasib and Bahman. He reigned 137 years.

IX. AKRAN, son of Shammar. He reigned 53 years.

X. TUBBA', son of Akrân, or Tubba'-i-Akbar. He
reigned 160 years.

XI. MALKIRAB, son of Tubba'. He reigned 35 years.

XII. TUBBA'-UL-AUSÂT [the Medium]. He was put to
death by his soldiery after reigning 160 years.

XIII. HASSAN, son of Tubba,' surnamed ZU-Hassan.
He was put to death by his brother 'Umaro after a reign of
5 years.

XIV. 'UMARO, son of Tubba'. He reigned 23 years.

XV. 'ABD-UL-KULAL, son of Marshad. In his reign 'ISA
[Jesus Christ] lived, and 'Abd-ul-Kulal believed in him.
He reigned 74 years.

XVI. TUBBA'-UL-ASGHAR [the Younger], son of Hassan.
He made great slaughter among the Bani-Isra'il of Ma-
dinah on account of their crimes, and slew fifty of their
Mihtars. He reigned 78 years.

XVII. MARSHAD, son of 'Abd-ul-Kulal. He reigned 41
years; and, after him, the dominions of Himyar and the
Tubba-yawa' became restricted to Yaman.

XVIII. WALTA'AB, son of Marshad. He reigned 37
years.

XIX. HASSAN, son of Hassan. He reigned justly for
70 years.

XX. ZU-SHANATAR. He did not belong to the family
of the Tubba-yawa'. How long he reigned is unknown.

XXI. ZU-L-NAWASH,1 son of Hassan, son of Hassan.
Tabari calls him Zar'ab. With him the Tubba-yawa'
dynasty ended, which from the time of Haris up to this
period lasted 1360 years.

XXII. ABRAAHUL-ASHRAM [The Scarred in the Lip],

1 Tabari calls him ZU-l-Nawas. He was a Jew.
Şahib-ul-Fil, son of Hasan-uş-Sabbâh. He endeavoured to destroy the ka'bah of Makkah, but perished with his whole army. The period of his reign and the reigns of his two sons, Yagṣūm [Bagsūm] and Masrūk, when this Ḥabashah dynasty terminated, was 73 years, and in the last year the Prophet, Muḥammad, was born.

XXIII. Yagṣūm, son of Abrahah, who reigned 4 years.

XXIV. Masrūk, son of Abrahah. He was deposed by Saif, the son of his mother by an 'Arab husband, aided by some criminals set at liberty for the purpose by command of Nūshīrwān, to whom Saif had complained.

XXV. Saif, son of Zi-Yazan. He reigned a considerable time, and was subsequently slain by a Ḥabashi left behind, who had entered his service.

XXVI. Hariz [or Dahriz], the 'Ajami, who had accompanied Saif, son of Zi-Yazan, from 'Ajam, by command of Nūshīrwān, became ruler. He reigned 4 years.

XXVII. The Marzabān, son of Hariz [or Dahriz], the 'Ajami. He succeeded his father by Nūshīrwān's command, and reigned over Yaman a long time. At his death his son, Sajān [Abū-Shajān ?], succeeded, and, at his death, Khur-Khusrau became king of Yaman. The reign of Nūshīrwān had terminated, and Hurmuz had succeeded; and Khur-Khusrau, having rebelled, was removed.

XXVIII. Bāzan, the Muslim Malik. He became king and ruled over Yaman up to the rise of Muḥammad, the Prophet. He embraced the new faith, and Yaman passed under the rule of the Musalmāns.
SECTION VII.
THE DYNASTY OF THE TĀHIRĪ MUḤAMMADAN MALIKS IN 'AJAM.

MINHĀJ-I-SARĀJ, JŪRJĀNI, the humblest of the servants of the Almighty's Court, gives, in the following pages, an account of the Tāhirī Maliks [kings], whose descent, in some histories, is traced to Manūchihr Al-Malik, sovereign of 'Ajam; and, according to which, the first of them who rose to power, was Tāhir ¹, son of Al-Ḥusain, son of Muṣʿab, son of Zarnik, son of Asʿad, son of Bādān, son of Māe Khūṣrāu, son of Bahrum. Māe Khūṣrāu was the first who embraced the faith of Islām, having been converted by 'Alī—May God reward him!—and received the name of Asʿad. This Bahrum was son of Razān Mūrit, son of Rustam, son of As-Saddīd, son of Dostān, son of Barsān, son of Jūrak, son of Gūshṭ-āsp, son of Ashrāf, son of Isham, son of Tūrak, son of Anšār, son of Shaid-āsp, son of Aẓar-sab, son of Tūḥ, son of Rū-shed, son of Manūchihr Al-Malik.

The Tāhirī Maliks were remarkable for their virtues and equity; and they first rose to power in Khurāsān, in the time of the Amir-ul-Mūminin [Commander of the Faithful], Māmūn, and in the following manner. Between the Khalifah, Muḥammad Amin, who was at

¹ The Tārif-i-Yāfā'[, which is a rare and most valuable work, and highly esteemed by the early chroniclers, gives a different account. According to it the following is the genealogy of the family:—"Abū-Ṭaiyib-i-Tāhir, called Zūl-Yamānain, son of Ḥusain, son of Rūzaiḳ [giving the vowel points], son of Māhān-i-Khāzā'[, son of Asʿad, son of Rādwīl; and, according to another tradition, Asʿad, son of Rādān; and, according to another, Muṣʿab, son of Tāḥāṣ. Tāhir's ancestor, Rūzaiḳ, was a servant of Tāḥāṣ-i-Talḥāṭ, who was renowned for his generosity and beneficence."
Baghdad, and his brother Mâmun, who was in Khurásan, ill-feeling arose. Upon this, Amin despatched 'Alî 'Isâ-i-Mâhān from Baghdad into Khurásan to reduce Mâmun to obedience; and, in one of the months of the year 195 of the Hijrah, he reached Hamadân with a warlike army. Mâmun appointed Harşamah; son of A'yan, to the command of a force to oppose 'Alî 'Isâ; and Tâhir, son of Hûsain, was nominated to command the van of Harşamah's army.

By the advice of Faţl, son of Sahî, who was Mâmun's Wazir, Mâmun bestowed a standard upon Tâhir, saying unto him at the same time, that he had bent, for him a standard which for thirty years should lead to victory; and so it turned out, for the sway of the Tâhirs lasted for upwards of thirty odd years. Within two leagues of Rai, with 14 or 15,000 horse, he encountered 'Alî, son of 'Isâ, son of Mâhân, who had brought 50,000 horse with him, defeated, and slew him, and sent his head to Mâmun. He then subdued the whole of the mountain tracts of 'Irâk, and took Wâsiţ and Ahwâz, and appeared before the gates of Baghdad.

After carrying on hostilities for the space of a year, Tâhir captured Muḥammad Amin, put him to death, and despatched his head to Mâmun, his brother,

---

3 His right name is Abû Yaḥyâ-i-'Alî, son of 'Isâ, son of Mâhân. His two sons were also sent to serve under him; and his army amounted to 50,000 men.
4 Ṣabûr states Tâhir was alone appointed, but, subsequently, when he asked for reinforcements, on marching from the Ḥulwân Pass to Baghdad, then Harşamah was sent with another army.
5 Other chroniclers of undoubted authority state that 'Alî, son of Abî Khâlid, was the minister in question.
6 Most writers give a greater number of years than this. Their dynasty is said to have continued nearly fifty-four years. One of the poets has brought together the names of the Tâhirîân rulers in these two couplets:

"In Khurāsân, of the race of Muṣlîb Shâh,
Were Tâhir, and Ṣulṭâh, and 'Abd-ullah:
Then a second Tâhir, and a Muḥammad, who,
Gave up unto Ya'kîb, the throne and crown."

7 Ṣabûr says 20,000 men.
8 'Alî, son of 'Isâ, was slain, it is said, by Dâ'ûd-i-Siyâh, or the Black. Most writers state that Tâhir himself slew him.
9 The author of the Mujmal-i-Fâjih-i states, that a slave of Tâhir's, Firdas by name, slew Muḥammad Amin on the 5th of Muḥarram, 198 H. The author of the Târitk-î-Yâsâf states gives the 6th of Şafar as the date.
THE TAHIRI DYNASTY

together with his mantle, his rod of office, and his seal, by the
hand of his uncle's son, Muḥammad, son of Al-Ḥasan, son
of Muṣ'ab. This event happened, and this victory was gained,
on the 25th of the month Muḥarram, in the year 198 Ḥ.

I. TAHIR-I-ZÜ-L-YAMANAIN. 9

Ibn Haiṣam, the chronicler, and author of the work entitled
"Ḳaṣṣaṣ-i-Sānī," whose patronymic appellation was Abū-l-
Ḥasan, and his name Haiṣam, son of Muḥammad, Al-Bāṣṭī
[Nābi ?] states, that, when the Commander of the Faithful,
Māmūn, removed Ghassān, 1 son of 'Ubbād, from the
government of Khurāṣān, he conferred it, together with
the government of 'Ajam, upon Amir Tāhir; and that
As'ad, the grandfather 2 of Tāhir, before his conversion to
the Muḥammadan religion, bore the name of Farrūḵh.
He was converted to the faith by Ṭalḥah 3, who gave him
the name of As'ad; and he had a son whom he named
Muṣ'ab; and he, Muṣ'ab, became resident at Fūshanj. 4

When the claims of the family of 'Abbās to the Khilāfāt
were put forward, this same Muṣ'ab became one of the
principal men and partisan leaders of that dynasty.
Muṣ'ab had a son, Ḥusain by name, which Ḥusain, for a
considerable time, administered the affairs of Fūshanj,
and was its Wāli [governor] 5; and Tāhir [Zū-l-Yamanain]
was his son; and these successes, which have been men-
tioned, were gained by this same Tāhir.

When Māmūn came to Baghdād, to assume the Khilāfāt,

9 Of the two right hands. Tāhir had also lost an eye, which our author
does not seem to have known. The reasons why he obtained the name of
Zū-l-Yamanain are differently related. One is, that, when engaged in battle
against 'Alī, son of 'Īsā, he struck another antagonist with his left hand, with
the other sword he carried, with such force as to cleave him in twain. The
other, that, when about to give his hand in token of allegiance to the Imām
Riṣā, at Māmūn's command, he gave the left. Riṣā asked the reason. Tāhir
replied, "I swore fealty to Māmūn with my right hand." Riṣā replied,
"Your left will do just the same."
1 Only one copy of the different MSS. collated contains this name correctly.
2 Ṭālḥah, son of 'Abd-ullāh, one of the Prophet's companions.
3 According to the genealogical tree previously
given, Tāhir was third in descent from As'ad.
4 According to the Tārīḵ-i-Yaḡāt, above quoted, the grandfather of Tāhir
held the government of Fūshanj and Hirāt. Fūshanj or Būshanj (it is written
both ways) "is the name of a city of Khurāṣān near Hirāt."
5 As considerable difference exists in some of these terms, I have thought it
best to add, occasionally, the signification which the author means to convey.
he despatched Tahir to Rakk'ah, to carry on hostilities against Nasr-i-Shis. Subsequently to this he came into Khurasan; and, in 207 H., he died, having nominated his son Talhah, son of Tahir, his Khalifah or successor.

The chronicler relates, that on the Friday he read the Khuṭbah, and either forgot to mention the name of Māmūn, or omitted it purposely. After he had returned to his residence at night, and had retired to rest, at day-break of Saturday morning he was found in his bed asleep in death; and it was never known how, or from what, his death originated.

II. TALHAH, SON OF TÁHIR-I-ZÚ-L-YAMANAIN.

When the Khalifah, Māmūn, became aware of the death of Tahir, he sent letters patent to Talhah, confirming him in the government of Khurāsān, together with a robe of honour. He held the government until 213 H.; and, when the end of his life drew near, he bequeathed the government of Khurāsān to Muḥammad, son of Al-Ḥasan, son of Muṣ'ab, At-Tāhīrī, who was Talhah's paternal uncle, and soon after died.

During his [Talhah's] lifetime, the Khārijī or heretic, Ḥamzah, broke out into rebellion in Sijistān, and Talhah

6 In two MSS. written Rakah, which is not correct. Tahir's father, Ḥusain, son of Muṣ'ab, son of Kuzaīk, died at Hirāt of Khurāsān in 199 H. At this time Tahir was at Rakk'ah, and the Khalifah, Māmūn, was present at his funeral, and prayed over him, and the Wazir Fāżl, son of Sahl, placed the body in the grave.

7 Abu Nasr-i-Shis, son of Rabī'ī (ṣ.ṣ.) the Khārijī, or Schismatic.

8 He died at Marw, according to Yaṣa'ī, 23rd of Jamāl-ul-Ākhir, 207 H., or, according to the computation of the Musalmāns, the night being reckoned before the day, on the night of the 24th.

9 As the word Khuṭbah will occur frequently in these pages, it will be well to explain, that it is an oration delivered after the service on the Muḥammadan Sabbath, in which the deliverer of it—the ruler or governor of the province properly—blesses Muḥammad, his successors, and the reigning Khalifah or the Sovereign. In ancient times, the Khalifah, or his heir apparent, pronounced it, at the capital, in the principal Mosque.

1 He is said to have been poisoned. The account is to be found in detail in several histories.

2 His death took place in the month of Jamāl-ul-Awwal.

3 The Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-I states, that, in 210 H., the Khalifah, Māmūn, despatched 'Abd-ullah, son of Tahir, to the assistance of his brother Talhah, that, in concert, they might proceed into Māwar-un-Nahr to carry on hostilities against Rāfī', son of Ḥāsham.

4 He died at the end of 212 H. 8 Also called Nīm-roz.
carried on hostilities against him for a considerable period; and what he did in Khurāsān, during the Khilāfat of Māmūn, was the cause of his name being remembered with gratitude in that country, where numerous proofs of his goodness remained.

III. 'abd-ullāh, son of tāhir.

On the decease of Tālḥah, the Commander of the Faithful, Māmūn, summoned to his presence Abd-ullāh, the son of Tāhir, who had become Amir [governor] of Miṣr. 'abd-ullāh had been brought up at the Court of the Khilāfat, and under the patronage, and under the eye, of the Khalifah himself, and had become greatly accomplished. In his seventeenth year, Māmūn had entrusted him with the command of his forces; and he had so conducted himself, that, in his twenty-seventh year, 'abd-ullāh had become renowned among men for his manliness, his vigour, his intrepidity, and his virtues and talents. At this period the Khalifah appointed him to the government of Khurāsān, and directed that 'Ali, son of Tāhir, brother of 'abd-ullāh, should act as his brother's Khalifah, or Lieutenant, in the command of the troops of the Dār-ul-Khilāfat [the capital], in repressing the seditious and rebellious, and in the extermination of heretic Khārijīs, and, likewise, in carrying out the affairs of state, and all such other duties as appertained unto 'abd-ullāh to perform and attend to.

At the time the Khalifah's mandate to proceed into Khurāsān and assume the government reached him, 'abd-ullāh was at Dinawr engaged in suppressing Bābak-i-Khurramī. When he reached Nishāpur, rain, which had not fallen for a considerable time, began to descend and

* Any large city: Egypt, and its capital.
* Some copies of the original mention "his twentieth year," but I prefer the other reading.

* Other writers state, that 'Alī succeeded his father in the government of Khurāsān, and that he was killed in battle fighting against the Khārijīs, in the vicinity of Nishāpur; and, that 'abd-ullāh was at Ablward when he received the intelligence of his brother's death.

* Tabarī makes no mention of 'abd-ullāh, son of Tāhir, as having been employed against Bābak, but says that Is-hāk, son of Ibrāhīm, son of Muṣṭab—who would be thus cousin of 'abd-ullāh's father—was. That author states, that 'abd-ullāh seized Bābak's brother in Khurāsān, and, that he sent that heretic to Is-hāk, at Baghdaḍ, to be dealt with as Bābak had already been.
to refresh the parched ground on the very same day, and the people took it as a good omen. He founded palaces for himself, and his followers and dependents, at Shād-yākḥ of Nishāpūr. He suppressed the Khārijīs, and punished them with severity; and ruled with the utmost equity and justice, and introduced many good and wise regulations.

He was also a great patron of learning, and to such a degree, that he requested the Imām 'Abd-ul-Ḵāsim, son of Sallām, to write a commentary for him on the work entitled “Gharīb-ul-Ḫadīṣ,” and, in recompense for so doing, sent him a present of 100,000 silver dirams, and a valuable dress of honour.

The Lord of the Faithful, Al-Māmūn, had entrusted 'Abd-ullāh with the government of the whole of the territory of 'Ajam; and, when that Khalīfah died, his successor, Al-Mutasim B'llah, confirmed him, as his father had done before, in the government of the whole of the territory of 'Ajam, which 'Abd-ullāh retained until the year 230 H., in the reign of Al-Wāṣīk B'llah, when he died. He had exercised sovereignty over the territories of 'Ajam for a period of seventeen years; and, when he died, he had attained the age of forty-eight, the same age as his father. When his death drew near, he nominated his son Tāhir as his successor over Khurāsān.

IV. TĀHIR, SON OF 'ABD-ULLAH.

When the account of the decease of 'Abd-ullāh reached the Khalīfah, Al-Wāṣīk, he despatched, from the Dār-ul-Khilāfat of Baghdād, letters patent and a standard, confirming him as his father’s successor. His brothers solicited from Tāhir the grant of the pro-

---

1 In the Persian translation of the Arabic work entitled Aṣār-ul-Bilād, by Muhammad Murād, son of 'Abd-ur-Rahmān, Shād-yākḥ is described as “a city of Khurāsān near unto Nishāpūr;” but it appears to have been a fortified suburb, where the royal palace, arsenal, and gardens were situated. The Ḥabīb-us-Siyar states that the capital of the Tāhīrīs was called Kar-shākḥ!
2 Some copies have Abū-l-Ḵāsim. 3 'Ajam—countries not Arabian : Persia.
4 'Abd-ullāh, son of Tāhir, had a son called 'Abd-ullāh, who was born 223 H.; and another son, Muhammad, who was his father’s deputy at Baghdād, died in 226 H.
5 In all the copies of the original the word brothers is used, but only one brother is mentioned afterwards.
vince of Khorassan, and its government; and he bestowed on his brother, Amir Mus'ab, the government of Nishapur. The Khalifah, Al-Wasik, died in the month Zul-Hijjah, 232 H., and Al-Mutawakkil assumed the Khilafah.

He confirmed Tahir in the government of 'Ajam. After a period of fourteen years and nine months, at which time the Khalifah, Al-Mutawakkil, was martyred by the Turks, he was succeeded by Al-Mustansir.

Six months subsequently to that event, in the year 248 H., Al-Musta'in succeeded him. He sent letters patent and a standard, and confirmed Tahir, son of 'Abdullah, in his government, as before; and, in that same year, Amir Tahir died, having previously nominated his son Muhammed as his successor over Khorassan.

V. MUHAMMAD, SON OF TAHIR.

Amir Muhammed-i-Tahir was endowed with good breeding, the gift of poetry, and many other accomplishments; but was greatly addicted to pleasure and amusement.

He had entrusted the government of Tabaristan to his uncle Suliman, son of 'Abd-ullah-i-Tahir; but, in 251 H., Amir Hasan, son of Zaid-ul-'Alawi, broke out into rebellion in that country. He was a Sayyid, and a well-bred and learned person, and a poet. He subdued the territories of Dilm, and Gilan, which were in the possession of infidels; and the people of those parts were converted to the Muhammedan faith by him. From thence he entered Tabaristan with a large army; and Suliman, son of 'Abd-ullah-i-Tahir, uncle of Amir Muhammed, was defeated by him, and retreated.

6 In 231 H., Hasan, son of Al-Husain, brother of Tahir-i-Zu'l-Yumanain, died in Tabaristan; and, in 235 H., Is'hak, son of Ibrahim, son of Zu'l-Yamanain's brother, Hasan, died at Baghda. He had held the sheikh, or district of Baghda, under three Khalifahs.

7 Middle of the month of Shawwal, 247 H.

8 According to our author, in his account of the Khalifahs, on the 4th of Rab-ul-Awwal, 248 H.

9 Succession to the government of Khorassan seems to have been considered hereditary, but to that of 'Ajam, at the pleasure of the Khalifah.

1 His name is given differently by Hamd-ullah-i-Mustaufl in his history. He styles him Muhammed, son of Ahmad, son of Tahir, son of 'Abd-ullah, son of Tahir-i-Zu'l-Yamanain. In the Mujmal-i-Fa'iz-i he is called Muhammad, son of Tahir-i-Zu'l-Yamanain.
to Rai⁵, and subsequently retired to Baghdād. On his arrival at the latter place, he was made Khá’íd [governor] of the district of Baghdād.

At this period, Ya’kūb, son of Laiṣ, had risen in rebellion in Sīstān, and had subdued some portion of Jarūm⁶, and of Zawulīstān, and had acquired considerable power in Khurāsān. In 259 H., Ya’kūb determined to attack Amīr Muḥammad. The reason of this was, that his enemies, Aḥmad and Fāzl, the brothers of ’Abd-ullāh-i-Ṣāliḥ, Sijīzī, had fled from the territory of Nīm-ruz, and had sought the protection of Muḥammad, son of Tāhir. Ya’kūb continued repeatedly to demand them at the hands of Amīr Muḥammad, but he had always refused to give them up. On this Ya’kūb determined to march against Nīshāpūr⁴; and, when he had arrived within a short distance of it, Aḥmad and Fāzl came to the entrance of the palace, where Amīr Muḥammad was at the time, to acquaint him with the news of Ya’kūb’s approach. The Ḥājīb [chamberlain] of the Amīr told them that his master was asleep, and that he had no leisure to receive them. They observed to each other that it was necessary that some one should awaken the Amīr; and, thus saying, they retired and went to their brother ’Abd-ullāh-i-Ṣāliḥ, Sijīzī, and told him what had occurred. He was well aware that Amīr Muḥammad was entirely sunk in carelessness, and that his dynasty was near its fall; so he retired to Rai, and sent his brothers, Aḥmad and Fāzl, to the Wālī [governor] of Rai, but went himself into Ṭabaristān to Amīr Ḥasan, son of Zaid-ul-‘Alawī.

When Ya’kūb, son of Laiṣ, reached a place called Farhādgurd⁶, a short distance from Nīshāpūr, Amīr Muḥammad despatched an agent to Ya’kūb, named Ībrāhīm-i-Ṣāliḥ,

---

⁵ Re is not the correct pronunciation for the name of this city, but Rai.

⁶ It is written thus in the original Persian—‌ٰ.

⁷ Jarūm is described as being the district of Garmsīr, which latter word is written in various ways by those who fancy that Oriental proper names, as well as other words, may be written according to their fancy, such as Garmsīh, Garmsīr, and the like.

⁸ The capital of Khurāsān. As stated, previously, the Tāhirī rulers held their court at Shād-yāk, a short distance from that city.

⁹ The name of this place is not quite certain: it is written امنیا کر کرباکورد and even امنیا کر in the different copies of the MSS. collated. The above name is the most probable one.
Marwazi [or native of Marw], with a message demanding whither he was going without the command of the Lord of the Faithful, and that, in case he had a commission, he should show it, in order that he, Muḥammad, might obey it, and observe its provisions. When the agent reached Yaʿḳūb's presence, and delivered his message, Yaʿḳūb put his hand under his prayer-carpet and drew forth his sword, and, placing it before the envoy, said: “This is my pass and authority.”

When the envoy, Ibrāhīm-i-Ṣalīḥ, returned with this reply, all the people of Nīshāpūr entered into communication with Yaʿḳūb; and they delivered Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir into his hands, and the dynasty of the Ṭāhiris came to an end. This event happened on Sunday, the 3rd of the month of Shawwāl, 259 H. Respecting the generosity and munificence of Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir, one of the learned, whose statement may be depended on, relates the following

**ANECTODE.**

There was a person dwelling at Nīshāpūr, one of the most excellent men of his day, named Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḳ. He possessed a female slave, who played exceedingly well upon the *barbat*—a kind of lute—and of such grace and beauty as cannot be described.

The fame of the loveliness of this slave-girl, and of her amiability and accomplishments, having reached the ear of Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir, to the effect that she improvised *ghazals*, or odes, sang them, and accompanied them on the *barbat*, the heart of Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir desired, beyond measure, to obtain possession of her. He had repeatedly asked Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḳ to part with her, and had offered to give a very high price for her; but all his offers were rejected, and he could not obtain possession of her, for her master himself was deeply enamoured of his beautiful slave, Rāṭībah, as she was named.

After some time had elapsed, however, and Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḳ had expended all his property and possessions in pleasure and expense on her account, and nothing remained to him, he despatched a person with a message to the

---

6 These events are fully detailed in the Jāmiʿ-ut-Tawārīkh, and several other histories. See note 5, page 22.
7 Warrāḳ means a writer, a cutter and folder of paper, also a monied man.
presence of Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir soliciting that the Amir would honour him with a visit, in order that he might dispose of his beautiful slave to him.

When Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir received this message he was delighted beyond measure, and directed that four *badrahs*⁸ of silver should be brought and handed over to the domestic who brought the message, while the Amir arose, and proceeded, by way of his own private residence to that of Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḵ. When the Amir had sat down, and the silver was placed before the eyes of Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḵ, he, seeing the state of affairs, went out, and directed Rāṭibah, saying: “Don your best apparel, Rāṭibah, and prepare to present yourself before the Amir, as I am going to sell you to him.” When the slave-girl heard these words she burst into a flood of tears, and, such was the paroxysm of her grief, that the sounds reached the ears of the Amir, who was in another apartment. He heard Maḥmūd say to her: “Wherefore all this grief and lamentation, O Rāṭibah?” to which she replied: “O my master! is this the end of our connexion, that at last you separate me from you?” Maḥmūd replied: “All this I do out of love and affection for you, now that I possess nothing, and am a beggar; and, that you may continue to live in ease and affluence for the rest of your life, I send you to the *haram* of the Amir.” Rāṭibah replied: “If you merely act thus on my account, refrain from doing so, for I undertake to work for the rest of my days, and, by industry befitting a woman, by weaving coifs and mantles, earn sufficient means for your subsistence and my own, but do not separate me from you.” Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḵ rejoined: “If such be the case, O Rāṭibah, I now pronounce you free, and fix your dowry at nineteen dinārs and a half, and make you my wife.”

Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir, hearing this loving and affectionate dialogue between Maḥmūd-i-Warrāḵ and his slave, arose, and, gathering his garments about him, said to Maḥmūd: “The whole of the four *badrahs* of silver are thine; I make thee a present of it: pass the rest of thy life in ease and affluence!” Thus saying, he went his way; and the fame of his generosity still remains.

---

⁸ A weight equal to 10,000 *dirams*, also a bag made of leather or lamb’s skin.
SECTION VIII.

THE ŞUFFÂRÎÜN DYNASTY.

The author, Minhâj-i-Sarâj Jûrjâni, makes a short extract from the Tâ'rikh or chronicle of Ibn Haişam-i-Ṣâni, respecting the dynasty of the Şuffârîüm. That chronicler and annalist relates, that Ya'kûb-i-Laiş, and 'Umro, 'Alî, and Mu'addil-i-Laiş, were four brothers, sons of Laiş, the Şuffâr or worker in brass, who was head of the braziers of Sijistân¹. [At this time] Ibrâhîm, son of Al-Ḥusain², was the Wâli [governor] of Sijistân on the part of Muḥammad, son of Tâhir, the last of the Tâhirîs, who was the Amir of Khurâsân. This Ibrâhîm had appointed a deputy or lieutenant of his own to govern in Sijistân in his name, who was called Şâlih, son of Un-Naṣr. This Laiş the brazier was a restless and refractory fellow, and had a great number of assistants, servants, and followers.

¹ Other historians greatly differ here, as to the origin and rise of the Şuffârîüm. One says that Laiş, the brazier, was in the service of Şâlih, son of Naṣr, Kanâni; and another, quoting the History of Khurâsân of Moulânâ Muʿīn-ud-Dîn, Sabawârî, states, that the latter author had traced the descent of this family to Nûshîrân, the Just, the celebrated ruler of Īrân. Again, another author states, that Ya'kûb, son of Laiş, after the death of Darhim [sic], son of Un-Naṣr, revolted against his sons Şâlih and Naṣr, in 237 H., and managed to gain possession of some portion of the territory of Sijistân. His affairs prospered, and, the principal men among the partisans of Darhim’s family having combined with him from time to time, in 253 H., he acquired the whole of Sijistân. Darhim’s sons fled to the king of Kâbul.

² In three copies of the MSS. compared, and also in the Tâ'rikh-i-Fânâkatî, this name is written “Haşîn,”  which signifies a fortification. A few words, respecting the Tâ'rikh-i-Fânâkatî, may not be amiss here. Abû Sulîmâni-Dâ’ud, the author of that work, surnamed Fârîkh-ud-Dîn, was a native of Fânâkatî—also written Banâkatî, according to the rule by which 'Arabs change Persian  into  in Mâwar-un-Nâhr; hence he is known as Al-Fânâkatî, and Al-Banâkatî, and his work as the Tâ'rikh-i-Fânâkatî or Banâkatî; but not by the absurd name that some persons have bestowed upon it, apparently through ignorance of the existence of this place, such as “Binâ-Getî,” and “Bina-i-Geti.” They probably supposed the meaning to be a “History of the Foundation of the World,” which Binâ-i-Getî would signify.
THE TABAKAT-I-NASIRI.

I. YA'KUB, SON OF LAIS, SUFFARI.

The author of these pages, in the year 613 H., arrived in Sijistān, during the rule of the Malik of Nīmroz, Shāh-i-Ghāzi, Yamin-ud-din, Bahrām Shāh, son of Malik-i-Kabīr, Tāj-ud-din, Ḥarab, son of I'zz-ul-Mulūk, Muḥammad. There I noticed a place, on the south of the city of Sijistān, which they call by the name of Dar-i-Ta'am, outside the city, at a spot called Reg-i-Gunjān. In the vicinity of this latter place, on a height or rising ground, there is a palace in ruins; and a number of trustworthy persons informed me, that Ya'kūb, son of Laīs, and his brothers, with their dependents and servants, were in the habit of coming thither one day in each week, as is the custom among young men, to divert themselves by sports and fun.

They used on these occasions to choose an Amir, or king of the sports, and a Wazīr, or minister. One day, according to their usual custom, they had come to the wonted place of meeting, and Ya'kūb had been chosen Amir for the day's sports; and, to each and every one of his brothers, his kinsmen, and dependents, he had assigned

* "There I noticed a place," &c. This sudden change to the first person is found in the original, and is not unusual in Oriental works. The whole of the MSS. compared here appear hopelessly corrupt, the place to the south of Sijistān having, apparently, two names, and yet either of them is named, as though it were a principal distinguishing designation. But, as the Bodleian and some other MSS. omit the relative in the last clause, it has been adopted in the text of the translation. Since the above has been in type I find, from "MASALIK WA MAMALIK"—the original MS., not a translation—that Dar-i Ta'am was the name of one of the thirteen gates of the suburbs of the then extensive city of Zaranj, the capital of Sijistān, founded after the city of Rām Shahr became uninhabitable. The city was surrounded by a high wall and a ditch, and had five gates, which were of iron. The walls of the suburbs were probably not so strong, and the gates seem to have been of wood. The author says: "The palace of Ya'kūb, son of Laīs, is situated between the gates called Dar-i-Ta'am, and Darwazah-i-Bārs [Fārs]; and the palace of Umro, son of Laīs, is the residence of the ruler." The copy of the above work which I have used is, from the style of writing, very ancient; and, from various events mentioned in it, appear to have been compiled previous to the time of Maḥmūd of Ghazīn. I have translated a considerable portion of it. Our author's journey to Sijistān took place some centuries after this work was written, at which period, from his remarks, the extensive suburbs had almost disappeared, and the names only of some of the gates appear to have survived. From the mention of the Reg [sand] of Gunjān, the suburbs had evidently been partially, if not altogether, buried in the sands, which, in after-times, reduced a once well-cultivated tract into a desert. See Section XIV. on the Kings of Nīm-roz and Sijistān.
the name of some one of the nobles and grandees of the country. Unexpectedly, the deputy of the Amir of Sijis-
tān, Šāliḥ, son of Naṣr, himself, on his return home from
the chase, arrived at this place, attended by his usual small
suite. Perceiving this assemblage of people collected on
the mound in question, he directed one of his attendants
to go and make inquiry who they were.

When the man sent reached the party, and noticed what
was going on, he was much astonished; and, a bevvy of youths
having come forward to receive him, the messenger was
forced to dismount from his horse, because it was necessary
to present himself before the Amir of the sports on foot.
The servant of Šāliḥ, accordingly, was under the necessity
of complying; and he made his obeisance, and returned,
and related to his master, Šāliḥ, son of Naṣr, what had
passed and what he had seen.

Šāliḥ, whose disposition was inclined to pleasantry, said,
"We will go and see what this party of youths are about,"
and rode up and came to the spot where they were.
Yaḵūb-i-Lāis never moved from his seat, and he directed,
that Amir Šāliḥ should be brought forward to pay his
obeisance. The youths, as commanded, advanced to meet
him, and they made Šāliḥ dismount from his horse, and
compelled him to make his obeisance to Yaḵūb.

As the day of his fortune and the period of his age had
reached the evening of their termination, and the morning of
the prosperity of the Šuffārīn had dawned, Yaḵūb made a
sign to the effect that it was necessary to put an end to
Amir Šāliḥ's career, and forthwith they put him to death.
Yaḵūb, without delay, mounted a horse, and the party
with him armed themselves, and, with the utmost expedi-
tion, they set out for the city, and proceeded to the palace
of the ruler, and there Yaḵūb took up his quarters.

This event took place at the time of early forenoon, and
by the time of meridian prayer the territory of Sijistān was
in the hands of Yaḵūb-i-Lāis, and all the people submitted
to his rule, like as if the Almighty God had pre-ordained
that he should follow his own way. Yaḵūb directed that
the Ḫuṭḥbāh should be read for him; and these events,
and this success, took place in the year 251 H.

After this, Yaḵūb led an army towards Bust and
Zāwulistān, and the territory of Dāwar [Zamīn-i-Dāwar]
and Ghaznin, and subdued the whole of them. From thence he advanced into Tuhkāristān and Balkh, and subdued them; and then returned and marched towards Kābul. This success took place in 256 H., and, subsequently, he returned to Sijistān, and afterwards advanced to Hirāt, which, after much fighting, he gained possession of. After this he took Bādghais, Būshanj [or Fūshanj], Jām, and Bākhrurz, and returned to Sijistān again.

After a short time Yaʿkūb again put his forces in motion, and marched against Nishāpur, which he gained possession of without opposition in 259 H., and seized upon Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir, son of Ḥusain, together with his treasures, and his dependents, and followers. He then marched towards Gurgān and Tabaristān, and, after having extorted tribute, again retired. He made his brother, Uʾmro-i-Lais, Wālī [governor] of Hirāt: and, in 261 H., a person—one of the Amirs of Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir—revolted, and set Muḥammad-i-Ṭāhir at liberty, who retired to the Court of the Khalifah, Al-Wāṣik Bʾillah. Yaʾkūb-i-Lais again marched an army into Irāk, and, on his return from thence, he reached a place which was called Khandah-i-Shāpur, and there he departed this life, in the year 265 H., of colic, after a reign of fourteen years.

* The ancient name of one of the districts of the territory of Balkh, and of which Tāt-kān—Tāl-kaṇ by moderns, but not correct, I think—is the largest town, the authority of “Hwen [Houen] ʔ Thsong,” and its extent of “ten day’s journey by thirty days,” and “twenty-seven states,” notwithstanding. See J. Ro. As. Soc., vol. vi. p. 94.

* As stated in a former note, the sons of Darhim, Naṣr and Šāliḥ, had fled to Kābul, and had sought shelter with the “Shāh,” as he is styled, of that territory, whose name was Ratbel or Rantbel; but this seems to have been a surname merely, for the opponent of the first Mussalmāns bore this very title.

* The name here is not correct: the last of the Tāhīrīs is Muḥammad, son of Ṭāhir, son of ʿAḥd-ullah, son of Ṭāhir-i-Zūl-Yamanain. See page 15.

* The author says not one word respecting Yaʾkūb’s overthrow near Ḥulwān by Muwaṣṣik, the brother of the Khalifah Muʿtamīd, in 262 H. On that occasion the baggage and effects of Yaʾkūb fell into the hands of the victors, among which were the chests containing his treasures, clothes, &c. On opening one of the chests, they found reclining therein the Amir Muḥammad, son of Ul-Ṭāhir, whom Yaʾkūb had made captive, when he gained possession of Nishāpur, and overthrew the Tāhīrī dynasty. Muwaṣṣik set him at liberty, and sent him to Baghdaḍ. He died there in 266 H., and, at that time, and with him, other authors consider the Tāhīrī dynasty to have ended.

* The Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh calls this place by the name of “Jand-i-Shapūr, a town of Aḥwāz,” and states that the date of his death was the 14th of Shawwal, 265 H. It is also called “Jande-Shapūr.” Yaʾkūb was buried there.
II. 'UMRO, SON OF LAİŞ, ŞÜFFĂRİ.

When Ya'küb-i-Laiş was removed from this transitory life, his brother, 'Umro, Şüffarı, sent a written petition to the Lord of the Faithful, the Khalifah, Al-Muwaaffik B'llah®, tendering his obedience and submission, and soliciting that he should be confirmed in the possession of the greater part of Fārs, Gurgān, Sijistān, and Khurāsān. His request was acceded to by the Khalifah, and 'Umro retired from the mountain tracts of Irāk with his own forces and those of his brother, and returned towards Sijistān again. From thence he moved towards Hirāt, and arrived there in the year 266 H. From Hirāt he marched to Nīshāpur; and Khujistān¹, who was one of the Amīrs of Muḥammad, son of Tāhir [the last of the Tāhirī dynasty], who had released his master from the hands of the Şüffāris, and who was at this period in Gurgān, marched to Nīshāpur against 'Umro, and there he was joined by Rāfī', son of Harşamah, from Marw.

They fought a battle with 'Umro before the gate of Nīshāpur, and 'Umro was defeated and put to the rout. He retreated to Hirāt, and the Khalifah, Al-Muwaaffik B'llah®, deposed

---

⁰ There was no Khalifah of this name. The author must refer to the Khalifah Mut'amid's brother, Muwaaffik, who was made Wālī over the eastern parts of Islām, and declared heir, after the death of Mut'amid's son Ja'far, but he did not succeed to the Khalifāt. Mu'taṣīd, son of Muwaaffik, who died before his brother, Mut'amid, succeeded his father, Al-Muwaaffik, in his capacity as ruler of the eastern parts of the Khalifāt; and he conferred the investiture of Khurāsān, Fārs, Iṣfahān, Sijistān, Kirmān, and Sūmd, upon 'Umro in 265 H., after the death of Ya'küb; and, in 266 H., 'Umro appointed 'Ubaid-ullah, the son of Tāhir, to the district of Bağhdād, as his deputy. Mu'tamid was the Khalifah who excommunicated 'Umro, son of Laiş, from the pulpit, at Bağhdad, in 265 H. 'Umro had despatched an agent to offer his submission and obedience, which the Khalifah refused to accept, and he cursed him.

Under the events of the year 278 H., the Mujmal-i-Faşīh-ī also mentions, that "Amīr Ismā'īl, Sāmānī, overcame 'Umro, son of Laiş, the Şüffār;" and, under the events of the following year, 279 H., I find the Khalifah, Al-Mu'taṣīd, presenting a standard to 'Umro, with the government of Khurāsān, at 'Umro's request, and that "Umro hoisted the standard over his Sarāe or palace, and kept it flying there for three days. The Khalifah also conferred upon 'Umro's envoy, who brought the request for a standard, a dress of honour, and a present." Our author sadly confounds the dates of events, and jumbles them into a very short space.

¹ This is an error, although seven copies of the text give the same name. Other authors state, that Ya'küb was defeated by Ahmad, son of 'Abd-ullah, Khujistānī, i.e. a native of Khujistān, which, the author of the Mujmal-i-Faşīh-ī says, is a dependency of Bağdāhais, in the highlands of Hirāt.

² See preceding note⁰, on this subject.
'Umro-i-Laiş from the government of Khurāsān in the year 271 H., and the whole of the territories and places which had been annexed by him were given [back] to Muḥammad, son of ʕāhir, son of 'Abd-ullāh.

Muḥammad was, at that time, at the Dār-ul-Khilāfah of Baghdād, and Rāfi', son of Harşamah, was directed to act as his deputy and lieutenant in the government of Khurāsān. The government of Māwar-un-Nahr—the territory trans Jihūn—was conferred upon Aḥmad, Sāmānī, as the deputy likewise of Muḥammad, son of ʕāhir. Between 'Umro-i-Laiş and Rāfi', son of Harşamah, many battles and conflicts took place up to the period that Rāfi'-i-Harşamah himself rebelled against the authority of the Khalifah.

In the year 284 H., in an encounter which took place between him and 'Umro-i-Laiş, Rāfi' was slain. 'Umro sent the head of Rāfi' to the Court of Baghdād, at which time the masnad [throne] of the Khilāfah had devolved upon Al-Mu’taṣid B’illah, and 'Umro-i-Laiş made a request to him that the government of Māwar-un-Nahr, Khurāsān, Nim-roz, Fārs, Kirmān, and Ahwāz, together with the Nakābat, or guardianship of the entrance to the palace of the Khalifah, and of the district of Baghdād, should be made over to him. More than this, he solicited that the name 'Umro should be inscribed on the canopies which every chief had in his residence [which would signify that he was above them all], and that his name should be mentioned in the Kuṭbah, and on the coins of Makkah and Madīnah and of Ḥijāz. All his demands were acceded to by the Khalifah's Court, and were duly carried out, and numerous dresses of honour, and countless marks of favour and distinction, were conferred upon him.

The letters patent, acceding to his demands, having reached 'Umro from his Majesty the Khalifah, he made

---

3 Other authors state that Rāfi’ was taken prisoner by ‘Umro, and sent to Baghdād, where he died in confinement, which former proceeding so pleased the Khalifah that he restored ‘Umro to the government of Khurāsān, Māwar-un-Nahr, Kirmān, &c., again. The Jámi'-ut-Tawārīkh, and Tārikh-i-Guzdah, however, state that Rāfi’ sought shelter with the ruler of Khwārazm, who put him to death, and sent his head to ‘Umro. The latter’s report to the Khalifah, in the Mujmal-i-Faqīḥ-ī, confirms this.

4 Sījistān.

6 Nakābat, the office of a Nakīb, a leader, &c.

The word is rather doubtful—سرمای One MS. has یسرمای another یسرمای
preparation for proceeding and taking possession of Māwar-un-Nahr; and Muḥammad Bayṣīr, who was his Ḥājib [chamberlain], was despatched with a force from 'Umro's army in advance.

Amīr Ismā'īl-i-Aḥmad, Sāmānī, marched from Bukhārā towards Khurāsān, crossed the river Jīhūn, and defeated the [advanced] force of 'Umro under Muḥammad Bayṣīr, who was slain in the engagement, together with a great number of his troops. Upon this 'Umro-i-Laiṣ proceeded towards Māwar-un-Nahr with a numerous army, for it included 70,000 horsemen armed with spears, besides other troops. Amīr Ismā'īl-i-Aḥmad crossed the Jīhūn, and fought a battle with 'Umro-i-Laiṣ before the walls of Balkh, defeated him, and took him prisoner, and sent him to the court of Baghdād, and then Ismā'īl returned to Bukhārā. In the year 288 h., the Khalīfah, Al-Mu'taṣīd, directed that 'Umro should be cast into prison, and in it he died; and the dynasty of the Šuṭfār Ūn terminated.7

7 Ismā'īl's army is said to have consisted of 12,000 horse, but the accounts of other writers differ considerably in their statements from this one.

8 The Oxus, also called Balkhtrus, and Amūfah.

9 According to the author's own statement above, Ismā-Īl with his army was already across.

1 See note 6, page 31, for a full account of 'Umro's fate.

2 The Ṭārīkh-i-Ibrahīmī, and others, state, that after the downfall of 'Umro his descendants contented themselves with the sovereignty of Sijistān, subject, however, to the Sāmānīs. This is also proved from the subsequent accounts given by our author himself. When the people of Sijistān became aware of 'Umro's capture they set up Tāhir, who, according to the Ṭārīkh-i-Guzīdah, Niṣām-ut-Tawārīkh, Muntaḳhab-ut-Tawārīkh, and other works, was not 'Umro's brother, but his grandson, Tāhir, son of Muḥammad, son of 'Umro. Ismā'īl, Sāmānī, overcame him; but after a time conferred the government of Sijistān upon Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, Tāhir's son. His descendants continued to possess it until the year 643 h. 'Umro, son of Laig, founded the 'Atīk Masjid at Shīrāz.
SECTION IX.

THE DYNASTY OF THE SĀMĀNĪS.

The humblest of the servants of the Almighty, Minhâj-i-Sarâj, Jûrjânî, states that, after the mention of the Maliks of Yaman, and the Ṣuffârîûn Amîrs, he has considered it preferable to insert here the section in which it is proposed to give an account of the race of Sâmān, and the Maliks of that dynasty, and therefore this portion of the work was made, in its arrangements, antecedent to that treating of the genealogy of the Maḥmûdî, and Nâshîrî Maliks. Although the history of the Maliks of Yaman ought, properly, to have been first in the arrangement of the book, still, as they were not among the number of Maliks of Islâm, he did not consider it right to place them before the Khalîfahs, and therefore they have received this much precedence.

This section has been taken from the Târîkh or Chronicle of Ibn Haişam, in order that those under whose inspection it falls may place perfect confidence in its correctness.

The chronicler relates that the ancestor of the Sâmânîs was named Sâmân; but, according to some others, his name was different from this; and, moreover, that Sâmân is the name of one of the districts of the Sughâd of Samrâkand, and that the ancestor of the Sâmânîs was the Ra'îs [chief] of that place, and that he used to be styled Sâmân-i-Khaddât; but, for sake of brevity, the name of Sâmân was

1 The Ghaznawî dynasty, and the Turkish Slave dynasty (not Pâlân), of which Nâsîr-ud-dîn, the ruler of Dîhâf, to whom the author dedicated his work, was one.
2 These remarks would have been better prefixed to the notice of the kings of Yaman, or the Tâhirîs, and are rather out of place here.
3 The Târîkh-i-Jahân-Ârâ states that he was chiefly known by the name of Sâmân-i-Khâdâh, which signifies the master or possessor of sâmân or effects, chattels, &c. Sâmân likewise, quoting the "Muajjam-ul-Balâdân," is the name of a village of Mâwar-un-Nâh, but others consider it to be the name of a place in the territory of Balkh. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawârîkh also agrees with this statement.
adopted, and it became the name by which he was generally known. He was of the posterity of Bahrām Shūbin⁴.

This Sāmān-i-Khaddāt had a son who was named Asad, who had four sons—named, respectively, Nūḥ, Yaḥyā, Ilyās, and Aḥmad. They became Princes and Lords of great dignity and power, able, and experienced, and endowed with considerable promptness and vigour. At length, when their family had attained the pinnacle of greatness and power, Alb-Tīgin⁶, the Amir of Ghaznīn, and Sabuk-Tīgin, were among the slaves and servants of their descendants. All the Sāmānis left numerous proofs of their goodness in Khurāsān and Māwar un-Nahr; and may the Almighty reward them by bestowing upon them exalted stations in the courts of Paradise.

ASAD, SON OF SĀMĀN-I-KHĀDDĀT.

He had four sons, Yaḥyā, who held the territory of Shāsh and Isfanjāb, and their dependencies; Ilyās, who held the government of the province of Hirāt and parts adjacent; Aḥmad, the third son, who held Samrḵand and Farghānā, and their dependencies; and Nūḥ, the fourth, who at first held the government of Samrḵand, which, however, was subsequently conferred upon Aḥmad.

The Lord of the Faithful, Māmūn, when he came to Marv, remarked the talents and capabilities, bravery, and innate nobility of mind of the sons of Asad, son of Sāmān, and he treated them with great distinction, and conferred great favours upon them, and raised them to high rank and position.

When the Khalīfah, Māmūn, returned to Bāghdād, his capital, he directed Ghassān⁶, the son of 'Ubbād, to

⁴ The noble, who, in the reign of Hurmuz, son of Nūshirwān, overthrew the son of the Khākān of Turkistan, with an immense army, before the walls of Bālk, but was insulted by Hurmuz, and he rebelled and dethroned him, and set up another in his stead. The word is sometimes written Chūbin, sometimes Shūbin.

⁶ See note ⁵, page 37.

⁶ In the year 204 H., Ghassān, son of 'Ubbād, was appointed to the government of Khurāsān. He conferred Samrḵand upon Nūḥ, son of Asad, Sāmānī. Aḥmad, Ilyās, and Yaḥyā, the other sons of Asad, received, respectively, the investiture of Farghānā, Shāsh, Isruḵtah; or Sīruḵtah, and Hirāt. Soon after, Tāhir-i-Zūl-Yamanain became Wāl of Khurāsān; Nūḥ died, and the former bestowed the territory held by Nūḥ on his brothers, Yaḥyā and Aḥmad. When Ilyās, another brother, died, Tāhir gave his territory of Hirāt to his own son, 'Abd-ullah. After this the family of the Sāmānis rose to great power in Khurāsān and Māwar-un-Nahr. See note ⁴, page 11; note ⁶, page 28.
assume the government of Khurāsān, and added thereunto the whole of it as far as Māwar-un-Nahr. Ghassān, son of 'Ubbād, made each of the sons of Asad the Amīr [ruler] of a territory, and conferred certain cities upon them, as the table given at the end of this Section shows. These governments were first conferred upon them in the year 204 H.; and, when his Majesty, the Khalīfah, nominated Amīr Tāhir-i-Zūl-Yamanain, son of Al-Husain, to the government of Khurāsān, the whole four Sāmānī Amīrs, who [as already stated] were four brothers, were confirmed by him in the territories and cities they were then holding.

When the sovereignty passed from Amīr Tāhir to his son, 'Abd-ullah-i-Ṭāhir', he confirmed the Sāmānis in their governments as his father had done, and made no change with respect to them.

1. Aḥmad, Son of Asad, Son of Sāmān.

Each of the sons of Sāmān-i-Khaddāt rose to great rank and power, and they each held a tract of territory in Māwar-un-Nahr, Farghānah, or Khurāsān, as will be mentioned in the succeeding pages.

Nūḥ, son of Asad, who was a person of excellent qualities and disposition, and of great energy and high courage, was invested with the government of the territory of Samrḳand. Yahyā, another son, held the territory of Shāsh, and Ṣafanjāb⁷, and their dependencies. He was a man of undaunted spirit and energy, and possessed great talent for government, and left many proofs of his goodness in those parts. Ilyās held the government of the province of Hirāt and its dependencies, and the parts adjacent. He also was a person of energy and great experience; but Aḥmad was the greatest, the most intrepid, energetic, and sagacious of

---

⁷ It passed to his son, Ṭalḥāb, first, and afterwards to 'Abd-ullah, and also by the author's own account.

⁸ Shāsh is the name of a territory, river, and city of Māwar-un-Nahr, on the Sībūn or Jaxartes, on the frontier of the Turks. It was also called Fanākat, and is now known as Tāshkand. According to the Ašār-ul-Bilād, and Maṣālik wa Mamālik, it was also called Chāj and Jāj. Ibn Ḥaukal [the translation] first states that Seket is the capital, and immediately after says Chāj is. Its inhabitants were Musalmāns of the tribes of Ghuzz and Khalj. Ṣafanjāb, also written Sfanjāb, is a town or city of Māwar-un-Nahr, towards Turkistān. These names are generally carelessly written in the various copies of the text.
the whole of the brothers, and held charge of the territory of Samrān.

Nūḥ, at first, was placed in charge of the affairs of Farghānah, but, subsequently, it came into the hands of Aḥmad, with the whole of Kāsghar, and Turkistān, to the frontier of Chīn. He was renowned for his courage, and valour, and experience, which were celebrated throughout Irān and Tūrān; and his descendants, one after the other, occupied the throne, and governed God’s people liberally and beneficently. Of those of his descendants who attained to sovereignty, one of the learned men has spoken, in verse, in the following quatrain:

"Nine persons there were of the race of Sāmān, renowned,
Who as rulers became famous in Khurāsān,
A Ismā‘īl, a Aḥmad, and a Naṣr,
Two Nūḥs, two ’Abd-ul-Maliks, two Maṃšūrs."

Amīr Aḥmad had nine sons: Naṣr, Ismā‘īl, Is-hāḵ, Maṃṣūr, Asad, Yaḵūb, Ḥamid, Yaḥyā, and Ibn Ībrahīm. The mention of their descent was found, as has been entered herein—Sāmān, son of Jašmān, son of Ṭamghān, son of Noṣher, son of Noṣhed, son of Bahrām, son of Shūbīn [Chūbin].

II. NAṢR, SON OF AḤMAD, SĀMĀN.

When Aḥmad, son of Asad, son of Sāmān, died at Samrān, he nominated his son, Naṣr⁹, as his successor; and, during the sway of the Ṭāḥīrīs, the territory, which Naṣr’s father had held, was confirmed to him, and his brother Ismā‘īl served under him, and acknowledged in him, as his suzerain, his superiority.

In 261 H. Naṣr conferred the government of the territory of Buḵhārā upon Ismā‘īl, who established himself therein. Naṣr performed great deeds, and was endowed with many virtues. He governed with strict regard to the rules of equity and justice until the end of his days, when death overtook him in the month of Jamādī-ul-Aḵhir, in the year 279 H.¹

⁹ The Tārīḵ-i-Guzfīdah and others state, that, after the death of Aḥmad in 261 H., the Khalfah, Al-Mu’tamid B’illah, placed the whole of those territories under the government of one person—Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, the most upright and best prince of the Sāmānī dynasty.
¹ According to the I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and the R.A.S. MS., which
When his brother, Ismā'il, had become established in the government of the Bukhārā territory, several designing and evil-intentioned persons managed to come between him and his brother Naṣr, his sovereign, and began to resort to calumny and falsehood [to effect their designs], until the disposition of Naṣr became completely changed towards his brother, and he determined to reduce Ismā'il by force, and overthrow him entirely.

Amir Naṣr accordingly moved from Samrkan towards Bukhārā with a large army. Amir Ismā'il despatched a trusty agent to Rāfi', son of Haršamah, son of A'yan, who was Amir of Khurāsān, and acquainted him with the state of affairs between himself and his brother, Amir Naṣr, and solicited assistance from that ruler.

Rāfi', son of Haršamah assembled a warlike army, numerous and well-equipped in every way, and marched towards the scene of expected hostility; but he, out of benevolence, kindness, and humanity, interposed between the brothers, and brought about an accommodation between them, and retired into his own territory again.

Amir Naṣr returned to Samrkan, and Amir Ismā'il proceeded to Bukhārā. As soon as Naṣr heard of this, still nourishing that antagonism against his brother which had taken possession of his heart, he advanced towards Bukhārā with a warlike army. Ismā'il came out of the city to encounter him; and a fierce and obstinate battle took place between them, attended with great carnage, in the year 275 H. Ismā'il was victorious over his brother, whose forces were defeated and put to the rout, and Amir Naṣr was himself taken prisoner. He was taken to the presence of Ismā'il, who, seeing that he was being brought forward, immediately dismounted from his horse, and rendered homage to his captive brother, and kissed him on the breast, and paid him the utmost honour and respect. He then induced Amir Naṣr to return to Samrkan, and returned himself to Bukhārā, which he continued to retain as the lieutenant of his brother. Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, ruled for a period of eighteen years.

of course agrees, Naṣr assumed the government in 269 H., and reigned eighteen years. This is quite wrong. The correct date is 261 H., as in the other MSS., which date other histories confirm.

Subordinate to the Khalifas.
III. ISMĀ'IL\(^b\), SON OF AḤMAD, SĀMĀNĪ.

On the death of Amir Naṣr, the Khalīfah, Al-Mu'taḍīd B'illah, conferred upon Amir Ismā'īl the government of the territory of Māwār-un-Nahr, and also all the territory which his brother, Naṣr, had held, and sent him a commission and a standard. He became a great and powerful ruler, and the whole of those territories submitted to his sway\(^4\); and all men, chiefs, and grandees, and the common people, became obedient to his authority.

He was a just man, and endowed with wisdom, and many great deeds were performed by him, for when 'Umrō, son of Laīṣ, determined to make war upon Ismā'īl, and set out with a vast army to attack him—according to the author of the Tārīkh of Ibn Haiṣam—on the day that 'Umrō, son of Laīṣ, set out to enter upon hostilities with Amir Ismā'īl, he had seventy thousand horsemen armed with spears under his standard, without counting archers, swordsmen, and other armed men besides. Amir Ismā'īl crossed the river Jīhūn, and encountered 'Umrō, son of Laīṣ, at Bālkh; and the Almighty bestowed the victory upon Ismā'īl. The army of 'Umrō was defeated and put to the rout, and 'Umrō was himself taken prisoner. Ismā'īl sent his captive to the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Mu'taḍīd-B'illah, to dispose of as he might deem fit\(^8\).

\(^b\) Abū Sulṭān-i-Dā'ūd, author of the Tārīkh-i-Fanākatf, considers Ismā'īl, Sāmānī, very properly, as the first of the dynasty who is entitled to be considered a sovereign prince. The Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī, Juhān-Ārā, and several other histories, also confirm it, as does Ibn-Ḥauḳal likewise. The Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-ī also agrees in this. Under the events of the year 287 H. it is stated, that from that year commenced the sovereignty of the Sāmānīs, who were nine persons, who reigned 103 years, 9 months, and 11 days; and, that Ismā'īl, Sāmānī, had risen, and had subdued, during that same year, Māwār-un-Nahr, Khurāsān, Fārs, Kirmān, Irāq, Sijistān, and some parts of Hindūstān. At this period, it must be remembered, the territory of Kābul was considered a part of "Hind;" and this, doubtless, is what is referred to here. In the same year, the Khalīfah, Al-Mu'taḍīd B'illah, sent Ismā'īl the investiture of Khurāsān, Tabaristān, and Jurjān, together with a rich dress of honour, and the sum of "ten times a thousand thousand dirams" [ten millions of dirams.]; and the affairs of Ismā'īl began to prosper greatly.

\(^4\) In 280 H., Ismā'īl made an expedition into the territory of the Turks, and made holy war upon them. The chief town was taken, and booty and captives beyond compute carried off, together with their Malik [king] and his wife. Each horseman present on this expedition received a thousand dirams for his share of the booty.

\(^8\) Respecting the subsequent fate of 'Umrō, son of Laīṣ, it appears, on
The Khalifah bestowed a commission on Amir Ismai’il, with the investiture of the territory of Khurasan, together with the whole of ’Ajam; and Amir Ismai’il’s power and grandeur increased accordingly.

Subsequently, the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Mu’taṣid, despatched a commission to him, with directions to free the countries of Tabariстан and Gurgan from the sway of Amir Muḥammad-i-Zaid-ul-‘Alawi, who had possessed himself of them. Amir Ismai’il appointed Aḥmad-i-Hārūn to the command of the van of his army, and sent him on in advance with that portion of his forces; and, between Amir Muḥammad-i-Zaid-ul-‘Alawi and Amir Ismai’il, very severe fighting took place, and the Amir Muḥammad-i-Zaid was slain. His son, Zaid, also, was taken prisoner and brought before Amir Ismai’il, who sent him to Buhārā, with orders that, on the way thither, due respect should be paid to him, and that he should be provided with suitable accommodation; and he treated him with such honour and attention as kindness and magnanimity could devise.

From a trustworthy authority, that Amir Ismai’il sent ’Ummro to Baghdad at his [’Ummro’s] own request. Arrived there, he was, by the Khalifah’s orders, paraded on a camel’s back through the streets of Baghdad, and afterwards thrown into prison. This was in 287 H. In the year 289 ’Ummro died in confinement. It is said that the Khalifah, Mu’taṣid, whilst in his last struggles, expressed a desire that ’Ummro should be put to death; but, that he was entirely forgotten in his prison, and neither food nor drink was brought to him, and he died of starvation and thirst. Another account is, that Mu’taṣid gave orders to Ṣaff to put him to death, and that he delayed carrying the sentence into execution. When Al-Muktaff succeeded to the Khalifah, he inquired of Ṣaff respecting ’Ummro, whether he was still alive. He replied that he was. Muktaff said: “I will act generously towards him; I shall, during the time of Mu’taṣid, continually send me presents, and was always very attentive to me.” Khaim, son of ’Abd-ullah, however, feared ’Ummro; and, when he heard this speech of the Khalifah’s, he gave directions to put ’Ummro to death in his prison. More respecting the Ṣaffarīs will be found at page 183. I hope, very shortly, however, to give a detailed account of the rise of the different Muḥammadan dynasties to the public.

4 In the Mir’at-ul-‘Alam and other works, he is styled “Muḥammad, son of Zaid-ul-‘Alawi,” who bore the surname of Ud-Dīr-al-Ḥāk.” In the Tārīkh-i-Gurj, he is styled “Al-Bākīr,” instead of ’Alawi; but the meaning of these two titles is much the same. He was a descendant of the Khalifah, ’Alī, and Bākīr was the surname of Abū Ja’far-i-Muḥammad, son of ’Alī, son of Ḥusain, son of ’Alī, the fourth Khalifah.

5 Muḥammad, son of Hārūn, seems to be the correct name of this officer. He had been deputy to Ṣaff, and had entered the service of Amir Ismai’il.
At this time, the Khalifah Al-Mu'taṣid B'illah died, and his son, Al-Muktaff B'illah, succeeded to the throne of the Khilāfat. He despatched a commission and a standard to Amīr Ismā'īl, and conferred upon him the territories of 'Irāk, Rai, and Ṣafahān, and the provinces of Ṭabaristān, and Gurgān, the whole of which were incorporated with Khurāsān. Amīr Ismā'īl gave the government of Rai to his nephew, named Abū Ṣāliḥ, son of Manṣūr, son of Is-hāḳ, Sāmānī, and to his own son, Aḥmad by name, that of Gurgān.

On the night of Tuesday, the 14th of the month Ṣafar, in the year 295 H., he died, and his title became Amīr-i-Māẓī, or the Past or Late Amīr: He had reigned for a period of eight years;

IV. ABŪ NAṢR-I-AḤMAD, SON OF ISMĀ'ĪL.

This ruler had four sons, named Naṣr, Manṣūr, Ibrāhīm, and Yaḥyā, whose surnames were, respectively, Abū Sāliḥ, Abū Muḥammad, Abū Is-hāḳ, and Abū Zakīrā.

Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad was a severe and energetic ruler, and put to death several of his slaves for some misconduct. The rest of the slaves, who were their comrades, sought opportunity to revenge them, and to assassinate Amīr Aḥmad; but he had a lion, which had been trained, and he was in the habit of securing the animal near his sleeping-apartment, in the night-time, in order that, through fear of this creature, no one should approach his place of repose.

This animal used to keep guard over his master at night, until, on one occasion, when the Amīr had gone on a hunting excursion, and set out, on his return from thence, at an untimely hour. The halting-place was at a considerable distance, and he was unable to reach the station fixed upon, and had to stop at another place for the night. The slaves

* Ṣafahān.
* A son of Aḥmad is so named. See page 29.
1 Amīr Ismā'īl made the celebrated Abū-i-Faṣṣ, Al-Bal'āmī, his Wazīr. He continued to act in that office up to the time of Amīr Nūḥ, son of Manṣūr, by whose command he translated the Tārīḵ-i-Ṭabarī from 'Arabic into Persian.
* Computing from the commencement of his reign in 287 H.
* Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad signifies Aḥmad, the father of Naṣr.
* The word ḥād is used both for lion and tiger.
now found the opportunity they had been seeking, and they assassinated Amir Ahmad. This event happened on the night of Thursday, the 23rd of the month Jamādi-ul-ÅkHzir, 301 H. They then took his body, and conveyed it to Bukhārā; and, after this occurrence, Amir Ahmad was designated the Amir-i-Shahīd, or the Martyred Amir.

In the outset of his career, after his father had departed this life, and an assemblage of the heads of the army, the grandees, and principal men of the country had pledged their allegiance to him, Abū Naṣr-i-Ahmād, son of Ismā’īl, he sent a distinguished person, as envoy to the Court of the Khalifah, and from thence, the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Muktafī B’illah, sent him a commission and a standard; and his reign gave regularity and order to the affairs of the Empire. In Sijistān⁶, however, Mu’addil, son of ‘Ali, son of Laiṣ, Šuffārī, brother’s son of Ya’kūb and ’Umrō, had broken out into rebellion, and caused great disturbance and disorder. An army had been appointed to proceed into that quarter, and Mu’addil had been reduced, and rendered powerless; and he was made captive, and put in durance.

The government of Sijistān was then conferred by Amir Ahmad upon his uncle’s son⁷, in whom he placed confidence, Abū Šāliḥ-i-Manṣūr, son of Is-hāk, son of Ahmād, Sāmānī. Subsequently the people of Sijistān revolted, and seized the person of Abū Šāliḥ, and confined him in the fortress of Ark⁸, and gave their allegiance to ’Umrō, son of Ya’kūb-

⁶ Tāfīkh-i-Guzīdah, Khulāṣat-ul-ÅkHzār, Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-ī; and other works, say this event occurred 23rd Jamādi-ul-ÅkHzir, 300 H. Faṣīḥ-ī gives his reign as 5 years and 3 months.

⁷ Our author seems to have had a very imperfect and confused idea of the state of Sijistān at this period. He makes no mention of the doings of Sijizī, the slave—the Sīgīzī, or Sījīzī slave probably—of ’Umrō, son of Laiṣ; his having, at last, taken to the fortress of Bām, in Kirmān, and his subsequent flight into the desert of Khurāsān; nor of Tāhir and Ya’kūb, ’Umrō’s sons, nor of Laiṣ, son of ’Alī, of the same family, all three of whom were, at different times, taken captive and sent to Baghdād. In 297 H., Muḥammad, son of ’Alī, brother of Ya’kūb and ’Umrō, son of Laiṣ, Šuffārī, was made prisoner along with Sīgīzī, by Amir Ahmād, Sāmānī, who subdued Sijistān. He sent them to Baghdād, at the Khalīfah’s request. In 299 H., Laiṣ, son of ’Alī, died in Fārs; and Mu’addil, his son, died the same year.

⁸ The same Abū-Šāliḥ, who was son of Manṣūr, son of Is-hāk, mentioned towards the close of the last reign, which see.

⁹ All the copies of the MSS. compared, except one, which has گیز گیز have the words قبیل قبیل “fortress of Ark or Arg”; but I think it might be قبیل [Qub], which is the name of a buried town of Sijistān, and, from its ruins, Afgānān and
i-La'īş⁶. On this, Amir Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad, son of Ismā'īl, nominated a well appointed army [well equipped in all things] to march into Sijistān for the second time, and Ḥusain 'Ali¹, Marw-ar-Rūdī², was made Amir [commander] of that force. This army had entered Sijistān in the year 300 H., and had invested 'Umro [son of Muḥammad], son of Ya'ḳūb, for a period of seven months³, when he begged for quarter, and came out and surrendered. Sijistān was then made over to the charge of Simjūr-i-Dowātī⁴.

It was at this period that the Amir, having been unable to reach his appointed place of rest before nightfall, as already related, was assassinated, after having reigned for a period of six years and three months.

V. NAṢR⁴, SON OF AḤMAD, SON OF ISMĀ'ĪL.

On the decease of the Amir-i-Shahīd, Aḥmad, son of Ismā'īl, the whole of the Amīrs, and commanders of the troops, and the principal men of the country, in concert with the 'Ulamā—the learned in law and religion—of that period, set up his son, Naṣr, as his successor⁶.

Amir Naṣr at this time was but eight years of age, and according to the statement of the chronicler, at the very

Hindūs of Kandahār have brought me coins. The fact of ʿAbd being given as well seems to throw a doubt upon it, for both Arg and Kala' are just the same in meaning, and would have to be read "the fort or castle of [the] citadel," unless Ark be a proper name—"the castle of Ark." Perhaps has been written by mistake for ʿAbd. The Tārīkh-i-Haft Aḵīlīn says there is "a place called ʿUk [j]ī, in Sijistān, near which is a Rawān-i-Rungh [running or flowing sand] situated near Kala'ī-Kāh, or Gāh, in which vicinity are several holy tombs."

¹ 'Umro, son of Muḥammad, son of Ya'ḳūb-i-La'īş, is correct.
² Other writers say Ḥusain, son of ʿAlī.
³ That is, he was a native of Marw-ar-Rūd.
⁴ Others give nine months as the period.
⁵ Tārīkh-i-Ibrahimī says Aḥmad-i-Simjūr—also written Simjūr-i-Dowātī. Dowātī is from dowāt, a pen-case, or ink-holder.
⁶ His proper designation, according to the Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-i, Tārīkh-i-Jahān-Arā, the Tārīkh-i-Ibrahimī, and Tārīkh-i-Fanākātī, is Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Naṣr, &c.
⁷ Among the events of the year 301 H., the Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-i mentions, the "arrival of the news at Baghdaḏ, that the slaves of Amir Aḥmad, son of Ismā'īl, son of Aḥmad, Sāmānī, had put him to death, on the banks of the Jīlūn of Balkh, [referring to what was mentioned under 300 H.] and that his son, Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Naṣr, had succeeded him. Upon this, the Khalīfah, Muqtadīr, despatched to him a commission confirming him in the government of Māwar-un-Naṣr, and added thereunto that of Khurāsān."
time that they brought him forth from the Ḥaram to place him upon the throne, being of such tender years, he was completely overcome with fear and began to cry, and was saying, "Where are you taking me to? Do you desire to put me to death, in the same way as you put my father? Let me alone, I beg of you!"

After they had placed him on the throne, Abū 'Abd-ullah Muḥammad, son of Aḥmad, Al-Jihānī, was appointed his Nāyab [lieutenant]. He was a man of sagacity, and wise in counsel, and he entered upon the administration of the government in accordance with the rules of strict justice, and with a firm hand, but based upon moderation and beneficence; but, as the Amīr was himself so young in years, the governors and great nobles on the confines showed a refractory spirit.

The first to revolt against his authority was his father's uncle, Is-hāḳ, son of Aḥmad, Sāmānī, and his son Ilyās, at Samarqand. They made ready their forces, and marched towards Bukhārā. Ḥamzah, son of 'Alī, who was one of the chiefs of Amīr Naṣr's forces, pushed forward to meet them with a large following, put them to the rout, and pursued them as far as the gates of Samarqand. Amīr Is-hāḳ sought for mercy, and became ashamed of his conduct, and he was forgiven.

Subsequently to this, Amīr Naṣr's uncle's son, Maṃṣūr, son of Is-hāḳ, revolted against him in 302 H. in Khurāsān and Niṣhāpūr; and Ḥusayn 'Alī, who was Wālī [governor] of Hirāt, joined him in his rebellion. The Sipah-sālār, [general-in-chief] of Amīr Naṣr's forces, Ḥamāwīyāh, marched against them from Bukhārā, but, before he came up with them, Maṃṣūr had died at Niṣhāpūr, and Ḥusayn 'Alī returned to Hirāt, but still continued in a state of revolt. He engaged in many conflicts, and gave battle on several occasions, until, at length, he was taken prisoner. He likewise, being clothed in a dress of

7 Ḥusayn, son of 'Alī.
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* In 309 H. Abū Maṃṣūr-i-Jihānī, was appointed to the government of Hirāt, Fūshanj, and Bāḍghais, and arrived at the former city to take up his appointment. In 311 H. Shāh-Malik, son of Ya'kūb, son of Laiṣ, the Ṣūfīṣ, and a body of Sanjarīs appeared before Hirāt. Shīmūr was at Hirāt at this time; and Shāh-Malik and his party invested Hirāt four months, but could effect nothing, and had to retire. Changes continually took place there for
pardon, was forgiven, through the intercession of Muhammad, son of Ahmad, Al-Jihânt, the Nâyab of the Empire; indeed, during the reign of Amir Nasr, whoever revolted against his authority, was either put to death, or, on expressing penitence for his conduct, was pardoned.

His sovereignty continued during the reigns of the Khalifahs, Al-Muqtadir B'illah, Al-Kâhir B'illah, Ar-Râzi B'illah, up to that of Al-Muttaqi B'illah, and he continued to pay fealty to them, and to render them submission and obedience; and, from each of those Khalifahs likewise, he received a commission and a standard. He continued to reign, until the month of Rajab, in the year 331 H., when he died. He was spoken of by the title, or surname, of the Amir-i-Sa'id, or the August Amir, and his reign extended to a period of thirty years. He had three sons, some years. In 319 H. Abû Zakrîa-i-Yâhyâ, son of Ahmad, son of Ismâ'îl, Sâmâni, appeared before Hirât, ousted Shabâsi, who had seized the government, burnt some of the gates, and threw down part of the walls, and left Karâ-Tigîn, a slave of Abû Ibrâhîm, Sâmâni, in possession. He then departed towards Samarkand, but, the following day, Amir Nasr himself reached Hirât, stayed one day, and set out by way of Karûkh, after Abû Zakrîa, leaving Sîmîjr again governor of the province. In 321 H., Manşûr, son of 'Alî, was appointed. He died there in 324 H., having been Wâlî [governor] for three years. The appointment was then conferred upon Muḥammad, son of Hasan, son of Iṣâbâk. Soon after, in the same year, Abû-l-'Abbâs, Muḥammad, son of Al-Jarrâb, marched against Hirât, took Muḥammad, son of Hasan, captive, and sent him, in bonds, to Jurjân to Balkâ-Tigîn. In 326 H. the office of Wâlî was conferred upon Muḥammad, son of Muḥammad, Al-Jihânt, by Amir Nasr.

Our author generally leaves out the principal events, or most of them, so does not say anything of Mâkân, son of Kâbî, Dîlamî, his attempt on Khurâsân, or the events which led to his death. He was slain by Amir 'Alî, son of Ilyâs, who was one of the Umrâ-i-Juyûsh [Commanders of the Forces] of Amir Nasr. Amir Nasr sent a Dâbrî [Secretary] along with Amir 'Alî, with directions to transmit him a brief account of what took place, and send it by a carrier-pigeon. He did so in the following words—"Wâlî [サーサン] was not," which interpreted is—"Was not' has become like his name."

In this same year, 329 H., Balkâ-Tigîn was removed from the government of Hirât, and it was again conferred upon Abû Manşûr-i-Karâ-Tigîn.

† A winding-sheet, with a sword hung round his neck, probably, as was the custom until very lately.

It was in Amir Nasr’s reign that Alb-Tigîn is first mentioned as being one of his mansûzî or slaves, but it was only in the subsequent reign that he rose to the rank of Amir [lord]. See page 40, and note 4.

The Târîkh-i-Gurîdah, Târîkh-i-Faṣîh-i, Târîkh-i-Ibrâhîmî, and other histories, state that Amir-Nasr was slain by his own slaves, 12th of Ramaḍân, 330 H., but some say it took place in 331 H.
THE TABAḴĀT-I-NĀṢIRĪ.

Nūḥ, Ismā'īl, and Muḥammad, and the first succeeded him.

VI. NŪḤ, SON OF NAṢR, SON OF AḤMAD, SĀMĀNĪ.

Amīr Nūḥ, son of the Amīr-i-Saʿīd, ascended the throne of the dominion of 'Ajam, on the 5th of the month of Sha'bān, in the year 331 H., and he reigned for a period of twelve years and three months. He had two sons, 'Abd-ul-Malik and Maṃṣūr. The Lord of the Faithful, Al-Muttaḳī Bʾillah, sent Amīr Nūḥ a standard, with the deed of investiture, confirming him in the government of the whole of the territories of 'Ajam and Khurāsān, which had been held by his father. He appointed the Imām, Shams-ul-Aʾimmah, Abī-ul-Faṣl, Muḥammad, son of Al-Ḥākim, Sarāḵšī, the author of the work entitled "Mukhtaṣar-i-Kāfī," to the office of Wāzīr, and made him his Nāyab, and entrusted to him the administration of his affairs.

Having entered upon his office, the Imām, began to conduct the affairs of the country according to the precepts of wisdom and knowledge, the rules of justice, and the canons of the orthodox law and usage, and, in such a manner, that he left not the least thing neglected. Matters went on in this way until Amīr Nūḥ, through the rebellion of 'Abd-ullah, son of Ashkān, Khwārazm Shāh, proceeded to Marw in 332 H., and brought that important matter to a successful issue. In the year 335 H., his

---

1 In 330 H., according to others, as stated previously.
2 Nūḥ first appointed Ḥākim Abū-l-Faṣl, Aḥmad, son of Muḥammad, to the office of Wāzīr in 330 H., when he succeeded his father. In the same year I find Amīr Nūḥ giving orders to put the Wāzīr Abū-l-Faṣl, Al-Balʿamf, to death. This is not the Wāzīr, Al-Balʿamf, who translated the Tāfīkh-i-Ṭabarī, but of the same family.
3 The Mujmal-i-Faṣīḥ-i mentions among the events of the year 332 H., that 'Abd-ullah, son of Ashkān, manifested hostility towards Amīr Nūḥ, but where, is not stated. The Khwārazm Shāhis are not mentioned by our author until a long period after this time. The name of this person is written Ashkān, Ashkāb, and Askāb, in as many different copies of the MS. In 331 H. Ḵaṟā-Tīqīn had been removed from the government of Hirāt, and it was conferred upon Ibrāhīm, son of Simjūr, who, in the following year, sent thither Abū-l-Faṣl-i-'Azīz, son of Muḥammad, the Sījīzī, to act as his deputy, until he came himself, and directed that the gateways should be destroyed and the walls of the city thrown down.
4 Neither “Meru” nor “Merve” is the correct pronunciation.
uncle, Is-hāk*, who had fled to Baghdād, had managed to obtain from the Khalifah, Al-Muktafi B’illah, the investiture of Khurāsān. He, accordingly, entered those parts, and seized upon the territory of Jibāl* and Khurāsān.

Amīr Nūḥ had proceeded to Marw to expel him, but the whole of his nobles, his retinue, and the soldiery were disaffected. They had become annoyed and irritated at the enlightenment displayed, and the just administration of Shams-ul-A’immah, and had become quite sated with his ministry, because he had entirely fettered the hands of tyrants and oppressors, and restrained their extortionate demands and exactions, so that that party were unable to succeed in acquiring what their ambition and tyranny suggested.

Amīr Nūḥ, was in urgent need of his army’s services, to enable him to oppose his uncle, Amīr Is-hāk, whilst the troops began to show a rebellious spirit towards him, and an inclination to take the side of his uncle. A party of the officers of his army, tyrants and enemies to progress and good government, proceeded to the presence of Amīr Nūḥ, and stated that all the dissatisfaction and discontent among his retinue and troops, the confusion in the country, and division in the state, was caused by the Wazir, Shams-ul-A’immah. “Give him,” they demanded, “over into our hands, or otherwise we will all join your uncle.” Amīr Nūḥ was constrained by necessity to deliver the Imām into the hands of those tyrants, and they brought him forth. At the entrance of the royal residence there stood two tall white poplar-trees. These they bent downwards, and, fastening each of that unfortunate minister’s feet to a branch of either tree which was nearest it, let the trees spring back again into their upright

* Other authors mention hostilities between Amīr Nūḥ and his uncle Is-rāhīm.
* Jibāl, or the Highlands of ’Irāk, is meant here.
1 Faṣīb-I, under the events of the year 335 H., mentions that Abū ’Alī-Sīmjar became hostile towards Amīr Nūḥ, son of Naṣr, and that the troops demanded of him the Wazir, Ḥākim Abū-I-Faṣī, son of Muḥammad, and that the Amīr had to comply, whether he liked it or not, and that they put the Wazir to death, after he had held that office four years. After his being thus put to death, Amīr Nūḥ conferred the office of Wazir upon Shams-ul-A’immah; so it seems from this, that our author has confused the two ministers into one.
position, and that great man was thus torn asunder. This occurrence took place in the year 335 H.

Amīr Nūḥ, son of Naṣr, died in 343 H., and he was styled by the title of Amīr-i-Ḥamīd, or the Laudable Amīr.

VII. 'A.bd'-UL-MALIK, SON OF NŪḤ, SĀMĀNĪ.

On the decease of Amīr Nūḥ, the son of Naṣr, the whole of the great nobles and principal commanders of the troops agreed together to give their allegiance to his son, Abū-l-Fawāris-i-'Abd-ul-Malik, and they accordingly placed him on the throne. The Wazīr's office was given to Abū Manṣūr, Muḥammad, son of Al'-Azīz, and the commander over the Amīr's troops was Abū Sa'id-i-Bakir, son of Al-Malik, Al-Farghānī.

Amīr 'Abd-ul-Malik based the administration of the government of his dominions upon the rules of justice and rigour, and placed Wālīs [governors] in different parts, while others of the great nobles were retained by him in authority near his own person. An arrangement was entered into with Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of Buwīyah respecting his territory, for the sum of 200,000 ruknī dwāns. This treaty was concluded, in accordance with the mandate of the Amīr 'Abd-ul-Malik, by Abū Sa'id-i-Bakir, son of Al-Malik, Al-Farghānī, before mentioned, who was the general of his troops; but Abū Sa'id being suspected of partiality in this matter towards the Dilamān and the family of Buwīyah, Amīr 'Abd-ul-Malik put him to death. He also imprisoned the Wazīr, and subsequently put him to death likewise, as both he and Abū Sa'id had become tainted with the doctrine of the Karāmiṭah sect of heretics. The command of his troops was entrusted to Alb-Tagīn, the Ḥājib [chamberlain],

---

2 Amīr 'Abd-ul-Malik made Abū Ja'far, ul-'Uṭbā, his Wazīr, according to other authors.

3 See the dynasty of the Dīālamāh, page 55.

4 In Faṣḥ'ī, Alb-Tagīn is first mentioned in the year 267 H. in the following words:—"Birth of Alb-Tagīn, the freedman (ج) of Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, Sāmānī." According to the same excellent authority in 346 H., Abū Manṣūr, son of 'Abd-ur-Razzāk, who had been made Wālī [ruler] of Hirīt [which appears to have always formed a province of itself, from its constant separate mention], that same year left it, and retired to Tūs, thus throwing up his command.
until the year 350 H., when Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik, having one evening to the Maidan or Course to amuse himself in playing Chaugān, fell from his horse and was killed, after having reigned for a period of little over seven years.

VIII. MANŞUR, SON OF NŪH, SĀMĀNĪ.

On the decease of Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik, the commanders of the troops, and the heads and elders of the religious bodies and the law, at the capital [Bukhārā], met together,

Great agitation and commotion took place at Hirāt in consequence, and the government was bestowed upon the Ḥājib, or chamberlain, Alb-Tīğīn. The latter sent his deputy, Abū Isḥāq-i-Tāhirī, thither; but in the same year Abū Sālīḥ was seized and bound and removed, and Ḥusain, son of Ῥibāl, came to Hirāt as Alb-Tīğīn's deputy. * * * In 350 H. Hirāt was given to Abū-Ḥasan-Sīnajūr. This Alb-Tīğīn is the Turkish slave who was master of Sabuk-Tīğīn, who was also a Turkish slave, and father of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī; some persons, who appear to have been unable to read Persian for themselves, gave called him by all sorts of names in their so-called "Histories of India," and in professed translations, such as "Alputtekeln," "Abistageen," "Abistagy," "Abistagi," "Alepteggin," and this, from Dow down to Marshman, and his "Samanides" and "Aluptugean," who "rose through the gradations of office to the government of Candahar [which is never once mentioned by any writer of that period] or Ghuznī"—he is not quite sure which.

Abū Sulfān-i-Dā'ūd, Al-Fanākāfī, says in 351 H. Manşūr succeeded in 49 H.

* Chaugān is a game somewhat resembling tennis, but played on horseback, and with a stick with one end bent, instead of a bat. The Turks were passionately fond of it. Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik, Sāmānī, was riding at full speed after the ball, when he fell from his horse, and was so injured thereby that he died. Kuṭb-ud-dīn, I-bak, the first of the Turkish slave-kings of Dihīf, was also killed from a fall while playing at this same game.

* Faṣīḥ-fī says, "This occurred in the year 348 H., although some say in 51 H.," and, that "it happened either whilst playing at Chaugān, or whilst hunting." He had reigned seven years, six months, and eleven days.

* There is great discrepancy here between our author and others. The Rūḥ-i-Guzfāh, Nusakh-i-Jahān-Ārā, Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh, Tarīkh-i-Ibrāhīm, Montekeb-ut-Tawārīkh, Khulāṣat-ul-Akhbār, Tarīkh-i-Yaṣāfī, and ust, and not the least trustworthy history, the Mufājal-i-Faṣīḥ-fī, all say that Abū-Sālīḥ, son of 'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, surnamed Us-Sadāfī, the son, of the brother of the late Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik, succeeded his father. The first event mentioned in the latter work, under the year 349 H., is "Accession of the throne of Manṣūr, son of 'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, son of Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, son of Iṣmā'īl, Sāmānī." What is most strange in our author's statement is that he only mentions one name of the two; and therefore I suspect he has confused them. All the copies of the MS., however, are alike in this point.
and held consultation whether they should raise to the throne Abū Šāliḥ-i-Mansūr, son of Nūḥ, the late Amir’s brother, or the latter’s son.

At this juncture Alb-Tigin, the Amir-i-Ḫājib [Lord-Chamberlain], was absent in Khurāsān, and the Wazir of the late Amir was ‘Ali Al-Bal’ami⁹, between whom and the Amir-i-Ḫājib great unanimity and concord existed. The Wazir wrote to Alb-Tigin to consult with him on this matter, and have his advice, to which Amir Alb-Tigin wrote in reply that the son’s right to succeed his father to the throne was greater than that of the father’s brother¹; but, before Alb-Tigin’s reply had time to arrive, the whole of the soldiery, the great nobles, and the heads of religion and law, had agreed to place Amir Manṣūr, son of Nūḥ, on the throne, and had already installed him thereon. When the news reached Alb-Tigin respecting Amir Manṣūr’s elevation to the sovereignty, he despatched messengers and agents in order to stop by the way, those bearing his letter of reply, and to bring it back, but they did not succeed in finding the Ḳāṣids, or couriers, who bore it.

Amir Alb-Tigin [at this period] held the government of the province of Nīshāpūr from the Sāmānī Court, but it was [now] conferred upon Ibn ’Abd-ur-Razzāk.²

---

¹ His name is not correctly given by our author. His right name is Abū ’Alī, son of ’Abd-ullāh, Muḥammad, Al-Bal’ami; and on the authority of the Āṣar-ul-Nuzārā, Tārīkh-i-Yaṣa’ī, and other works, Abū ’Alī was the translator of the Tārīkh of Imām Muḥammad Jarīr-ut-Tabarī, as stated in the preface to that translation. See note ⁴, page 44.

² Other writers state quite contrary to this, and say that Alb-Tigin, having risen so as to be considered one of the greatest Amīrs, was written to, and asked which of the two named he preferred being raised to the throne. He wrote in reply that the uncle was the best of the two; but, before his reply came, the nobles and great men had raised Manṣūr, son of the late ’Abd-ul-Malik, to the throne. On this account Manṣūr cherished enmity towards him, or at least Alb-Tigin thought so. Fasih-i says nothing whatever respecting the letter to the Wazir, or his advice as to the succession. Had Alb-Tigin written what our author states he did, it was entirely in favour of the son, and therefore if Manṣūr was the son he could have no cause to entertain enmity against him; but, if the uncle, the case would be different. I have been very careful to give the exact words here.

³ It was conferred upon Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Simjūr in 351 H., he having become Šāhib-ul-Jaʿīb, or commander of the troops, and proceeded to Nīshāpūr; and the government of Hirāt was conferred upon Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of ’Umro Al-Ŷābī. After four months it was bestowed upon Ṭalḥah, son of Muḥamma)i, Un-Nisā’ī. In 352 H. Alb-Tigin died.
Alb-Tigın was filled with wonder and astonishment, and he determined to proceed from Nishāpur to the court of Bukhārā; but, when he had reached Balkh, on the way thither, having been informed respecting the change in the heart of Amir Mašūr towards him, on account of the letter he had despatched [which had fallen into Mašūr’s hands], on reaching Balkh, he turned aside, and proceeded towards Ghaznīn. Amir Mašūr despatched a commission after him, and pacified his mind [by assuring him of his favour].

In this reign, Hasan, son of Būwīlah, died; and his son, Fanā Khusrau, removed his father’s treasures, and proceeded to Baghdaḍ, overcame his uncle, Bakhtyār, and possessed himself of ‘Irāk. The ‘Ulamā and the Kāzīs he now put forward, and solicited an accommodation from Amir Mašūr, under the agreement that he, Fanā Khusrau, should retain possession of the territories of ‘Irāk, Rai, Gurgān, and Tabaristān, in fief, on payment of a tribute, at the rate of one thousand gold dinārs daily.

During the reign of Amir Mašūr, in Farghānah, Sijistān, and ‘Irāk, the whole of the great nobles were continually revolting from his authority; but the Almighty was pleased to bestow victory upon the Amir’s nobles and...

4 This too is quite contrary to other writers, who give much greater details of these matters. An army was sent by Mašūr against Alb-Tigın, who defeated it, and then marched against Ghaznīn, and gained possession of it. Upon this Mašūr proposed to move against him in person, but instead, he sent a still larger force than before against him, but did not succeed in reducing him. The details of these events are far too long for insertion here. I may mention, however, that “when Alb-Tigın appeared before Ghaznīn, the Šāhīb, or lord of Ghaznīn, refused to admit him, on which he invested it until it was reduced to such straits that the city was surrendered to him, and he put the Bādshāh of Ghaznīn to death.” On this Amir Mašūr sent 30,000 horse against him, but he suddenly fell upon them with a force of 6000, and defeated them. On this Mašūr gave up the contest. Our author says nothing more respecting Alb-Tigın until the middle of the next reign, and then, that he “had died at Ghaznīn.” The Mujmal-i-Faṣīb-i, which is quite silent on the hostility between Mašūr and his slave, and the cause of it, states, under the year 352 H., that “Alb Tigın, Turk, died at Ghaznīn in this year,” and that “Is-hāk, son of Alb-Tigın, assumed the government.” See note on this subject at page 71. Our author is entirely silent on the affairs of Khalaf, son of Ahmad, in Sijistān, and of his proceeding to the court of Bukhārā to obtain aid from Mašūr. See notes to Section XIV.

6 The investiture of Ghaznīn he means, no doubt.

8 See account of the Būwīlah’s farther on, and note to page 63.

7 The I. O. L. MS., the Bod. MS., and the R. A. S. MS., say “three thousand gold dinārs”; but the other MSS. give the amount as above.
troops, until the whole of the rebels were reduced to submission.

Amir Maṣūr died on Tuesday, the 11th of the month of Shawwāl, 365 H., after a reign of seventeen years, six months, and eleven days. He went by the surname of the Amir-i-Sadīd, or the Steadfast Amir.

IX. Nūḥ, son of Maṇṣūr, son of Nūḥ, Sāmānī.

His sons were Maṇṣūr, 'Abd-ul-Malik, and Muḥammad. On the departure from this world of Amir Maṇṣūr, son of Nūḥ, they [the people] gave their allegiance to his son, Amir Abū-l-Ḳasīm-i-Nūḥ, and raised him to his father’s throne. The Lord of the Faithful, Ut-Tā’l’u-L’illah, sent him a patent of investiture and a standard.

The new ruler directed Fāyīk-i-Khāṣah, and Tāsh, the Ḥājib [chamberlain], to assume the command of his troops and the direction of military affairs. Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Simjūr, who was the son of a slave of this dynasty, and ruled, in the name of Amir Nūḥ, over parts of Khorāsān, such as Hirāt and Niṣhāpūr, and over the territory of Māvar-ʿun-Nahr, received the title of Nāṣir-ud-Daulah from the Amir, and the territory of Tūs was added to the territories already held by him.

The office of Wazīr was conferred upon Abī-ul-Ḥasan-i-ʿAbd-ullah, son of Aḥmad Al-ʿUtbā; and Tāsh, the Ḥājib, was made head of the army, or commander-in-chief, with the title of Ḥisām-ud-Daulah. Ḵābūs, son of Waṣḥm-gīr, was made Wālī [governor] of Gurgān,

---

6 Five years previous to this event, in 360 H., Maḥmūd, son of Sabuk-Tīghn, was born.
7 The author’s arrangement of his work is by no means uniform; he sometimes mentions the sons of rulers, and at times leaves them out altogether. This too is often the case with respect to their titles. The title of Nūḥ was Ar-Riṣā, and other authors style him Nūḥ, son of Maṇṣūr, son of ʿAbd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, son of Naṣr, &c.
8 From one meaning of this word, Fāyīk appears to have been a secretary. The Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī calls him Fāyīk-i-Bak-Tūzūn.
9 His right name is Abū-l-ʾAbbas-i-Tāsh. So in all copies of the text.
4 The author of the Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī was of this family. The name has sometimes been written ʿUtbī. Guzīdah, and other most trustworthy works state that Abū ʿAlī, son of ʿAbd-ullah-i-Muḥammad, son of Baḥʿamī, translator of the Tārīkh-i-Ṭabarī, was his Wazīr. In the preface to that translation Maṇṣūr is styled son of Nūḥ.
and he and other nobles were despatched along with Tāsh into 'Irāk, in order to carry on hostilities against Buwiah, son of Al-Ḥasan, son of Buwiah. They fought a battle before the gate of Gurgān and were defeated, and Tāsh, the Ḥājib, was overthrown and had to retreat.

After some time Tāsh and Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Sīmjūr, both of them, revolted; but, after some struggles, and victory over the Dīlamah of the family of Buwiah, they both returned to their allegiance; and the command of Amir Nūh's forces, after some time, fell to Abī 'Ali, son of Sīmjūr, and Nīshāpūr was made over to him, and he received the title of 'Imād-ud-Daulah.

In this reign likewise, Amir Abū Mūsā-i-Hārūn, I-lak Khān, determined to attack Bukhārā, and Amir Nūh fled to Āmul, and kept in retirement. Abī 'Ali, son of Sīmjūr, now began to act in a rebellious manner. I-lak Khān, after having succeeded in gaining possession of the country [Bukhārā] and overthrowing the government, became greatly afflicted with hæmorrhoids, and determined to retire into his own territory again. He sent for Amir 'Abd-ul-'Aziz, son of Nūh, son of Naṣr, who was an uncle of Amir Nūh's, and presented him with a robe of honour, and made over the territory to him, after which he retired towards Turkistān. Amir Nūh, son of Maṃṣūr, brought assistance from the Turkmāns, and set out in pursuit of I-lāk Khān until he came up with him; but I-lāk Khān faced about, and inflicted a defeat upon his pursuers before the gate of Sāmrukand; and on his way back to Turkistān the Khān died.

Amir Nūh returned again to Bukhārā, and once more

8 So in the original; but it was against the forces of 'Uzd-ud-Daulah, Abū Shujā'-i-Fanā Khusrau, the Dīlamī, that Amir Nūh's forces were sent. The details are very long.
8 Our author's account here is very confused. The details would occupy more space than I can spare.
7 Abū-l-'Abbās-i-Tāsh, surnamed Ḥisām-ud-Daulah, died in 379 H., at Jurjān. Some copies of the text have ʿuṣūr for ʿuṣūl.
8 This is incorrect; it was Buğhrā Khān, ruler of Turkistān, not I-lāk, who was his son and successor, as mentioned farther on by our author himself. According to Guzidah and other histories, Abū 'Ali-i-Sīmjūr contemplated assuming independent sovereignty, and sought support from Buğhrā Khān to aid him in doing so. Buğhrā Khān's coming was after Nūh and Sabuk-Tighn proceeded to Hirāt to attack Abū 'Ali-i-Sīmjūr. See note 4 to page 46.
9 In Māzandarān.
acquired strength; but, through the rebellion of Abū 'Alī-i-Simjūr, the affairs of Khurāsān had fallen into great disorder, and [to make matters worse] Amīr Alb-Tīgin had likewise died at Ghaznīn, and Sabuk-Tīgin had succeeded him there, and become very powerful.

The people of Balkh, on account of the weak state of the Sāmānī ruler's power, implored aid from Amīr Sabuk-Tīgin from the tyranny of Fāyik-i-Khāshah, and he had marched thither. Amīr Nūh sent a sagacious person to him, and great graciousness and courtesy passed between them, and compacts were entered into. Amīr Sabuk-Tīgin came to Kāsh and Naḵshāb, and Amīr Nūh came out of Bukhārā [to meet him], and they united [their forces], and afterwards marched into Khurāsān to crush Abū 'Alī-i-Simjūr. When they reached the confines of Tāl-kān, the agents and instigators of the Karāmītah and Mulāhidah schismatics had arrived in that territory, and a great number of the people of those parts had listened to and accepted their doctrine. Amīr Sabuk-Tīgin laid hands upon the whole of them, and made holy war, as by orthodox institutes prescribed, [upon them], and obtained the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn.

When Bū 'Alī-i-Simjūr became aware that Amīr Nūh and Sabuk-Tīgin had set out towards Hirāt, he left Nīshā-

---

1 The only correct way of spelling his name as given with the vowel points—s followed by the short vowel a, silent b followed by the short vowel u, and silent k = Sabuk; t with the short vowel i, and silent g, the long vowel i, and silent n = Tīgin —  (Sabuk-Tīgin). Neither "Sībektekein," nor "Sābak Taqīn," "Subuktugeen," "Sībektegin," "Subuktāgi," &c.

2 Sabuk-Tīgin had certainly succeeded; but between his accession and Alb-Tīgin's death sixteen years had intervened, and three other persons had administered the government.

3 "Kesh," as this place has been styled in some works, is an impossible word. The Persian is كش and by any change of the vowel points it cannot be made Kesh. It must be either Kash, Ḧīsh, or Kūsh; but the first is correct.

4 Fāṣīḥ-i says, under 382 n., "Amīr Nūh, son of Mansūr, Sāmānī, and Amīr Nāṣir-ud-dīn, Sabuk-Tīgin along with him, came to Hirāt, and fought a battle with Abū 'Alī-i-Simjūr, and overthrew him." It was in the following year, 383 n., that Buḥrā Khān advanced against Bukhārā. Our author has put this event previously to Nūh and Sabuk-Tīgin joining against Abū 'Alī-i-Simjūr, not only confusing the order of events, but also giving Buḥrā Khān a wrong name. His title and name was Shīhāb-ud-Daulah, Ḥārūn, son of Sulīnān, son of I-lak Khān, surnamed Buḥrā Khān, the Turk, and he held the tract of territory from Kūshghar to the Jīthūn. His son, I-lak Khān, succeeded him. In 384 n. Amīr Nūh gave the government of Khurāsān to Sabuk-Tīgin.
pür and proceeded thither. Amīr Nūḥ, on the day of the engagement between the two armies, gave up the command of the troops to Amīr Sabuk-Tigīn. When their forces encountered each other before the gate of Hīrāt, and, during the engagement, Dārā, son of Ḫābūs, son of Washm-ḡīr, who was on the side of Abū 'Alī, deserted, and went over to the other side; and Abū 'Alī was overthrown, through the misfortune of his having acceded, as well as most of the chief men of that territory, and his army also, to the exhortations of the Ḫarāmīṭahs, and having become contaminated with that heresy. He had founded a Masjid-i-Jāmi', or great masjid, at Nīshāpūr, intending, when it should be completely finished, that the Ḫuṭbāh should be read there for Muştaņṣār-i-Mişrī. This victory was gained by Amīr Nūḥ, son of Mašnūr, in the middle of the month of Ramaţān, in the year 384 H.; and, after this success, the affairs of the province of Hīrāt were arranged by Amīr Nūḥ, and he proceeded to the territory of Nīshāpūr.

Abū 'Alī-i-Sīmjūr now sought for peace; but, on his request not being acceded to, he left Nīshāpūr, and set out towards Rai, and sent his son to Abū-l-Ḫaṣan, son of Buwīhah. Amīr Nūḥ was now left to return [to his capital]; and Sabuk-Tigīn and his son, Amīr Maḥmūd, were stationed at Nīshāpūr; but, as Amīr Nūḥ paused at Īṣ, Sabuk-Tigīn despatched his son, Amīr Maḥmūd, to the Court; and he was nominated to the command of the troops, and the title of Saif-ud-Daulah was conferred upon him, together with the government of Nīshāpūr. Subsequently to this, Amīr Nūḥ, son of Mašnūr, returned to Bukhārā, leaving Balkh, Hīrāt, Nīshāpūr, and the territory of Khurāsān, under the care of Amīr Sabuk-Tigīn and his son, Amīr Maḥmūd, the latter of whom took up his quarters at Nīshāpūr.

6 With a body of troops.
7 The great masjid, in which the Ḫuṭbāh is read on Fridays, is called by this name.
8 The rival Khalfah, whose seat was in Miṣr, and who was head of the Ḫarāmīṭah sect at this period, was Ul-ʿAzīz Billumah, Mašnūr-i-Nizār, who died in 386 H.
9 Faṣīḥ-ī says Nūḥ defeated Abū 'Alī-i-Sīmjūr at Nīshāpūr, and that Abū 'Alī fled.
10 He was not “Amīr” Maḥmūd then, and the author's intention here is merely to call him by the title he subsequently acquired.
11 So in the original.
In the month of Rabî‘-ul-awwal, 385 H., Abū 'Ali-i-Simjûr came out of Gurgân, and advanced to Nishâpûr, with the intention of compelling Maḥmûd to relinquish it, and the people of the city espoused his cause. Maḥmûd, after much opposition and hard fighting, was defeated, for he had but a small force with him, and retired again to Hirât. Abû 'Ali-i-Simjûr again gained possession of Nishâpûr, and continued there until Sabuk-Tîgin, with a large army, advanced towards that place. Abû 'Ali moved forward towards Tûs to oppose his advance, and there they encountered each other, and a severe and sanguinary battle ensued. Amîr Maḥmûd made an attack upon the rear of Abû 'Ali’s army, and broke through his ranks, and overthrew Fâyîk, who was with him, and completed the defeat of Abû 'Ali’s army. Fâyîk retired to Bukhârâ, and there was thrown into confinement, and died; Amîr Sabuk-Tîgin proceeded to Bîlkâh, and took up his quarters there; and Amîr Maḥmûd returned again to Nishâpûr.

At length, on Friday, the 13th of the month of Rajab, 387 H., Amîr Nûh, son of Mansûr, departed this life. His reign extended over a period of twenty-one years and nine months; and in this same year Amîr Sabuk-Tîgin also died.

X. MANŞÛR, SON OF NUH, SON OF MANŞÛR.

The late Amîr Nûh had nominated his son, Amîr Mansûr, as his heir and successor; and, when the former died, his son ascended his father’s throne. He entrusted the command of his forces to Fâyîk-i-Khâṣah; and Abû Mansûr-i-'Azîz, who, through fear of Amîr Maḥmûd, son

* Other writers say that Fâyîk, after this defeat, separated from Abû 'Ali, and feared to return to Amîr Nûh, although he had permission to do so. He went, therefore, and joined I-lak Khân, son of Bughrî Khân, and obtained high rank in his service.

* Hostility arose between Amîr Nûh and Sabuk-Tîgin in 386 H.

* Some state that Abû 'Ali and Fâyîk sent a force of slaves and had him put to death; others, that it was supposed he was assassinated at the instigation of the Saḥib, Ibn-i-'Ubâd, the Wazîr of Fâkhr-ud-Daulah, Abû-i-Hasan-i-Buwfah, by the Karâmîthah schismatics. Faṣîb-î says, trAmîr Ar-Râsî-i-Nûh, died at Nishâpûr, 13th of Rajab 387 H.; and, in the same year, Sabuk-Tîgin, the slave of the house of Sâmîh, also died."

* He has not been mentioned before, and who or what he was, the author does not say; but Faṣîb-î mentions that the Wazîr, Abû Mansûr-i-'Azîz, was removed from that office in 388 H., on account of disagreement with Fâyîk, the Hajib.
of Sabuk-Tigin, had fled, and retired to Isfanjāb*, was brought back again. At the time of returning he had implored help from I-lak Khān, soliciting that he would take vengeance upon the enemies and opponents of Amir Mansūr. When Abū Mansūr, son of 'Azīz, reached the gate of Samrākand he seized him; and at this period Fāyīk-i-Khāsah was at Samrākand. I-lak Khān summoned Fāyīk to his presence, and despatched him to Bukhārā with an army; and, on Amir Mansūr becoming aware of it, he left Bukhārā, and retired to Āmul.

When Fāyīk reached Bukhārā, and approached the gate of the palace of the Sāmān princes, he showed great emotion, and became greatly agitated, and went and joined Mansūr [Amir Mansūr, son of Nūh], and asked of him why he had left the government, and abandoned the capital. Mansūr, on this, returned to Bukhārā again, and left the office of commander of the troops [there, as previously stated.] to Fāyīk, and in Khurāsān the command over the troops was given to Bak-Tūzūn⁷, as Amīr Maḥmūd had proceeded to Ghaznī, in order to take possession of the territory of his father, Sabuk Tigin [who was now dead], and he left Bak-Tūzūn the command over the forces in Khurāsān⁶.

At this period Bak-Tūzūn slew Abū-l-Ḵāsim-i-Simjūr, and took up his residence at Nīshāpūr; and, on this, Amīr Maḥmūd marched an army from Ghaznī towards Khurāsān⁶.

---

* Also written Sīfanjāb.

⁷ In every copy of our author which I have compared, except one, the first letter of this word is m, and the other letters also differ; but from other histories it is fully proved that the name of this personage is Bak-Tūzūn. A similar name occurs in the history of the Dīlāmah; and sometimes the Bak is omitted, as in the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh. Guzīdah also has Bak-Tūzūn. The word, Bak, (ب) is quite a distinct word from Beg (ب). The Shams-ul-Lughāt describes it as written with Arabic kāf [i. e. not gāf], and short a—Bak, signifying "a lord," "a great man." It is a title or surname, like Bak in Bak-Taghdīf, Alb in Alb-Tigīn, and Balkā in Balkā-Tigīn, &c. The Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmī calls him Fāyīk-i-Bak-Tūzūn.

⁶ The command of the troops, and the government which he had held, when the late Amīr died. Other, authors state that Mansūr would not confirm Maḥmūd in that appointment, and that he became hostile in consequence.

⁸ A great deal of detail is wanted here to elucidate these transactions. In the month of Rabī'-ul-Awwal, 388 H., Abū-l-Ḵāsim, the commander of the Simjūr forces, was defeated by Bak-Tūzūn, on which he retired to Fūshanj. Bak-Tūzūn again assembled a force, and advanced to Fūshanj against Abū-l-Ḵāsim; but an agreement was arrived at between them. I have not space to give further details.
Bak-Tūzūn, being aware that he could not cope with Māḥmūd, evacuated Nishāpūr, and set off for the presence of Amir Manṣūr. The latter had left Bukhārā, and had arrived at Marw, and Fāyīk was with him; but, when Bak-Tūzūn joined him, Amir Manṣūr had reached Saraḵhs. Fāyīk-i-Khāṣah and Bak-Tūzūn now conspired together to dethrone Amir Manṣūr; and, on the night of the 12th of the month of Šafar, 389 H., they removed him from the sovereignty, after which they left Saraḵhs, and went back to Marw again. There they agreed together to place Abū-l-Fawāris-i-ʿAbd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, on his brother’s throne. This they carried out, and they deprived Amir Abū-l-Ḥirāʾ-i-Manṣūr, son of Nūḥ, of his sight, after he had reigned one year and eight months.

XI. ABŪ-L-FAWĀRIS-I-ʿABD-UL-MALIK, SON OF NŪḤ.

By the time that Fāyīk-i-Khāṣah and Bak-Tūzūn had placed Amir ʿAbd-ul-Malik upon the throne, Amir Māḥmūd had arrived at Balkh; and, on being made acquainted with this occurrence, he advanced to the gates of Marw in order to revenge the treatment which Amir Manṣūr had suffered at their hands. They, however, sent an agent to negotiate with Māḥmūd; and an arrangement was entered into between them and him, whereby it was agreed that Hirāt and Balkh should be held by Māḥmūd, and Marw and Nishāpūr by them. Amir Māḥmūd, after this arrangement, again retired, and this was on Tuesday, the 26th of the month of Jamādi-ul-awwal, in the year 389 H.

1 Faṣīḥ-ī says, on the 8th of Šafar, and that they then deprived Amir Manṣūr of his sight. His reign, according to the same authority, was one year and nine months.

2 According to some, Abū-l-Ḥirāṣ was his title, but Abū-l-Ḥirā is correct. The whole of the Sāmānī rulers had titles of this kind, but the author does not always give them. I have supplied them.

3 He had deposed his own brother Ismāʾīl, and had assumed the Ghaznī throne, a short time previous to the accession of Abū-l-Fawāris-i-ʿAbd-ul-Malik.

4 Māḥmūd fought a battle against ʿAbd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, who fled, along with Fāyīk and Bak-Tūzūn; the two former retired to Bukhārā, and the latter to Nishāpūr. Abū-l-Ḵāsim-i-Ṣūmūr retired to Kūhistān, and Khurāsān was left in Māḥmūd’s possession. About this time, Māḥmūd gave the command of his troops to his brother Naṣr, and made Balkh the capital of his dominions. See notes to Māḥmūd’s reign.
At this period, Dārā, son of Kābūs-i-Wāshm-gīr, was Wālī [governor] of Gurgān, and incited a party of the slaves, of the Sāmānī kings [who appear to have taken refuge with him], to follow the forces of Amir Maḥmūd, with the object of plundering his retinue; and they set out in pursuit of them. Amir Naṣr, son of Sabuk-Tīğīn, the brother of Maḥmūd, had charge of the rear [column] of his brother's forces, and joined battle with the body of pursuers, and also despatched a messenger to Maḥmūd to inform him of the state of affairs. Amir Maḥmūd turned back, and proceeded to the scene of action; but, previously to his reaching it, Amir Naṣr had already defeated the assaultants, and put them to the rout.

When the party of nobles, at Marw, became aware that Maḥmūd had made a retrograde movement in that direction, they evacuated it, and retired to Bukhārā. Fayīk, shortly after these events took place, died in the month of Shā'bān, of this same year. He had deeply regretted, and heartily repented of the acts he had committed, but all was now of no avail, and his contrition came too late; and all the adherents of the Sāmānī dynasty became separated and dispersed.

After the death of Fayīk, Amir Abū-l-Hasan, I-lak'-i-

5 Styled nobles in following paragraph, and refer to slaves such as Albtīgīn and Sabuk-Tīgīn, who were some of the chief men in the state.

6 Maḥmūd having succeeded his father in 389 H., by the dethronement of his brother Ismā'īl, appointed his brother Naṣr commander of his army in Khurāsān, and made Balkh the capital of his dominions. At this period, Amir Abū Ibrāhīm-i-Ismā'īl, son of Nūḥ, the last of the Sāmānīs, was struggling to recover the dominions of his ancestors, after having escaped from Bukhārā when I-lak-i-Naṣr, son of Bughrā Khān, entered it, and had, just before this period, succeeded in reaching Khwārazm. At this time he had come to Bukhārā again, from whence he went to Abīward, and from thence to Nishāpūr. Naṣr, brother of Maḥmūd, on this, evacuated Nishāpūr with all despatch, and retreated precipitately towards Hirāt. Subsequently, Maḥmūd advanced to Nishāpūr, upon which Abū Ibrāhīm fled therefrom, and took shelter with Shams-ul-Ma'ālīf, Kābūs, son of Wāshm-gīr. This must have been the time, when, according to our author, Amir Naṣr had charge of the rear [column] of his brother's army, but he has related these events in his usual confused manner, and has not mentioned even the name of Abū Ibrāhīm-i-Ismā'īl. See note 1, page 52.

7 Other authors state that Amir Maḥmūd, son of Sabuk-Tīgīn, marched against Bak-Tūzūn and Fayīk, who had conspired against their sovereign, dethroned him, and deprived him of his sight, drove them out of Khurāsān, and possessed himself of that territory; and that Bak-Tūzūn and Fayīk fled
Naṣr, son of 'Ali, brother of the Khān-i-Buzurg, or the Great Khān, advanced from Farghānah, and appeared before the gates of Bukhārā, in the month of Zī-Ka‘dah, in the year 389 H. He pretended to the people that he had come to render alād to Amir Abū-i-Fawāris-i-'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ. Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik despatched the nobles and principal officers still remaining in his service to receive him; but, as soon as they approached, he gave orders to seize the whole of them; and, on the 10th of Zī-Ka‘dah of that same year, he entered Bukhārā. Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik concealed himself; but I-lak-i-Naṣr asked him to return, and succeeded in getting the Sāmānī prince into his power; after which he sent him to Īrjand, and the dominion of the Sāmānis terminated. The dynasty, into Māwar-un-Nahr, and once more conspired with I-lak Khān, who, under pretence of aiding Amir 'Abd-ul-Malik, whom they had set up, marched out of Kāshghar, and appeared before Bukhārā.

I-lak, son of Bughrā Khān, took Bukhārā, 10th of Zī-Ka‘dah, 389 H. The blind Amir Manṣūr, 'Abd-ul-Malik, Ibrahim, and Ya‘kūb, the four sons of Nūḥ, were made captive at the same time.

One copy has Īrjand, but other writers give Īrjand, and the fortress of Īrjand; and state that there he was confined till his death, which took place in 389 H. It was the capital of Khwārazm, and the name of a province: the 'Arabs called it Jurjānīlah. It is the present Īrganj.

Other most trustworthy historians, some of whose works I have been quoting from, give an account of the reign, or rather struggles, of another prince of this dynasty, brother of Manṣūr and 'Abd-ul-Malik, which, in a condensed form, is as follows:—

"ABŪ IBRĀHĪM-I-ISMĀ‘ĪL, SON OF NŪḤ.

"He was known by the title of Muntaṣir, one of the significations of which word is 'extricating one's self from any calamity or misfortune,' which may have reference to the following circumstances. During the uproar and confusion which ensued upon the seizure of 'Abd-ul-Malik by I-lak-i-Naṣr, Abū Ismā‘īl, having covered himself with the mantle of a slave-girl, succeeded, by means of that disguise, in getting out of the throng. For three days he lay concealed in the dwelling of an old woman, after which time he managed to effect his escape from the place in the dress of a common soldier, and reached the territory of Khwārazm. Some of the nobles and soldiery of the Sāmānī dynasty, on becoming aware of his escape, hastened there to join him. Muntaṣir by this means acquired some strength; and he began to prepare his followers to make an effort to regain the territory of his ancestors. For several years he carried on a desultory warfare on the confines of Khurāsān and Māwar-un-Nahr. He encountered the troops of I-lak Khān [I-lak-i-Naṣr], and the governor of Khurāsān, on several occasions, with various success. At length, in the month of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal 395 H., while in the encampment of a
from the commencement of the reign of Ismā'il up to this time, had continued for a period of one hundred and eight years.

The following table gives the genealogical tree of the race and dynasty of the Sāmānis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Son</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mī-Dād</td>
<td>Kar-Kīn</td>
<td>Bahram Jash-Nash</td>
<td>Bahram Chūbīn</td>
<td>Nūshad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mī-Dād</td>
<td>Kar-Kīn</td>
<td>Bahram Jash-Nash</td>
<td>Bahram Chūbīn</td>
<td>Nūshad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nomad tribe, in whose tents he had sought shelter, in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā, he was put to death by Māh-Rūe [moon-faced], the chief of the tribe. The Muşmal-i-Faṣīḥ-i states that Māh-Rūe was 'Amīl or subordinate governor of the district in the vicinity of Ürgand, on the part of Sultan Māḥmūd, and that Māḥmūd put Māh-Rūe to death for his treatment of Amīr Abū ʿIbrāhīm. Thus ended the dynasty of the Sāmāns, none of the race being left, after having lasted one hundred and three years, nine months, and eleven days. The account given by Abū-Sulṭān-i-Daʾūd, Al-Fanākati, is slightly different from this.

The I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and its prototype the R. A. S. MS., for they seem, as far as errors go, to be copies of each other, give one hundred and eighty years as the period during which this dynasty continued. Gūzḏah says one hundred and two years, six months, and twenty days.

To make it more intelligible I have reversed it, as the author begins with the last ruler. It must be also borne in mind that, as such great difference exists in all the MSS. as to the names before Sāmān, and that no vowel points are given, they cannot be absolutely depended upon. I give the variations within brackets, and also mention the result of my comparison with other writers.

This word of course may possibly be read Gargīn, &c., as in Persian, may be ē or ĝ.

No doubt Nūshir is correct.

Faṣīḥ-i gives the following names:—Sāmān-i-Khaddāt, son of Amīr; son of Māḥmūd, son of Bahram Chūbīn, son of Bahram Ḥashnūgh, who is said to have been stationed at Rai and Ahwāz, as Wāli of Ḥazarbājn on the part of Hurmuz, son of Nūshirwān.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Rulers</th>
<th>Period of Reign</th>
<th>Sons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ismai'il, son of Ahmed</td>
<td>Eight years.</td>
<td>Nasr, Mansur, Ibrailm, Yahya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Nasr-I-Ahmad, son of Ismai'il</td>
<td>Six years and three months.</td>
<td>Ya'kub, Asad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nub, son of Nasr</td>
<td>Twelve years and three months.</td>
<td>'Abd-ul-Malik, Abu Sahili-Mansur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nub</td>
<td>Little over eight years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Sahili-Mansur, son of Nub</td>
<td>Seventeen years, six months, and eleven days.</td>
<td>Mansur, 'Abd-ul-Malik, Muhammad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nub, son of Abu Sahili-Mansur,</td>
<td>Twenty-one years and nine months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansur, son of Nub</td>
<td>One year and six months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Nub</td>
<td>Between nine and ten months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 From the period he acquired sole rule. Tarikh-i-Guzfah gives seven years and ten months.
8 One MS. gives twelve years and nine months, another eleven years and nine months.
9 Two copies have eight years.
1 One MS. has seventeen years; another seventeen years, six months, and eleven days; two others, eighteen; but, as he assumed power in 350 H., and died in Shawwal, 365 H., the above is correct.
10 There were other sons besides these. See note 8 page 52.
SECTION X.

THE DYNASTY OF THE DĪLAMAH MALIKS AT THE DAR-UL-KHILĀFAT OF BAGHDAD, AND IN 'IRĀK.

The first person of the family of the Dīlamah, who rose to power, was Mākān, son of Kākī, Dīlamī 1, who was

1 Mākān, son of Kākī, was certainly a native of Dīlam, but he was not of the same family as the Buwāhs, and belonged to an entirely different dynasty, called the Āl-i-Ziyār.

According to the most trustworthy writers, the first of the family of Buwāh, who attained to sovereign power, was 'Imād-ud-Daulah, Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-ʿAlī, who afterwards received the title of 'Imād-ud-Daulah, the son of Buwāh, son of Fānā Khusrāw, Dīlamī. 'Imād-ud-Daulah’s father is said to have been a fisherman. Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-ʿAlī was an officer in the service of Mardāwjan, as he had previously been in that of Mākān, son of Kākī, whom Mardāwjan had succeeded, when Mākān retired, and entered the service of the Sāmānīs. Mardāwjan had conferred some territory upon Abū-l-Ḥasan, who, in 321 h., considered himself sufficiently powerful to endeavour to gain possession of Iṣfahān and the territory of 'Irāk for himself. Abū-l-Ḥasan accordingly marched against Iṣfahān, and defeated Muṣaffār, son of Yākūt, a slave of the 'Abbāsī dynasty, who was governor of Fārs for the Khālifah. Muṣaffār was defeated, and retired to Shīrāz, which was his father’s head-quarters. Mardāwjan did not approve of this movement on the part of Abū-l-Ḥasan, and he determined to march to Iṣfahān and oust him. Abū-l-Ḥasan was not sufficiently strong to oppose Mardāwjan, and was advised to turn his arms against Fārs. This he acted upon; and Yākūt, who came out of Shīrāz, the capital of Fārs, to oppose him, was overthrown. Abū-l-Ḥasan took possession of it, and made it his capital. This was in 321 h.; and he now assumed sovereignty, and read the Khuṭbah for himself, and coined money. In 323 h., on the death of Mardāwjan, at Iṣfahān, he determined to extend his conquests; and he gained possession of Iṣfahān, Rai, Ḥulwān, and other territories. He now made his eldest brother, Abū ʿAlī-i-Ḥasan, afterwards entitled Rukn-ud-Daulah, ruler of 'Irāk, and sent the youngest, Abū-l-Ḥusain-i-ʿĀḥmad, afterwards Muʿizz-ud-Daulah, to Kirmān. In 326 h., 'Imād-ud-Daulah, Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-ʿAlī, sent an envoy to Baghdad to the Khālifah-Ar-Raṣīl B’illah, and asked to be confirmed in the possession of his territory, which was granted; and, in the same year, 'Imād-ud-Daulah left his brother, Muʿizz-ud-Daulah, as his representative at Baghdad. In 330 h. 'Imād-ud-Daulah died, after a reign of nearly seventeen years, leaving no sons. Rukn-ud-Daulah, his eldest brother, succeeded him at Shīrāz, while Muʿizz-ud-Daulah, the youngest, remained at Baghdad as previously; but, in the course of that same year, Muʿizz-ud-Daulah set out on an expedition towards Miṣr and Shām. In 333 h. the Khālifah, Al-Muttaḳī B’illah, was blinded by Tūzūn, son of Abū-l-Wafā,
Wāli [sovereign] of Gurgān until the reign of Abū 'Alīş, Sāmānī, who succeeded in wrestling Gurgān from him, after considerable fighting. Mākān retired towards Rai, and sought shelter from Sham-gir [Washm-gir], son of Ayāz. Abū 'Alī went in pursuit of him, and fought an engagement with both of them, slew Mākān, son of Kākūt, and became powerful in that part.

Amīr Buwīah, Dīlamī, was with Mākān’s force; and he had a great number of followers and dependents, and grown-up sons, who were endowed with wisdom and valour, and great talent and ability. All of them rose to greatness and renown, and became sovereign princes; and for a considerable time they held the supreme authority and dominion at the Dār-ul-Khilāfāt of Baghdaḏ.

Notwithstanding the author made much search for information on this subject in the Tārīḵh-i-Ibn Haiṣam-i-Ṣānī, but little was to be found respecting them and their actions in those chronicles, on account of some confusion as to which preceded, which followed the other. The author, therefore, has written a short account of them, somewhat based on supposition and conjecture. If any errors have been made, he hopes he may be excused, since it is known that no mention is made of them in the histories of 'Ajam and Khurāsān, except very briefly.

a Turk, the Amīr-ul-Umrā [see note 1, page 58], who set up his son, Al-Mustakfī. We now come to the first ruler mentioned by our author, who, certainly appears to have had a very superficial knowledge of this dynasty. He takes little or no notice of the other two dynasties of Fārs and 'Irāk, and confines his account to those who ruled at Baghdaḏ. It is the most meagre and incorrect notice of these princes, that I am acquainted with; and, although the dynasty only terminated in 459 H., he ends his history of them in 388 H. Ample materials for a history of this dynasty are available; and I have been obliged to burden the translation with this long note to make the author’s account intelligible.

1 So stated in all the copies of the work examined, but erroneously; for it refers to Abū 'Alī, son of Ilyās, Sipahsālīr, or general of the forces of Amīr Naṣr, son of 'Abd-al-Momad, Sāmānī, who overthrew Mākān, son of Kākūt, as subsequently shown. See latter part of note 1, pages 36, 37.

1 The I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and of course the R. A. S. MS., have “and in Yamāḏ” after the word Šāfī, but not the other MSS. The word Šāfī at this place, in four of them, is doubtful; and, in two, another word follows. I think “Ibn Haiṣam-i-Fāryābī” [native of Fāryāb] is the correct name of this author.

1 A novel way of writing history, and our author’s account of this and other dynasties shows what such history is.
GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE DĪĀLAMAH PRINCES OF THE DYNASTY OF BUWĪAH, DĪLAMI.  

BUWĪAH

- Mu'izz-ud-Daulah, Abū'l-Ḥasan Ḥisam al-Ḥusayn.
- Fakhr-ud-Daulah wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Ḥasan (i. 'Alī).
- Rukn-ud-Daulah, Abū 'Alī-i-Ḥasan.

[Izz-ud-Dīn, Bakhtyār.

Fakhr-ud-Daulah.

- Muayyid-ud-Daulah, Buwīah.

'Uzd-ud-Daulah wa ud-Dīn, Fanā Khusrau.

Bāhā-ud-Daulah, [Khusrau Firūz].

Sharaf-ud-Daulah, Abū-l-Fawāris-i-Mākān.

Şamsām-ud-Daulah, Marzabān.

---

The whole of the MSS. compared do not contain this Tree, and, in those that do contain it, it is arranged in such a manner as to be almost unintelligible without reference to the different princes in the body of the work, besides being incorrect. The names within brackets I have added. The author mentions the names of ten out of eighteen persons, and gives an account of six only.

* Abū-l-Husayn is correct.
* His correct title and name was Sharaf-ud-Daulah-i-Shir-Zail.

* His title was 'Imād-ud-Daulah.
I. ABÛ-L-ḤASAN, SON OF BUWĪAH, UD-DİŁAMI.

He bore the title of Fakhr-ud-Daulah⁹; and he, first rose to power and dominion, from the time that he was Amīr [lord] of Āhwāz, when the Turks of Baghdād, whose chief and commander was Tūzūn, seized the person of the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Muttaquí Bʾillah, and deprived him of his sight, set him aside, and fixed a stipend for his support. Having done this, Tūzūn set up the dethroned Khalifah's son, Al-Mustakfī Bʾillah, in his stead, while Tūzūn himself became Amīr-ul-Umrā¹, and assumed the direction of the whole of the affairs of the Khilāfāt.

Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of Buwīah, assembled the troops of Dīlam, and marched towards Baghdād; and for a period of four months carried on hostilities with the Turks, at the expiration of which time the Turks were defeated, and put to flight. Abū-l-Ḥasan took possession of Baghdād, and his commands were obeyed in all matters respecting the government of the territory, and the Khilāfāt. A party of spies informed him, however, that the Khalifah, Al-Mustakfī, meditated treachery towards him, in order to get him into his power, and intended to put him to death if he succeeded in doing so. Abū-l-Ḥasan, however, determined to be beforehand and to anticipate his intention, and seized the person of the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Mustakfī Bʾillah, blinded him, and set up the Khalifah, Al-Muṭṭ'u- Lʾillah⁸, in his stead. According to the historian Uṣ-Ṭaḥrī³, he gave himself the title of Muʾizz-ud-Daulah, and took the whole power in the State into his own hands, so

⁹ He bore no such title: it was Muʾizz-ud-Daulah. His name also, as given by our author, is not correct. It was Abū-l-Ḥusain-i-Āḥmad. For his first rise to power see note ¹, page 55. His elder brother, Ḭmād-ud-Daulah, ought to have been the first mentioned here.

¹ Lord of Lords: a title adopted by the ministers, or rather tyrants, of the Khalifāhs, in the decline of their power. This title was also often conferred upon the chief commander of an army—a captain-general.

³ Faṣīḥ-i, among the events of the year 334 H., mentions the succession of Al-Muṭṭ'u-Lʾillah, and that he had no territory, and was agreeable to a stipend being allowed him.

⁸ As these events occurred in 334 H., and Muḥammad, son of Jaḥr-ūṭ-Ṭabarī, died at Baghdād, in 310 H., although some say in 311 H., our author must refer to the continuation of Ṭabarī's Chronicle by the Waṣḥr, Al-Balʿāmī.
that Al-Muṭī‘u-L‘illah was Khalifah only in name, while he ruled the country, issued his mandates, and exercised the supreme authority over the Khilāfah.

Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of Buwīah, instituted many excellent regulations which he carried out; and he caused the whole of the depopulated and dilapidated parts of Baghdād to be restored and rendered habitable. He also abolished a custom whereby each quarter of the city possessed a separate prison of its own, and had them all demolished. On the son of Abū-l-Hayjā, he conferred the fief of Müṣil, and to his brother, ‘Alī, son of Buwīah, he gave the title of Ḥimād-ud-Daulah, and to another brother, Ḥasan, that of Rukn-ud-Daulah; and day by day the sovereignty of the family of Buwīah began to prosper uninterruptedly.

II. AL-ḤASAN⁴, SON OF BUWĪAH, UD-DILAMI.

He was Amir of Hamadān and Rai, and was a person of great manliness and generosity; and he entertained a large number of troops in his pay, and possessed great military resources. The whole of the men of Dilam, both high and low, were obedient to his authority. He had several talented and warlike sons grown up, the name of one of whom was Fakhr-ud-Daulah, 'Ali, son of Al-Ḥasan, and of the second, Muayyid-ud-Daulah, Buwīah. Fakhr-ud-Daulah, 'Ali, was Amir of 'Irāk, to whom Shams-ul-Ma‘all, Kābūs-i-Washm-gir, went for protection, and sought his assistance, and Fakhr-ud-Daulah accordingly marched to Nishāpūr for that purpose, and Muayyid-ud-Daulah had

⁴ Only two copies of the MSS. collated are altogether free from a great blunder, contained in the text here. ‘Imād-ud-Daulah whom our author styles Fakhr-ud-Daulah, the first sovereign prince of the dynasty, had no offspring, hence he could not have conferred the government of Müṣil on “his” son, Abū-l-Hayjā,” as the R. A. S. MS. and I. O. L. MS. No. 1952 have. Other writers, very properly, state that these titles were conferred by the Khalifah. Abū-l-Hayjā is a totally distinct person.

⁵ His correct name is Abū-l-Ḥusain-i-Aḥmad, and his title was Mu‘izz-ud-Daulah. His elder brother was called Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-‘Alī, as previously stated.

⁶ Only two sons are mentioned by our author. The I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, and the R. A. S. MS. also, contains but one name. ‘Uṣd-ud-Daulah, Abū Shujā‘-i-Fanā Khusrāu, the eldest of the sons, who was accounted “the cream” of the Buwīah family, is not mentioned here. An account of his reign, however, is given at page 61.
several engagements with them, the events of which Ṣāḥib has mentioned in his History.

III. BAKHTYĀR, SON OF AL-ḤASAN, SON OF BUWĪAH, DILAML

On the death of his father he took possession of Baghdād, and directed the affairs of government after the manner of his father, and acquired great power and dominion. As soon as he had become firmly established in his authority, the Khalifah, Al-Muṭṭī’u-L’illah, preferred a request to him respecting the sedition and discord caused by the Ḳarāmiṭah sect of schismatics, which had assumed great proportions throughout the empire of Islam, and urged him to assemble forces and suppress them, and uproot them utterly. Bakhtyār, however, did not pay attention to the solicitations of the Khalifah, and, consequently, enmity arose between them. Matters assumed such an aspect that Bakhtyār was not safe from the designs of Al-Muṭṭī’u-L’illah; and the informers of Bakhtyār warned him that the Khalifah meditated treachery towards him. Bakhtyār sought his opportunity, according to the statement contained in the History of Ibn-Haiṣam, and assembled together all the Kāzīs and 'Ulamā—judges,

7 The oldest MS. has Zīā-yī; but one of the others has Ṣāḥib, and another Ṣāḥī, which is one and the same thing, and I also find Guzdhah quotes, as one of its authorities, the Kitāb-i-Nājī of Ṣāḥī-i-Dabīr, or Ṣāḥī, the secretary; and, among the events recorded in Fasīb-i in the year 365 H., is the death of Sābit, son of Sinān, son of Ṣābit, son of Kurrah, surnamed Abū Kurrah, nāṣī-Ṣāḥī, in the month of Zī-Ka’dah, the author of the Sannāfah-ut-Tūrīkh, containing a history of events between the years 195 H., and 343 H. This, no doubt, is the author referred to by the Tūrīkh-i-Guzdhah, and our author.

8 As before stated, the father of Bakhtyār was named Abū-l-Husain-i-Ahmād, son of Buwīlah, and his title was Mu’izz-ud-Daulah. Bakhtyār’s title was Ḳiz-ud-Daulah, Abū Manṣūr-i-Bakhtyār. Mu’izz-ud-Daulah, the father of Bakhtyār, died at Baghdād, of which he was ruler on the part of his nephew, Amīr ‘Uṣd-ud-Daulah, the head of the dynasty, on the 1st of Rabī’ul-Awwal, 356 H., but, according to other writers, on the 16th of that month. He was known by the name of Ikṭā’, having lost his left hand, and the fingers of his right, in an affair with the Kurds of Kirmān according to the Tūrīkh-i-Yād, but other writers say, with the Kūch and Baluqh, a nomad tribe [two tribes] then inhabiting a portion of Kirmān, according to the Burhān Kātī’, and from whom the present Balūchis are descended. Kūch in Persian, among other meanings, signifies a nomad, and in the Afghān language, Kōghey, which some persons, who know no better, imagine to be the name of an Afghān tribe, signifies “pastoral” or “nomad.”
lawyers, and ecclesiastics—and transferred the office of Khalifah to the son of Al-Muṭṭī'u-L'illah whose name was Abū-Bikr-i-'Abd-ul-Ḵārīm, and gave him the title of Uṭ-Ṭā-i'u-L'illah. As soon as he was installed in the Khilāfah, he gave his daughter in marriage to Bakhtyār, Buwīah, and he became the chamberlain and lieutenant of the Khilāfah.

Soon after this dignity was conferred upon Bakhtyār, he set out for Āhwāz in order to levy the revenues and taxes. Sābuk-Tīgīn, Chāshnī-gir, [cup-bearer or taster] who was Bakhtyār's deputy, began to act insubordinately towards his master, and took the power out of his hands.

IV. FANĀ KHUSRAU, SON OF AL-ḤASAN, SON OF BUWĪAH, DĪLĀMĪ.

The title borne by Fanā Khusrau was 'Uzd-ud-Daulah, and he was a proud and haughty prince, but was, at the same time, endowed with great intellect and valour.

The direction of the affairs of the country, and the different forces were left under his control; and the whole of the property and treasure of the dependencies of the Dār-

9 The author himself states, in his account of the Khalifs, Section IV., that Al-Muṭṭī'u-L'illah abdicated in favour of his son, in 363 H., on account of his infirmities. Other historians confirm it; but, in Faṣīḥ-ī, it is said that he abdicated at the end of Muḥarram, 364 H., having previously been stricken with palsy, and died two months afterwards. It must also be remembered that the Buwīah rulers were Shī'ahs, hence probably their severity towards the Khalifs.

1 Her name was Shah-i-Zamān, and she had a dowry of 100,000 dinār.

2 See note 3, at page 63.

3 Al-Fanākātī considers Fanā Khusrau third prince of the dynasty.

4 In 366 H., Rukn-ud-Daulah, Abū 'Alī-Ḥasan, son of Buwīah, brother of 'Imād-ud-Daulah, the founder of the dynasty, died. Some say he died in 365 H. He had succeeded his elder brother, 'Imād-ud-Daulah, who died without issue, in the sovereignty of Fārs, the sovereign of which was, in that family, considered suzerain over the other two branches, who ruled in 'Irāk, and at Baghdād. Rukn-ud-Daulah bequeathed his dominions in the following manner:—To his youngest brother, Muʿizz-ud-Daulah, Aḥmad, he left Kirmān. He afterwards became Amīr-ul-Umrā at Baghdād. He was the father of Bakhtyār; and our author calls him Al-Ḥasan, and says he was the second prince of the dynasty. To 'Uzd-ud-Daulah, Abū Shuṭā'-i-Fanā Khusrau, his eldest son, he left the sovereignty of Fārs; and he became the head of the family, and suzerain over all. To his second son, Muṣayyid-ud-Daulah, Abū Naṣr, he left 'Irāk and its dependencies; and to his youngest son, Fakhr-ud-Daulah, 'Alī, he bequeathed Rai, Hamadān, Ḫazwīn, and other territory in Aṣarbājān.
ul-Khilāfat came into his possession. The reason of this was, that, when Bakhtyar set out for Āhwāz, to collect the revenue due to the Bait-ul-Māl, or Khalfah's treasury, Sabuk-Tigin, the Chāshni-gir [cup-bearer], who was his deputy at Baghādād, assembled the Turks together, and opposed the authority of Bakhtyar, drove out the Dīlamīs, broke out into open revolt, and began to act in an overbearing and tyrannical manner. They [the Turks and Sabuk-Tigin] commenced shedding the blood of Musalmāns, and carrying off their females. 'Īzz-ud-Daulah, Bakhtyar, sent to acquaint his uncle Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of Buwīlah, who was ruler of Rai, with what had occurred; and to his first cousin, Fanā Khusrāu-i-Abū Shujā', who held the government of Fārs, he also gave information; and solicited assistance from both of them. A large army was assembled, and Fanā Khusrāu came to his aid with the troops of Fārs; and Abū-l-Ḥasan, his uncle, despatched his forces to co-operate with them.

The combined troops marched towards Baghādād; and Sabuk-Tigin, with the Turks and other forces, moved out of Baghādād, and advanced to meet them. When Sabuk-Tigin and his adherents reached the village of 'Ākūl', he was taken ill, and died after four days. The Turks were defeated; and they took along with them from Baghādād, the Lord of the Faithful, Uṯ-Ṭā-i'u-L'illah, and marched towards Nahrwān, in order again to encounter Fanā Khusrāu. They were defeated a second time, however, and retired towards Mūṣil.

Fanā Khusrāu entered Baghādād, and found with respect to the affairs of his cousin, Bakhtyar, that he was in the habit of passing his time in gaiety and pleasure, and that he was no longer fit for and capable of directing the affairs of government. He therefore seized Bakhtyar, and put him in durance. The latter sent a letter of complaint to his uncle, Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of Buwīlah, the father of Fanā Khusrāu, ruler of Rai, saying: "Your son, Fanā Khusrāu, has seized me without cause or reason, and has imprisoned me."

---

6 Intended, according to the Kur'ān, "For God, His Apostle, his kindred, the orphan, the poor, and travellers."

6 As before stated, the name of Rukn-ud-Daulah, the uncle of Bakhtyar, was Abū 'Alī-i-Ḥasan.

7 A small town or village in the Mūṣil [not Mosal] territory.
The father of Farâ Khusrau issued a mandate to his son, directing him to set Bakhtyâr at liberty. This he did, and he [Farâ Khusrau] returned to Fârs; but, when his father died, Farâ Khusrau proceeded to Baghâdâd, again seized Bakhtyâr, and put him to death, after which he took possession of the territory of Baghâdâd, and the control of the affairs of the Khilâfât.

He entered into a compact with the Sâmâni Amîrs for the mountain tracts, or Highlands of 'Irâk, as far as Tabarîstân, of which he received the tenure from them, at the rate of one thousand dinârs per day.

Farâ Khusrau ruled with vigour and energy; and, as before stated, was excessively proud, but of great spirit and resolution. He had, however, great dread of death, so much so that not a soul dared to mention before his throne, in any way, the name of the Gor-i-Daghtî, or Wild Ass, because Gor also signifies a grave; and it is stated that he commanded that all graveyards should be enclosed with lofty walls, so that his eyes might not behold a grave. Of his pride and grandeur the following is a specimen. After his decease, eight thousand napkins and handkerchiefs, of great price and fineness of fabric, befitting a king, were found, belonging to him, of brocade, linen, and Egyptian tûstî, threaded and embroidered with gold, and ornamented with jewels, with which he was wont to wipe his mouth and nose, and which fetched the price of 50,000 dinârs of gold.

When his end drew near, he affixed his seal to mandates and decrees, which he gave into the hands of his secretary, directing him to fill them up according to the best of his own ability and judgment, and to issue, and carry them into execution, and not to let people know of his death. For a period of four months his decease was kept con-

---

* 'Izz-ud-Daulah, Abû Manşûr-i-Bakhtyâr, iisaid, by the author of the Mujmal-i-Faşıh-I, to have ended his days at Baghâdâd, in 367 H., having been put to death by his nephew, 'Uzd-ud-Daulah, Abû Shuja'i-Farâ Khusrau, after he had ruled there for a period of eleven years and some months, at the age of thirty-six, and Bahâ ud-Daulah, Khusrau Firuz, son of 'Uzd-ud-Daulah, his nephew, succeeded him as ruler of Baghâdâd.

* The name of an expensive and fine fabric so called from being the peculiar manufacture of a town or city of that name, now in ruins. It is said to have been manufactured from flax; but tûstî is also the name of the bark of a tree like the papyrus.
sealed, and they continued to place his corpse upon the throne, so that people, from a distance, could see him, as they supposed, as usual. When his end drew near, he directed that ashes should be spread upon the floor, in which he rolled about exclaiming, "What advantageth all my wealth and my sovereignty, since death has overcome me!" until he ceased to be.

His death took place in the month of Ramażān, in the year 372 H. 1 The Almighty alone is eternal.

V. AL-MARZABĀN, SON OF FANĀ KHUSRAU, DĪLAMI.

On the decease of his father 'Uṣd-ud-Daulah, the Khalifah, Uṭ-Tā-i-L'illah, conferred upon him the title of Şamşām-ud-Daulah, and raised him to his father's office.

The Khalifah treated him with great esteem and distinction. He embarked on board a vessel on the river Dijlah [Tigris] and proceeded to the palace of Fanā Khusrav, and paid a visit of consolation and condolence to his son, Marzabān, and conferred considerable honours and dignities upon him. The Khalifah left the administration of affairs in his hands, and showed great respect and honour towards

1 'Uṣd-ud-Daulah died, it is said, at Shīfāz, his capital, although Gusradah says, at Baghdād, which is not probable, 15th of Ramażān, 372 H. He was buried in the Maqād, or sepulchre, [especially for those killed fighting for their religion] of the Khalifah 'Alī, and his son Imām Hūsain, which was one of the buildings founded by him. The same illustrious prince also founded the great hospital at Baghdād, and liberally endowed it; and the great embankment over [as the historian from whom I quote says] the river Kur, the like of which there is not in the world, called the Band-i-Amīr. This is the same structure that Mac D. Kinneir refers to in his "Geographical Memoir of the Persian Empire." He says, "The river Bund-Emeer [sic] takes its name from a dyke [in Persian a bund] erected by the celebrated Ameer Azad-a-Daulah, Delemi"[1].

Among other great works carried out by him were a town founded opposite Shīfāz, named Sūk-i-Amīr [plural of Sūk, a market, &c.], the walls of Madīnah, and a splendid Sarāe or palace, at Baghdād, called the Sarāe-i-Sulṭān. He was succeeded, in the government of Baghdād, by his son, Şamşām-ud-Daulah, Al-Marzabān, which latter word is derived from mārz, a boundary, border, &c., and signifies the governor of a frontier, and the like. He is also called Abū-Kālinjār, and sometimes Kānjār, the meaning or derivation of which, the Buhārī Kāṭīr, the Farangi-i-Jahāngīr, and other works, do not give. Kānjār, in Persian, signifies war, battle, &c.

2 This is absurd, for the Khalifs had long before been stripped of all power, and were mere shadows of sovereignty.
him. He [Marzabân] exercised the authority at Baghdad until his brother, Abû-l-Fawâris, rose against him.

VI. ABÛ-L-FAWÂRIS, MÄKÄN, SON OF FANA KUSRAU, DILAMI.

He was ruler of Kirmân; and, when he became aware of the death of his father, and heard of the exalted position of his brother at the Dar-ul-Khilâfat, he assembled troops in Kirmân, and entered Fârs, and seized upon that territory. He then advanced to Āhwâz, and possessed himself of that likewise, having expelled from thence his brother Abî-ul-Hassan-i-Abî Shu'ja', son of Fanâ Khusrau, and then he pushed on to Basrah. Having gained possession of that place he marched towards Baghdad.

When the news of his approach, and his designs, reached Baghdad, his brother, Samṣâm-ud-Daulah, Marzabân, son of Fanâ Khusrau, came out and waited on him, in order to show his submission and pay him homage. Abû-l-Fawâris-i-Mäkân seized his brother, and deprived him of his sight.

Enmity and hostility now arose between the Turks and Dilamis; and the Turks of Baghdad overcame their opponents, and of the Dilamis about 4000 men were slain by them. After a short time, however, Abû-l-Fawâris overthrew them, and entered Baghdad, and assumed the administration of the affairs of the Dar-ul-Khilâfat. The Khalîfah, Ut-Tâ'-l'u-Lîllah, conferred upon him the title of Shâraf-ud-Daulah.

After him, the author has not found any annals respecting the Diâlamah such as he could write down. What

8 in the year 375 H.
9 His correct titles and name are, Shâraf-ud-Daulah, Abû-l-Fawâris-i-Shîr Zail, son of 'Ujd-ud-Daulah. All the copies of the work have "Mäkân," but it is not mentioned by any other writer that I am acquainted with.
10 He was imprisoned in the fortress of 'Ummân after being blinded in 375 H.; and on the death of Shâraf-ud-Daulah, who had dethroned him, he was again brought forth, blind as he was, and reinstated. After about nine months, Shams-ud-Daulah, 'Alî, son of Shâraf-ud-Daulah, rose against him, whom he defeated in 379 H.; but Bahâ-ud-Daulah now rose against him, and civil contention continued for some time, till, in 380 H., the sons of 'Izz-ud-Daulah, Bakhtyâr, put him to death.
11 Shâraf-ud-Daulah, and Zain-ul-Millât, in 377 H. He died in the month of Jamâd-ul-Äkhîr, 379 H., after reigning seven years over Kirmân, and six months at Baghdad.
was contained in histories, and what came to his hearing, has been entered herein, so that this work may not be without mention of those princes; and he hopes that those who may peruse it will extend pardon and indulgence to the author for any shortcomings.\footnote{The dynasty of the Buwahs did not terminate until 459 H., or eighty two years after the date of our author’s account of them, when it fell before the power of the Saljuqs. His great mistake throughout has been in not keeping the rulers of Fars, Irak, and Kirmân, separate from those who ruled at Baghda. Al-Fanâkatif gives a more accurate account of this dynasty, although a very abridged one. The last of the family was Abû ’Alî-Kai-khusrau, son of Izz-ul-Mulk, who died in 487 H., and who submitted to Alb-Arsalân, and had a small tract of territory assigned to him.}