SECTION XI.

THE DYNASTY OF THE YAMIŅIAH, AL-MAḤMUDIAH
SOVEREIGNS OF THE RACE OF SABUK-TIGIN.

The pages of this section are devoted to the mention of the Maliks and Sultāns of the dynasty of Naṣir-ud-Dīn, Sabuk-Tigīn, and of Sultān Yamin-ud-Daulah, Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Ḵāsim, Maḥmūd, the Conqueror, and to the description of the events in their lives; to an account of their lineage; to the record of their justice and equity, and the incidents in their reigns; to the vicissitudes and changes in the fortunes, and the dominion of the sovereigns of that family of exalted power and might, from the outset of the career of the Amīr-i-Ghāzi, Sabuk-Tigīn, to the end of the reign of Khusrāw Malīk, the last of that dynasty of kings, in an abridged and concise form, in order that this Tabakat of kings and nobles may be illumined by the mention of their lineage and their titles, and the pages of this history be adorned and ennobled by the relation of the deeds of those sovereigns of Islām, whom may the light of Almighty God illumine!

Imām Abū-l-Faḍl, Al-Ḥasan-i-Baihaḵī, in his chronicle

1 So called from Maḥmūd’s title of Yamin-ud-Daulah.

2 The printed edition of the TABAKAT-I-NAṢIRĪ, edited by Lt.-Colonel W. N. Lees, LL. D., and his Maulawīs, commences from this Section. It forms No. 42—50 of the BIBLIOTHECA INDICA, New Series. I have been unable to make any use of it for a very cogent reason, that not a page of it is correct. Whole sentences are often wanting, and, at times, much more; and the names of persons and places are frequently wrongly spelt. The work, however, appears to have been printed from the text of the MS. No. 1952 of the India Office Library, and the Royal Asiatic Society’s MS., to which I have before alluded, both of which are the most defective and incorrect of any I have collated. The same errors occur in each, in nearly every instance. To restore the text would be impossible without entirely reprinting the work. I may say, however, that the state of most of the MSS. I have collated is such that it would be impossible to give any thing like a correct version without examining the number of copies which I have been so fortunate as to find in different Libraries, and others which have been placed at my disposal through the kindness of their owners, and of the Imperial Russian Government in particular.

3 So called from Baihaḵ, the name of his native town, which is also called Muḵir, in Zawulistān. His correct name will be found in note 6, page 87. The passage above quoted may have been contained in the first portion of his work; but is not to be found in what has been preserved, as far as we know.
The Tabaqat-i-Naqiri relates the following tradition told him by the August Sultan Mahmud himself, which the latter had heard from his father, the Amir Sabuk-Tigin, namely that his [Sabuk-Tigin's] father used to be called Hul, and that Chah-Chail in the Turkish language is called Bab-kam, and that the meaning of Karg Bab-kam would be the Black Tatar bull, and that the name of Karg Bab-kam, and that this proper name was formed of the words [i.e., that it was composed of the words] Mahr Bab-kam.

The printed text is similar to No. 7, except that it has فُرْغُ وَا in both instances. The I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, the R. A. S. MS., and the St. Petersburg MS. No. 572 Abb., are all alike defective here, being minus only nine words. I shall call them Nos. 10, 11, and 12 respectively:

13. The St. Petersburg Imp. Bibli. Publ. MS. is very defective here, and has lost several pages.

* Paris MS. 181.  † Paris MS. 182.  ‡ St. Petersburg MS. No. 572 Abb.
Turks, in Turkistan, heard his name mentioned, they fled before him on account of his energy and valour.

Imām Muhammad 'Alī, Abū-l-Ḵāsim, 'Imādī⁴, in his work, the “Ṭārīḵ-i-Majdūl,” states, that Amir Sabuk-

It will be noticed that four copies say his name was [Hark, or Ḥurk], which might possibly be read [Ḫūk, or Ḥauḵ], as in the two best copies, whilst in two other copies the word is [Jūk, or Jauḵ], and in another [Jūn]. Then comes the signification of the Turkish word, as it is called, ʃɜrwə. In five copies, it is said to mean ʃɜrwə in one; ʃɜrwə in another; in a third ʃɜrwə in three others ʃɜrwə and in one ʃɜrwə. The printed text has ʃɜrwə. The Arabic words ʃɜrwə contained in two copies of the text—in one of the best and one of the most modern—would be intelligible enough, but we are told that the words, whether ʃɜrwə or Ḥaiju ʃɜrwə are Turkish, and that they signify ʃɜrwə—[of the printed text] ʃɜrwə—[of the printed text] and ʃɜrwə—[of the printed text] whichever we choose to select, and we must presume that these words are intended for the Persian equivalents of the Turkish. The word must be ʃɜrwə—Ghazij-gaio—also written ʃɜrwə—Ghazij-gaio, and, at times, ʃɜrwə—Ghazij-gaio; and as ʃɜrwə in the Persian language is permutable to ʃɜrwə the words are, and may be respectively written, ʃɜrwə, or ʃɜrwə, signifying a Khitaṭ fibre—the Yāk [Bos Grunniens], found in the vast mountain tracts of Central Asia, north of Hindūstān, the tail of which is fastened to the manes and necks of horses, and as an ornament to Tartar and Turkish standards [hence “a Pachah” of so many “tails”]. The author from whom I take this says, “Its real name is Gao-i-Khitaṭ fibre, the Khitaṭ fibre, and is called σιρός by the Rūmīs [Greeks], who say it is a ‘sea-horse.’ It is also called the ‘Silk Bull,’ as ʃɜrwə and ʃɜrwə also signify silk.” The word ʃɜrwə, or, more correctly, ʃɜrwə is, of course, the Turkish for black, in Persian سیاه In Elliott’s INDIA, vol. ii., p. 266, the passage in question is thus translated: “His [Subuktīgin’s] father was called Jauḵ [troop], and in Turki they call a troop bahkam [on whose authority, I wonder?] so that the meaning of the name Kard-bahkam is black-troop.”

From this it will be seen that the translator has discarded altogether, both ʃɜrwə of MSS. 10 and 11, and ʃɜrwə of the printed text, and has given the person’s Turkish ʃɜrwə as the equivalent [the Persian equivalent, it must be supposed] of his Turkish ʃɜrwə name; so according to this theory ʃɜrwə means troop, and ʃɜrwə also means troop, but what becomes of the Persian translation سیاه ʃɜrwə &c., the translator sayeth not! Jauḵ, however, is Arabīs for a party, a troop, &c., but what ʃɜrwə may mean, remains to be proved. I have an idea, however, from the manner in which the word is written, in one place, in one of the MSS., viz. ʃɜrwə—Baj-kam, that ʃɜrwə—Bah-kam—is an error of some early copyist [but ʃɜrwə and ʃɜrwə are interchangeable] for ʃɜrwə—Bach-kam, “a wolf,” which word is used, but not commonly, in Persia, and probably is Turkish; and it is not impossible that the author quoted may have been under the impression that a Khitaṭ fibre was the same beast ʃɜrwə—Gurg, a wolf; and, therefore, I am inclined to think that the correct interpretation is, that Sabuktīgin’s father was called in Turkish, the Black Wolf meaning a soldier of [black being expressive of excess, &c.] excessive fierceness and daring. This reading, as I have said before, is not certain; but I do not think anything more intelligible can be made of it without Baihakī’s work to refer to; but that portion does not appear to be in existence.

⁴ A few copies have حمادي [Hamādī], which is incorrect.
Tigīn was a descendant of Yazdijurd-i-Shahryār—the last of the sovereigns of Persia—and, that, at the time that Yazdijurd was murdered in the mill in the territory of Marw, which was during the Khilāfat of the Lord of the Faithful, 'Uṣmān, the family and dependents of Yazdijurd fled before the troops of Islām into Turkistān, and reached the frontier district of Nakhistān in that territory, and there took up their residence, and intermarried with the people. After two or three generations had passed away, they became Turks; and their palaces are still standing in that country.

The pedigree of Sabuk-Tigīn is given in the above history after the manner in which it is here entered, in order that it may come under the notice of the king of the world—May the Almighty perpetuate his sovereignty!—and of such others may peruse this work, viz.:—Sabuk-Tigīn, son of Hūk-i-Ḵāra Bah-kam, son of Ḵarah [Ḵara?] Arsalān, son of Ḵarah [Ḵara?] Mallat [or Millat], son of Ḵāra Na’mān, son of Firūz-i-Bam-sinjān [?], or Barsinjān [?], son of Yazdijurd-i-Shahryār, or Yazdijurd, the king.

I. AMĪR-UL-ḠĀZĪ, NĀṢĪR-UD-DĪN-ULLAH, SABUK-TIGĪN.

Imām Abū-l-Faḍl-i-Baihaḵī states that, during the reign of Abd-ul-Malik-i-Nūb, the Šāmāni, there was a merchant named Naṣr, the Ḥājī [pilgrim], who purchased Sabuk-

6 But in three copies and in one I am not satisfied that this name is correct, still five copies of the work agree in the reading above. Both the I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, the R. A. S. MS., and the Petersburg copy 572 Abb. are minus another nine words here, and the printed text is the same. The place is not mentioned in Masālik wa Mamālik or Aṣār-ul-Bilād.

7 Their descendants doubtless.

8 Another writer states that Ḵāra Firūz, the fifth ancestor of Sabuk-Tigīn, who was son of Yazdijurd, became ruined during the Khilāfat of 'Uṣmān, left his country, and retired into Turkistān; and there his descendants continued to dwell until 335 H., when Alb-Tigīn made an incursion into that country. He carried off from thence three thousand captives, and among them was Sabuk-Tigīn. Another author states that Alb-Tigīn purchased Sabuk-Tigīn at Nishāpūr, when stationed there in command of the Šāmānī forces.

9 "The king of the world," here referred to by the author, is that shadow of a monarch to whom he dedicated his work. It is a very slight specimen of his slavish flattery of him, and of others.

1 This name occurs in eight MSS., but none of them are very distinct: one has Bar-sinjā, son of Parwiz, son of Yazdijurd.

2 Ghāri signifies a conqueror, one who makes war upon infidels.
Tigin and brought him to Bukhārā. Perceiving in his countenance evident signs of capacity and energy, the Amir-i-Ḥājīb [Lord Chamberlain], Alb-Tigin, purchased him. He accompanied his master into Ṭukhāristān, when the government of that territory was entrusted to him; and subsequently, when the government of Khurāsān was made over to Amir Alb-Tigin, Sabuk-Tigin attended him thither also. After some time had passed away, Alb-Tigin, through the vicissitudes of fortune, retired towards Ghaznīn, and subdued the territory of Zāwulistān, and wrested Ghaznīn out of the hands of Amir Abū-Bikr-i-Lawīk.

Eight years subsequently to these events Amir Alb-Tigin died, and his son, Is-hāk, succeeded to his father's authority. He entered into hostilities against Lawīk, but was defeated, and retired to Bukhārā, to the court of Amir Mansūr, son of Nūḥ, Sāmānī, and there continued until

---

8 See note 8, page 70.
4 See under the reign of Mansūr, son of Nūḥ, the eighth sovereign of the Sāmānī dynasty.

"In the year 322 H., Alb-Tigin, the Turk, the slave of the Sāmānī dynasty, took Ghaznīn, and Lawīk, the Wālī [the word here signifies a chief or sovereign, as he does not appear to have been subject to the Sāmānīs] of that territory, fled." Nothing more is mentioned respecting Alb-Tigin, in the work from which I have extracted these occurrences, until 346 H. There had been repeated changes in the government of Hirāt for some time past, and considerable disorder had arisen therein. "In 346 H.," I find that "Abū Mansūr, son of 'Abd-ur-Razzāḵ, the Wālī of Hirāt and its dependencies, gave up his appointment, and withdrew to Tūs again, in consequence of which great agitation and commotion arose at Hirāt." On this becoming known to the Sāmānī court, the Ḥājīb, Alb-Tigin, who appears from this to have administered the affairs of Ghaznīn since 322 H., was entrusted with the government. He sent to Hirāt, as his deputy, Is-hāk-i-Tahirī; but he was very shortly removed, and Ḥasan, son of Ribāl, was sent to replace him. In 350 H. Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Slmjūr was sent to govern Hirāt; and, in the following year, having been promoted to the rank of Sayh-ul-Jaṅīb [Commander-in-Chief of an army], he proceeded to Qishāpūr, and was succeeded, at Hirāt, by Abū-l-Ḥasan, son of 'Umro, Fāryābī. After he had held it four months the government was bestowed upon Ṭalḥah, son of Muḥammad, Nisā'ī. In the following year, "352 H., Alb-Tigin, the Turk, died at Ghaznīn, and was succeeded in the government by his son, Is-hāk," subordinate, of course, to the Sāmānī sovereigns, although Mr. E. Thomas, in his paper "ON THE COINS OF THE KINGS OF GHAZNI," in Ro. As. Soc. Journal for 1859, styles them kings and speaks of their reigns, when they were merely subordinate governors. The most astonishing thing, however, is, how our author makes out that Alb-Tigin died eight years after his seizure of Ghaznīn. From 322 to 352 H. is a period of thirty years; but then he generally eschews dates. According to Faṣīḥ-ī and others, Alb-Tigin was born in 267 H., and died in the year above-mentioned.
that ruler directed that aid should be afforded to him, when Is-hâk came back again to Ghaznîn, and regained possession of it. After a year Is-hâk died, when Balkâ-

Is-hâk succeeded his father in the government in 352 H., and died in 355 H., and so ruled for about four years. Among the events of the year 353 H., Fâṣîb-î mentions that “Amîr Is-hâk, son of Alb-Tîgnî, attended by Sabûk-Tîgnî, his father’s slave—who is mentioned for the first time in that work—fled from Ghaznîn, and proceeded to Balkârâ, and obtained the investiture of the government of that province from the Sâmânî sovereign.” In the following year, 354 H., the same work states that “Is-hâk, son of Alb-Tîgnî, the Turk, the slave of the house of Sâmânî, returned to Ghaznîn again, and fought against Lawfî [this name is also confirmed by other writers, and there is no doubt of its correctness], who, previously, had been Wâlî [sovereign or chief] of Ghaznîn, and had been ousted by Alb-Tîgnî. When Is-hâk retired to Samranb, Lawfî returned to Ghaznîn, but now that Is-hâk had come back again, Lawfî again fled.”

Mr. Thomas, in his paper just referred to, trusting implicitly, it would seem, to the L. O. L. MS. No. 1952, and the R. A. S. copy of our author’s work, calls Amîr, Abû Bikr-i-Lawfî, “the Anûk.” In those two MSS. Amîr, Abû Bikr, is left out altogether, but occurs in the other MSS., although some have ûrûr ûbrî and ûrûr instead of ûbrî yet in a note Mr. Thomas says,—“I propose with but slight hesitation a rectification of the orthography to ûbrî or ‘Lumghân,’ the Lamps of classical writers,” from a personal to a local name! Into what mazes of error do not the “classical writers” draw their disciples as regards Oriental history! See note E., Elliot’s India, vol. ii., last par., which is quite to the point.

On the death of Is-hâk, Balkâ-Tîgnî, the slave of Alb-Tîgnî, succeeded to the government of Ghaznîn, by order of Amîr Nûb, son of Naṣr, the Sâmânî sovereign. Balkâ-Tîgnî died in 362 H., after being governor eight years. Mr. Thomas, on this passage in our author, in which the latter says Balkâ-Tîgnî ruled ten years, remarks: “Two copies [of the work], out of the three I have at this moment the opportunity of consulting, give ten instead of two [years]; the former, however, is a palpable error.” I wonder on which side the error lies really? This is not all. In his remarks on the “coin of Manṣûr, son of Nûb, with the name of Balkâ-Tîgnî under the symbol, on the obverse,” Mr. Thomas gives a translation of his Excellency, State Counsellor Von Dorn’s description, and a woodcut of it, contained in the St. Petersburg Journal. If the translation is correct, of which there can be but little doubt, his Excellency must have been somewhat in the dark respecting the Sâmânîs, and their connexion with Ghaznîn, which formed part of their dominions. What I refer to is this: “History mentions only the conquest of Alp-Tîgnî, but is silent in regard to the rule of the Sâmânîs in Ghazna. We see from our coin that Balkâ, or Bûlka-Tagh, in the year a.H. 359 was chief of the Sâmânî party in this city. His name appears already on the Balkh coins of a.H. 324. Subsequently he passed over to Alp-Tîgnî’s cause [1] became chamberlain under Abû Ishâk, and is said to have ascended the throne after the death of the latter in a.H. 365.” This is absurd. What sort of history can it be that is silent in regard to the rule of “the Sâmânîs in Ghaznîn,” when it formed an integral part of their empire? Balkâ-Tîgnî, in 324 H., was governor of the province of which Balkh was the seat of government, hence his name on the coins referred to.
Tigin, who was the chief or commander of the Turkish troops, was raised to the government. He was a just and pious man, and one of the greatest warriors of his time. He exercised the authority for a period of ten years, and died. Sabuk-Tigin was in his service.

After the death of Amir Balka-Tigin, Pirey succeeded to the authority. He was a great villain; and a body of people wrote from Ghaznīn to Abū 'Alī-i-Lawik, and invited him to come there. Abū 'Alī-i-Lawik acceded to their request, and brought along with him the son of the Shāh, or king, of Kābul to assist him. When they reached the vicinity of Charkh, Sabuk-Tigin, with a body of five hundred Turks, suddenly fell upon them, and defeated them, killed a great number of their followers, took them captive also, and slew them. He also captured ten elephants, and brought them to Ghaznīn.

Such a great success having been gained by Sabuk-Tigin, and all having become quite sated with the villainies and misdeeds of Pirey, with one accord, they raised Sabuk-Tigin to the direction of affairs. On Friday, the 27th of the month of Sha'bān, 366 H., Amir

---

7 Our author is quite correct as to Pirey, but gives no details or dates. I will furnish them. "On the death of Balka-Tigin, in 362 H., Pirey, the slave of Alb-Tigin [as was his predecessor and successor also], obtained the government. In the following year, 363 H., Pirey, the Wali of Ghaznīn, with the help of Sabuk-Tigin, fought a battle with a body of infidels who had advanced out of Hind for the purpose of seizing Ghaznīn, overthrew them, and despoiled them. This event is confirmed from other annals. In the year 367 H. Pirey was deposed from the government [as our author records], and the government passed to Sabuk-Tigin." He was confirmed by the Sāmānī ruler, but soon after, on the decline of their power, became independent in all things, except, perhaps, in name.

The "Kitāb," or "Tarikh-i-Yamānī," which is considered to be a very trustworthy and authentic history, contains, judging from Reynold's version, not one word about Sabuk-Tigin having been Alb-Tigin's slave, although probably transferred as such to Balka-Tigin, and his son Is-hāk; and makes no mention of the government of Amir Pirey, although he ruled over the province of Ghaznī for just few years.

8 A well known place situated a few miles from the right or east bank of the Lohgar river on one of the routes between Kābul and Ghaznī. Abū-l-Faṣl, the secretary, mentions in the Ā'īn-i-Akbarī, that Charkh is so called after a pious man, one Maulānā-i-Charkhī.

9 Faṣīḥ-i says this took place in 367 H., the same year that 'Izz-ud-Daulah, Abū Mānsūr-i-Bakhtyār, Buwlah, was put to death at Baghdad. See page 63. In the same year Sabuk-Tigin appointed Abū-l-'Abbās, Al-Faṣl-i-Aḥmad, son of Muḥammad, Al-Iṣfārānī, his Wazīr. He had acted
Sabuk-Tigin, with a scarlet canopy held over him, and attended by a large following with standards, came down from the citadel, and proceeded to the Jāmi’ Masjid, or Great Mosque, and the administration of the government and the sovereignty of that province was settled upon him.

Soon after, he put his forces in motion and marched from Ghaznīn towards the adjacent parts, and took possession of the districts of Bust, Zamin [district] of Dāwar, the Zamin of Kušdār, and Bāmlān, all Ṭukhāristān, and Ghūr.¹

On the side of Hind, he overthrew Jai-pāl², with numerous elephants and a host of troops, and he rid the Sāmānī family of Bughrā Khān of Kāshghar, and marched to Balkh, and sent back the Amir of Bukhārā to take re-possession of his throne.

During the time that Amir Sabuk-Tigin held the government, great deeds were performed; and he completely put an end to the iniquitous heresy of the Bātinīah schismatics in Khurāsān.³

in the same office to Fāyīk-i-Khāṣah, and, after the latter’s defeat, Amir Sabuk-Tigin took him under his patronage. Wafṣr does not necessarily mean the minister of a sovereign prince only; and Sabuk-Tigin was not yet independent.

¹ The mode of spelling the word by its people, and on the authority of the Burhān-i-Kāṭī and other works.

² “In 369 H., Jai-pāl, ‘Bādahāh’ of Hind, as he is termed, marched an army towards Ghāzmīn to attack Amīr Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Sabuk-Tigin; but an accommodation was come to, and Jai-pāl again retired.” This is quite a different affair from that in which Sabuk-Tigin assisted Amīr Pīrey, mentioned in a previous note. It must be remembered too, that, at this time, the country west of the Indus, between Safīd-Koh west, and the Salt-Range on the east, and Hindū-Kush, extending as far west as Kābul, was still under Hindū rule. The Afghān had not extended northward of the river Kurmāh [erroneously called the Kurum and Koorum] at this time.

³ Our author says nothing about the affair of Bust in 370 H., or of Sabuk-Tigin’s raid on the frontier districts of Hind in 376 H., when he carried off many captives and much booty. In the same year he took possession of the territory of Kuşdār. In 378 H., Sabuk-Tigin again encountered Jai-pāl, king of Hind, who was routed, and pursued by him. A peace was afterwards concluded, the terms being that “Jai-pāl should cede unto Sabuk-Tigin four of the fortresses of Hind on the side of Ghāzmīn, and one hundred elephants.” In 380 H., an occurrence took place, which few writers have noticed, namely, the imprisonment of Maḥmūd in the fortress of Ghāzmīn, by his father’s orders, where he remained until the following year. In 382 H. Amīr Nuḥ, son of Manṣūr, Sāmānī, reached Hirīt, attended by Sabuk-Tigin, and marched against Abū ʿAlī-i-Simjūr, whom they defeated. See page 46, and note. In 384 H. Amīr Nuḥ conferred the government of Khurāsān upon Sabuk-Tigin; and in the same year Amīr Nuḥ defeated Abū ʿAlī-i-Simjūr at Nīshāpūr. In
In the month of Shawwāl, 384 H., his son, Amīr Maḥmūd, was made captain-general of the forces of Khurāsān, and received the title of Saif-ud-Daulah, while Amīr Sabuk-Tīgīn himself received that of Naṣīr-ud-Dīn-ullah. Abū-l-Hasan-i-Sīmjūr they defeated and repulsed, and Khurāsān became cleared of their enemies.

Amīr Sabuk-Tīgīn was a man of great valour and intrepidity, just and pious, faithful, true to his word, not avaricious of other men’s goods, kind and compassionate to his people, and a discerner between right and wrong; and, in fact, every sign and indication of all such virtues and accomplishments as are desirable in kings and nobles, the Almighty had amply endowed him with. He ruled for a period of twenty years; and was fifty-six years old when he died. His decease took place on the frontier of Balkh, at the village of Madrū-mūṭ, in the year 387 H.

His sons were Ismā‘īl, Naṣr, Maḥmūd, Ḥusain, Ḥasan, and Yūsuf.

II. SULTĀN-UL-A’ZAM, YAMĪN-UD-DAULAH, NIẒĀM-UD-DĪN, ABŪ-L-KĀSIM, MAḤMŪD-I-GHĀZĪ, SON OF SABUK-TĪGĪN.

Sultān Maḥmūd-i-Ghāzī was a great monarch, and was the first among the sovereigns of Islām, who was styled
Sultān by the Court of the Khalifāh of Baghdād. He was born on the night of 'Ashūrā, the 10th of the month Muharram, in the year 361 H., in the seventh year of the government of Amīr Balkā-Tigīn, at Ghaznīn.

About one hour before his being ushered into the world, Sabuk-Tigīn, his father, saw in a dream, that there began to issue from the chafing-dish [used in those countries instead of having fire-places in the wall, and placed in the centre of the apartment] in his room, a tree, which began to grow to such a height that the whole world began to be overshadowed by it. When he awoke from his sleep, he began to ponder in his mind what the interpretation of this dream could be, when a bearer of good news presented himself, bringing intelligence that the Almighty had been pleased to give him a son. At this joyful announcement Sabuk-Tigīn became overjoyed, and said to the messenger: “I have given him the name of Maḥmūd.”

The same night also upon which Maḥmūd was born, the idol-temple of Wahand or Bihand [it may also be read Wahind, or Bahind], which was situated on the confines of Barshābūr, on the bank of the river Sind, split asunder.

---

8 There is a different version given as to how and when Maḥmūd became styled Sultān. When Maḥmūd took the fortress of Tak in Sijistān, by assault, and Khalaf was brought before him, the latter addressed Maḥmūd by the title of Sultān. This pleased Maḥmūd so much that he gave Khalaf his life. The titles bestowed upon Maḥmūd by the Khalifāh, and also bestowed, according to Baihaḵf, upon Masʿūd, were as follow: “The right hand of the empire, defender of orthodoxy, the guardian of the true religion and of the true believers, the regulator of the faith, the friend of the Lord of the Faithful.” See note 4, page 50.

9 Faṣīḥ-I says he was born on that date in 360 H.

1 The past. part. of the Arabic verb ḥadd used as an adjective, signifying—laudable, praised, worthy, &c.

3 Out of the thirteen MSS. collated, four agree respecting the word Barshābūr, and three have Parshāwar. These are meant, probably, for the present Pashāwar. Six copies have Nāshābūr; and six copies say that the idol-temple in question was situated on the bank of the Sudarrah [Sudarrah is an old name of the Chināb, see the Sādābūrā—farther on], and a f’t’h copy has, the bank of the Ab-i-Shudah [Ab-i-Sudah]. ‘Uṣbā [‘Uṣba] quoted in Elliot’s India, vol. ii. pp. 27 and 41, makes the “Sihun” the Indus; and in Reynolds’ version of the same work, the Indus is called the “Jihūn!” I need scarcely mention that the first is the Jaxartes, and the last the Oxus. In the last named version, also, we have “Wāmumd” for “Waihind.” The name of the idol-temple is written in three different ways in the various copies of the original collated: Behend—which may be either Wahhind or Wabband, in six MSS.; Behend, or Bahand, or Bihand, in two; and Behend—
The author of the Jami‘-ut-Tawarikh, in his account of the river of Kabul and its tributaries, taken from Abū Rihān, Al-Bīrūnī, says, that, having passed by Lamghān, the united streams "join near the fort of Darūnāh, or Darūntah [the only place that can possibly be meant here is Darūntāhā, दरुंताह or दरूंताह, ] and fall into the river of Un-Nūr and Kārīt, or Kārīt [लुंगूर और फ्राट, ] after which the united waters meet together opposite the town [city] of Barhāwar [one MS. compared has has बर्हावर or बर्हावर, ] and become a mighty river called by the name of Lī‘r-wāl. The village of Manhārah [मन्हार] lies on the east bank of the united waters [another MS. has, instead of this sentence, the following:—
‘called by the name of Ma‘bar, signifying a ford or crossing place,’ which fall into the Ab-l-Sind in front of [or near] the fort of Yittūr, or Yattūr [one MS. has शेताह—शेताह, belonging to the town [city] of Gandhār [how Gandhār—गंधार can ever be mistaken for Kandahār—कंदाहार is inexplicable to me], which place [मंगो] is called Wahind [or may be Dahind]."

This place—Wahind, or Dahind, or whatever it may be proved to be—is that which our author refers to, with doubt, and is the same place, probably, as mentioned by Bihākh in one or two places in his History, although he does not mention it as being on the bank of the river Sindh. I have never seen it written वी हिन्द. The printed text, edited by Morley, has वी हिन्द and a MS. in my possession has वी हिन्द. Some three years since I carefully compared the whole passage in the Jami‘-ut-Tawarikh, with the work of Al-Fānākhīf, the Arabic copy of a portion of the former work, in the R. A. S.'s Library, and other works; and I am unable to agree either with Sir H. Elliot's first reading of it, in his Appendix p. 30, or Mr. Dowson's new reading, in Elliot's
ties; and the same predominant star was in the as-

HISTORY OF INDIA, edited by him, vol. i. pp. 47 and 48, both of which differ widely from each other. Neither do I agree in the theory that Ûhand [not Ohind] so many miles above the junction of the Nfî-áb, or river of Kâbul with the Abâ-Sind, or Indus, is the place indicated, in face of the statement of Abû Râhân, which is perfectly plain in the passage referred to, namely, that the river in question falls into the Abâ-Sind, "in front of" or opposite the fort of Yîtûr or Wahind.

If the western bank of the Indus were the right place to search for this spot, so difficult to trace, there is Mahâban [ماہبان—not much unlike and بنيد and نشيد to look at] together with Oong, Behoh, and Râm-takht, mentioned by Abbott —although, from his mode of rendering Oriental words, it is impossible to tell what the originals may be—in his "Gradus ad Aironum," in the Ben. As. Journal for 1854, and Râjah Hoçâyey's castle, as well as "Ohind." There are also extensive ruins of a temple on a hill called Takht-i-Bihî, about fifteen miles north-east of the Kâbul river's junction with the Landâsey Sind, and some thirty miles north-east of Peshâwâr, which I visited in 1849 [see my account of Peshâwâr, Bom. Geogr. Journal, vol. x., for 1851-2]. Can this be the idol-temple which fell when Maḥmûd was ushered into the world? In the same vicinity, and within a few miles of each other, are "Kâpir di Gîrî"—the Infidel's Mount, and "Pratah Minârah"—the Fallen Minâr, in Pughâto, which names bear a striking resemblance to Bâhâkî's fortress of "Gîrî" or "Gîrî," and "Man-Minârah"; but both the places I have mentioned are on the western, not the eastern bank, and the last lies above Ûhand, which latter name, in all probability, is not ancient, but one of the many new designations given to places in that vicinity by the Yûsusaf Afghâns, when they first conquered those tracts on the Indus. I have made the early history of the Afghâns my especial study for a particular purpose, and I have never met with the name of Wahband, Wahind, Bahind, or Wahband in the histories containing the account of their conquests in those parts.

Since the above was written, I have looked over vol. ii. of Elliot's INDIA, and find that the author, at page 465, when referring to Maḥmûd's fourteenth expedition into India, says that Farîghtah in his work, as well as the "Tabâkät-i-Akbarî," and "Kânzû-l-Mahpûr," which latter I have not examined, mention "the waters of Nûr and Kirâz" as falling into the Kâbul river, precisely as I had read the same words in the passage from Al-Bîrûnî; but the editor, Mr. Dowson, still persists, as he says in a note to the same page, in reading them "Nûrokirât." Did he not consider that the second ١ in the words ﷲیروارف یبظ١ might be and? The dârâk of Nûr is mentioned by Bâbar, and is well known still.

To return to the subject of Wahind. From the passage in the Jâmi'ut-Tawârîkh, and our author, "the fort belonging to the town or city of Gandhâr, which place is called Wahind or Bahind, on the banks of the Sind, facing the junction of the Nfî-áb with the Abâ-Sind," must be looked for east of the Indus, near Attak-Bânâras, in the vicinity of which extensive ruins of an ancient city are mentioned in the account of the building of the former fortress in Akbar's reign. Apollonius of Tyana, in his "Travels," mentions a lofty temple as situated outside the walls of Taxilas, a few miles east of the Indus. [See Jour. R. A. S., vol. xvii. p. 76.] These ruins were again noticed in the writings of a Muḥammadan traveller towards the close of the last century. However, under any circumstances, and in whatever manner we may read these names, which want the vowel-points, and are probably incor-
cendant at his birth as appeared at the dawn of Islam.

rectly copied, the situation of the rivers, and the number mentioned, will not agree with actual facts. The Muhammadan traveller I refer to, states, from actual observation: "The Kābul river, after flowing through the darak of Mandor—called by the same name as the chief town of Lamghan—is joined, to the north of that place, by the Takhrīf (طخرف), generally known as the river of Lamghan; and near the koh or mountain of Durūnštā [درونست] those streams are joined by the Surkh-rūd [Red-River], which then flow past Jallābād on the east, and near the town of Kāmah are joined by the Chitrār or Chitrāl [also called the Kāmah], and thus united flow on towards Peshāwar. On issuing from the Khaibar mountains at Michāf [not Michīn], the united streams again separate into three branches, and thus [not united] pass by Peshāwar—which is some distance from the nearest branch—for some miles, and do not unite again until just after receiving the Landāsey Sind and its tributaries at Nisatāh, after which the united waters fall into the Indus a little above, and opposite Attak." The courses of rivers may alter in the lapse of centuries, in a flat country, as they have in the Punjāb, in some instances, but not in such a mountainous tract as the Kābul and its tributaries flow through, on their way to the Indus. I cannot but coincide with Abīl- Faqīr, the secretary [but never "minister"] of Akbar, in his remarks upon the accounts of India, written by early travellers, such as Āl-Bīrūnī and others. He says, in the Āl-Bīrūnī [I give the pith of his remarks merely], that "Fanākati, Ḥāfu- Abrū, and others, wrote down all the nonsense that was palmed off upon them; and, therefore, what they state is contrary to facts, and not to be depended upon, while other writers have wilfully perverted them. How could it be, otherwise, when such persons knew nothing of the languages of India, or of its people, or their customs? They could neither make investigations themselves, nor could they obtain efficient interpreters, or reliable information." See R. A. S.'s Journal, vol. iv. p. 356.

Farther investigation, since the above remarks were written, has, I think, enabled me to throw some light upon the situation of what is called Wahind and Bahind, and as to its correct name. The Tārīkh-i-Mirāt-i-Jahān Nūmā, a general history by Muḥammad Baḵš, contains the following respecting Māḥmūd’s two first expeditions against Hindūstān. "In 390 H., Māḥmūd set out for Hindūstān and captured the fortress of Barjandū or Barjundū [باجندود], possibly جندود but this word is not quite certain], and again retired. In Shawwāl, 391 H., he again set out towards Hindūstān, and reached Peshāwar with 10,000 horse, and defeated Jai-pāl, who, with fifteen brothers and sons, was taken captive. This took place on Saturday, 8th Muharram, 392 H. From thence, Maḥmūd advanced to the fortress of [Bhimdah], which was the residence of Jai-pāl; and he subdued that territory." In a history of the Rājahs of Jamū, said by its author, a Hindū, to have been compiled from Hindū annals, [Bhimdah] is said to have been Jai-pāl's capital and place of residence, which Maḥmūd captured. Mīrā Mughal Beg, who, about eighty-three years since, made a survey of great part of the North-West Provinces between Dihlī and the Sutlaj, the Punjāb, and great part of Afghān- istān, and the countries on the northern slopes of Hindū-Kūsh, in his account of the Lakhī jungle, says: "Bhaṭīndah [بیتند], which is also called Whaṭīndah [بہتند], is the name of a territory, with a very ancient stronghold bearing the same name, which was the capital of the Chāhīl [چل] tribe. Lakhī, son of Jūndharah, of the Bhaṭī tribe, having been converted to the Muḥammadan faith, during an invasion by Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghāmnī,
THE TĀBAKĀT-I-NĀṢĪRĪ.

itself. In the year 387 H., Maḥmūd proceeded to Balkh, and received the title of Rānā Lakīf, and he and his tribe were removed thither. They found there some three hundred and fifty or sixty towns and villages of considerable size, some with large and fine buildings; and began to make inroads into the tracts adjacent, against the infidels.” According to traditions quoted by this author, which are also to be found in other works, there were formerly two or three considerable rivers in this now sandy tract of country. In ancient times the Ghaghār flowed past Bhaṭnīr, and “fell into the Sind [Indus] on the confines of Jassalmīr. One of these rivers is called the Saghūrī [see the various readings of the original at the beginning of this note], which falls into the Ghaghār, and in its neighbourhood, at about five miles west; is a sacred pond or small lake, visited by hundreds of thousands of persons, and there is no other place accounted like unto it in sanctity.” There is a great deal more about this district, but I have no space for it here. I think it very probable that-what has been called Wahind or Bahind is no other than Bhaṭnīdah, which, written without the points—بھائید or بھائید are much the same in appearance as the words in the various MSS. of our author's text—بھائید and بھائید.

As to some confusion in the arrangement of Elliot's INDIA, tending to distract, which I have referred to above, I would mention, with respect to the name “Wahind,” that at p. 63, vol. i., “Wahind” is said to be the capital of Kandahār [w stands for g as well as k, and Kandahār in Afghanistan is always with j]; in a note at p. 397, the “river of Wahand or Wahind-Sagar” is mentioned; in vol. ii. p. 28, in the extract from Yaminī, “Wahind” is said to be a country; at p. 33, and other places, it is again called “the river of Wahind; and at p. 444, “the river of Wahind or the Indus.” Notwithstanding all this, this identical passage in our author, after having been “revised and sundry long gaps filled up by the Editor,” is thus translated [vol. ii. p. 269]:—“On the same night that he [Maḥmūd] was born, an idol-temple in INDIA, in the vicinity of Parshāwar, on the banks of the Sind, fell down!! There is nothing like giving a bold translation.

3. This last sentence is somewhat obscure in all the copies. It may be understood also to mean that his appearance was propitious to the ascendency of Islam: الکل does not mean “the greatest champion.”

4. See note 4, page 75, for date of accession.

5. Balkh has been mentioned by more than one author, as the capital of Sabuk-Tigin’s and Maḥmūd’s dominions. In the same year wherein he overcame his brother (389 H.), Maḥmūd, according to Faṣīḥ-ī, fought a battle against ’Abū-ul-Malik, son of Nūḥ, Sāmānī, and the Sāmānī dynasty terminated. See page 52. His independency may be dated from that time. In the same year, Arsalān-i-Jashīf fought an engagement with Abū-l-Kāsim-i-Sinjūr, and compelled him to retire to Tabas; and Maḥmūd made his brother, Amīr Naṣr, the commander of his array (see page 51, note 4). In that same year, likewise, he made Balkh the capital of his dominions; and the Khālfah, Al-Kādir Billum, sent him a robe of honour, with the titles of Yamin-ul-Daulah, and Amīr-ul-Millat. Maḥmūd also received the submission of the Shāh, as was the style of the rulers of Gharjistān [called by some Gharjistān], Abū Naṣr, son of the Shāh, Rashid, and of his son, Shāh, Abī Muḥammad; and the Khutbah was read for Maḥmūd in that territory, and the coin impressed with his name and titles. In 390 H. Maḥmūd made a dash upon Niḵāpūr, which he took possession of, and Bak-Tūsīn, the slave of the Sāmānī dynasty, fled; and in the same year Bughraḵāṭ, the uncle of Maḥmūd,
ascended the throne of sovereignty, and donned the robe of honour which had been sent to him from the Dār-ul-Khilāfat. At this time the throne of the Khalifahs was adorned by the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Ḵādir-Billah.

When Sultān Maḥmūd ascended the throne of sovereignty, his illustrious deeds became manifest unto all man-

was slain by Ṭāhir, son of Khalaf, son of Aḥmad, at Fūḥānj. Maḥmūd marched into Sijistān against Khalaf, who fled before him, and took shelter within the walls of the fortress of Tāq, which Maḥmūd directed should be invested. This is a different place to Ūk. For farther particulars respecting Khalaf, whose doings appear so obscure [Jour. R. A. S., vol. xvii. p. 147], see notes to Section XIV. Maḥmūd does not appear to have established his power in Khurāsān, for in 391 H., Amīr Abū Ibrāhīm Al-Muntashir—the last of the Sāmāns, who is not even mentioned by our author—aide by Shams-ul-Maʿālīf Ḳābūs, son of Ṣawāṅīf, who sent his sons Dārūs [see page 51] and Mānūchīhr, advanced with an army to recover Rai; but, having altered his plans, Abū Ibrāhīm, and his adherents, faced about, and marched on Ṣafāpur, from which Naṣr, Maḥmūd’s brother, again fled, and Abū Ibrāhīm once more gained possession of Ṣafāpur. Naṣr, who had retired to Ḥirāt, again moved to recover it, aided by Arsalān-i-Jāṣīb from Tūs. Abū Ibrāhīm despatched his forces under Arsalān-i-Bālū and Abū-l-Ḳasīm-i-Sīmūr to oppose them; but they were overthrown, and Abū Ibrāhīm again retired from Ṣafāpur, and took refuge in Jurjān, with Ḳābūs. Eventually he reached Ṣarahūs, and Amīr Naṣr marched against him and defeated him; and he fled for refuge to the tribe of Ghuzz. Naṣr made prisoners of Abī-l-Ḳasīm-i-Sīmūr, and Yūz-Taḥ, the Ḥajib of Abū Ibrāhīm, who had previously put Arsalān-i-Bālū to death for fleeing from Amīr Naṣr. In the following year, 392 H., Jai-pāl, [which appears to be the title, not the actual name, of two or more princes], Bādschāh of Hind, as he is called, was made captive by Maḥmūd. “He was sold for,” as the chronicler states, whose words I quote, or rather his ransom was fixed at “200,000 golden dīnārs, and 150 elephants; and the necklace taken from Jai-pāl was valued at another 200,000 golden dīnārs. This battle took place on Thursday, 8th of Muḥarram, 392 H., in sight of Burāh of Hind.” Here we might have expected to find “Wahhind” or “Waband” mentioned. Whether this is what is now called Pešāwar is somewhat doubtful, for up to the time of Bābār and Akbar, the latter city was called generally Bagrām, and is seldom mentioned, except by more modern writers of the Farīghtah class. The chronicler adds: “Jai-pāl, the Hindū, subsequently shaved his head, and mounted a funeral pyre, and died; for it is customary with Hindūs, that any Bādschāh of theirs, who becomes a captive to Munṣāmāns, should abdicate in favour of another ruler. His son Tand-Pāl [MS. تندپارل but probably ٌندپل—Anand-pāl—is meant], succeeded him as ruler of Hind.” In 393 H. the Ḳutbah was read for Maḥmūd in Sijistān, by Khalaf’s own nobles, and his titles were impressed upon the coins. In the following year the fortress of Tāq was captured, and Khalaf was made prisoner. The Sultān kept the territory of Sijistān entirely for himself, but gave the district of Jurjān to Khalaf, who, taking his family with him, left Sijistān altogether. Afterwards, however, Sultān Maḥmūd gave the government of Sijistān to his own brother, Naṣr; and the government of that province was joined to the appointment of commander of the forces [of Khurāsān].
kind within the pale of Islam, when he converted so many thousands [1] of idol-temples into masjids, and captured so many of the cities of Hindustan, and overthrew and subdued its Raes. Jai-pal, who was the greatest of the Raes of Hind, he made captive, and kept him [a prisoner] at Man-Yazid, in Khurasan, and commanded that he might be ransomed for the sum of eighty dirams. He led an army to Nahrwalah of Gujarat, and brought away Manat, the idol, from Somnath, and had it broken into four parts, one of which was cast before the entrance of the great masjid at Ghaznin, the second before the gateway of the Sulthan's palace [2], and the third and fourth were sent to Makkah and Madinah respectively.

Concerning this victorious expedition the poet 'Unsuri composed a Kasidah[3], or poem, two couplets of which are here inserted:

"When the potent sovereign made the expedition to Somnath,
He made the working of miracles his occupation.
He staked the Chess of dominion with a thousand kings:
Each king he check-mated, in a separate game."

Out of the different occasions in which the Sulthan's greatness showed itself pre-eminent, one occurred during this expedition. When he retired from Somnath, and desired to lead back the army of Islam by way of the desert[4], to Sindh and Mansurah, out of Gujarat, he directed that guides should be procured. A Hindu presented himself,

---

[1] Nearly every copy agrees in the name Man-Yazid [بیابی]. "Yazid" is not meant. One copy has "Zaid".
[2] Sic in MSS., but I fancy the word "thousand" must have been left out. If not, Mahmud did not set much value on his captive. See amount mentioned in note[5], preceding page.
[3] One of three chief pagans of the pagans of Makkah was named Manat.
[4] Some fragments of idols might still have been seen lying near the entrance to the Sulthan's tomb a few years ago, and probably they are still there.
[5] The first two lines are corrected from 'Abd-ul-Kadir-I-Budainf. The point of these lines lies principally on the play upon the terms in chess, lost in translation.
[6] The Rinn or desert of Kachh. An author, quoting from the Tarikh-i-Nasir of Baihaqf, relates a remarkable circumstance, which occurred upon this occasion: "On the Sulthan's return from Somnath, one of his huntsmen killed an enormous serpant or boa-constrictor, which was skinned, and found to be thirty ells (gaz) in length and four in breadth. Baihaqf adds, 'Whoever doubts the correctness of this statement, let him go to the citadel of Ghaznin, and see for himself the skin in question, which is hung up like a canopy.'"
and offered to act as guide, and that sovereign, with the army of Islām, proceeded on his way. After the army had marched all night and next day, and the time had come round for the troops to halt, although search was made for water, none was any where to be found. The Sulṭān directed that the Hindū guide should be brought before him, and inquiries made from him. This was done, when the Hindū guide replied to the Sulṭān, saying: "I have devoted my life for the idol Somnāth, and I have led you and your army into this desert, in any part of which water is not to be found, in order that you may all perish." The Sulṭān commanded that the Hindū should be despatched to hell, and that the troops should halt and take up their quarters for the night. He then waited until night had set in, after which he left the camp, and proceeded to some distance from it, aside. Then, kneeling down, and with his forehead to the ground, he prayed devoutly and fervently unto the Most High for deliverance. After a watch of the night had passed, a mysterious light appeared in the horizon, and the Sulṭān gave orders for the troops to be put in motion, and to follow him in the direction of the light. When the day broke, the Almighty God had conducted the army of Islām to a place where there was water, and all the Musalmāns were delivered safely out of this impending danger.

The Almighty had endowed that ruler with great power of performing many miraculous and wondrous acts, such as He has not bestowed since upon any other sovereign, nor such vast military resources, so large a number of troops, and unbounded wealth. Sulṭān Maḥmūd possessed two thousand five hundred elephants; and his court was guarded by four thousand Turkish slave-youths, who, on days of public audience, were stationed on the right and left of the throne,—two thousand of them with caps ornamented with four feathers, bearing golden maces, on the right hand, and the

---

1 A period of three hours.

2 The words used are ترلا وحن Wāshak signifies a good-looking slave, and a beardless youth; and has sometimes been used to signify a slave-girl. As these youths attained unto man's estate and their beards began to grow, they were attached to a separate corps, and placed occasionally under the command of rulers of provinces.

3 Signifying a Tartar cap, a sort of mitre or tiara made from leather or cloth or such like fabric, and covered with brocade or cloth of gold.
other two thousand, with caps adorned with two feathers, bearing silver maces, on the left.

This monarch, by his manliness, his bravery and intrepidity, his wisdom and foresight, and his prudent counsels and wise measures, considerably extended the Muḥammadan conquests in the east, and greatly increased the dominion of Islam in that quarter. The whole of 'Ajam, Khurāsān and Khwārazm, Tabaristān, 'Irāk, the territory of Nimroz, Fārs, the mountain districts of Ghūr, Tukhāristān—all came under the control of his officers. The Maliks, or rulers, of Turkistān paid him obedience and acknowledged his superiority. He threw a bridge over the Jīhūn, and marched his forces into Tūrān, and Kadr Khān had an interview with him, as had the Khāns of the Turks likewise; and the Khākāns of Turkistān came and presented themselves before him, and tendered him their allegiance.

6 That Maḥmūd ruled "the whole" of 'Ajam, and Tabaristān, is an exaggeration. Not one word is mentioned, by other writers of any authority, as to his holding any part of Fārs, and in 'Irāk his sway was but partial over a portion.

7 The only notice of this contained in Fāṣīh-I, during the whole period of Maḥmūd's reign, is in the following words:—"400 H. Death of the son of Sūrī, Malik of Ghūr, who was taken prisoner in an encounter fought by Sultān Maḥmūd, in Ghūr. He sucked poison from a ring he had, and destroyed himself. Some say it occurred in 401 H."

8 In the year 387 H., the same in which Sabuk-Tīghān died, and two years before Maḥmūd became ruler, Māmūn, son of Muḥammad Al-Farīghūnī, the Wāli, or ruler, of Jurjānīsh, [also written Gurgānīsh], of Khvārazm died, and was succeeded by his son 'Alī; and, in this same year, 'Alī was married to a daughter of Maḥmūd. 'Alī, however, died in 390 H., and was succeeded by his brother, Abū-l-'Abbās, son of Māmūn. He, in the following year, sent an envoy—supposed to be the author so much depended upon by Sir H. Elliot, and others, for his geographical knowledge of India—Abū Rīhān, Al-Bīrūnī, to Maḥmūd, asking permission to marry the lady, his brother's widow. This was sanctioned by Maḥmūd, and Abū-l-'Abbās married her.

9 In 396 H., Sultān Maḥmūd sent an envoy to İ-lak Khān, the Turk, son of Būghrā Khān [for now the last of the Sāmānīs had been put to death, as already related], proposing that they should enter into an alliance, and that all the territory this side [on the left bank] of the Aṃūshā [Oxus] should belong to him, Maḥmūd, together with Khwārazm, and that all on the other side should appertain to İ-lak Khān, and that they should not interfere with or molest each other's territories. Baihaqī says, writing in 451 H., that Kadr Khān at that period was called Būghrā Khān. It was in this same year that Maḥmūd undertook the expedition into Hindūstān, against Bihārī Rās [also written Ṣīrāf-Bajrā in Fāṣīh-I, Bīrārī in Mirāt-I-Jahān-numā, Iṣṭ—Bīrārī by Yaḥyā Khān in his History, and Rājah Bahārī by
At their request, the son of Saljūk, through whose activity, and boldness, too, the whole of the Khākāns of the Turks were reduced to a state of helplessness, was permitted to

Sanjan Rae in his work. He was doubtless chief of the tribe of Bīrār—\(\text{Bīrār}\)—See also Elliot, APPENDIX to vol. ii., pages 34 and 439, wherein great confusion appears to exist. Bīrā Rāe was slain, and the fortress of Bāhīfah near [i.e. not far distant from] Mulān was taken. After this, the Sūltān returned to Ghānīn, but in the same year he undertook an expedition against the Wāli of Mulān, Abū-l-Fath, who fled from that territory. Whilst Maḥmūd was absent in Hindūstān, in 397 H., I-lak Kḥān broke the newly made treaty of alliance, and invaded Khurāsān. This made Maḥmūd return to Ghānīn to make arrangements for marching against him, for I-lak Kḥān had penetrated as far as Hīrāt, which he took; but, in the following year, Maḥmūd encountered him at Balkh, and compelled him to retire. Khalaf, the late ruler of Sījestrān, it was found, had been intriguing with him during Maḥmūd's absence, and had advised this invasion. On this account Khalaf was immured in the fortress of Jusdez of Kuhistān. In 401 H., Maḥmūd again advanced into Hindūstān against the fortress of Bīhīn [also called Bīhm-nagār], the chief of which was Bīhm Naryān. There is no mention of any expedition undertaken in that quarter in Faṣībīf, as contained in the Jāmi'-ut-Tawarīkh, against Nārīn; but, in some works, an expedition against Nandanahin, in 404 H., is mentioned. In 407 H., Maḥmūd's son-in-law, Abū-l-Abbās-I-Māmūn, Farghūnūf, ruler of Jurjānāf of Khwārazm, was murdered by some of his troops. Maḥmūd went in person into Khwārazm, defeated the insurgents, and put Nāfīl-Tīghīn [called Alb-Tīghīn by Bāhāfīf], the ringleader, and the murderers, to the sword, reduced that territory under his sway, and Altūn-Tāsh, the great chamberlain, was entrusted with its government. I-lak Kḥān had died in Māwar-un-Nahr, in 403 H.; and in 408 H. Maḥmūd sought from her uncle, Tūghān Kḥān, who had succeeded him, the hand of I-lak's daughter in marriage for his son Mas'-ūd, whom he nominated as his heir and successor. Tūghān Kḥān himself died in the same year, and was succeeded by his brother, Bughrā Tīghīn, entitled Arsalān Kḥān. On that lady's arrival shortly after at Balkh, the capital was illuminated; and soon after Maḥmūd made over the government of Khurāsān to Mas'-ūd, with Hīrāt as the seat of government, having previously assembled the whole of his Ulūs, or tribe, together, to take oath of fealty to his son. [According to Bāhāfīf, however, this lady had been betrothed to Muḥammad, Mas'-ūd's brother, but the former, having been immured in a fortress by the latter, when he ascended the throne, Muḥammad could not marry her, and Mas'-ūd did, with the consent of her brother; but this was several years subsequent to the events above-mentioned.]

After having disposed of these affairs, Maḥmūd had leisure again to turn his attention to Hindūstān; and I will here mention, as briefly as possible, his next expedition into that country, because the narrative will greatly differ from the accounts of other writers. In the year 409 H. [see Elliot, vol. ii. p. 460], Sūltān Maḥmūd undertook another expedition against the infidels of Hind, and overcame Hardab [Hardab—vbīl—the "Hardat" of 'Abd-ul-Khādir-I-Budānī, the "Hardat of Matharrah" of the Jāmi'-ut-Tawarīkh] in that region, at which place—[my authority so styles Hardab, but must mean his capital, Matharrah]—there were nearly a thousand palaces, of stone, and an idol-temple of such extent and size, that "if a thousand times a thousand thousand dinārs should be expended, and builders and workmen of the greatest
pass the Jihān with all his kindred and dependents, and cross over into Khurāsān. The wisest and most sagacious men of that time considered the granting of this permission

activity and energy should be employed for two hundred years, they could not complete the like.” Within this great temple were five idols of gold, five guns or ells in height, and the eyes of one of them were formed of two rubies [Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh—“of a dark red colour”], which were valued at 50,000 dinārs of gold. The eyes of another were formed of two sapphires, of the weight of four hundred mishāls [600 mishāls = 1 ser = 7 lb. 13 oz.] the immense value of which could not be computed. From the lower extremities of one of the idols, pure gold of the weight of 4400 mishāls was obtained. Besides these great idols, there were two hundred others of silver, in the temple, the whole of which were broken up; and the temple itself was overthrown, and set on fire. [Compare with Elliot, vol. ii. pp. 44, 45.] After this Khinauj on the Gang, and other places, were captured, the details of which events are too long for insertion here; but among them is mentioned Nāridān, the fortress of “Brāmāh” [perhaps the place called Bhāwan or Bahāwan by some authors] called Manj, Asf, and other places. From the idol-temple of the first named, a stone tablet was brought, on which was written that the temple had been founded forty thousand years before. Jal-pāl of Khinauj fled across the Gang, on the bank of which were ten thousand idol-temples in seven fortresses. At the capture of Asf, Chand-pāl Bhūd, the sovereign of that part, was slain. In 410 H. Maḥmūd again entered Hindūstān, “and was engaged [detained] therein for a period of four years” [ءاجار سال كث وائم كث] during which time many conquests were made. In 411 H. Maḥmūd became greatly incensed against his brother Amir Naṣr, who had been acting improperly and carelessly in his duty in command of his troops, being constantly engaged in wine-bibbing and pleasure, and, by his conduct, causing relaxation in discipline, “for, when the forces were about to march, his followers were generally found to be in the bāzārs, instead of present at their posts; and great excesses were committed by them.” Maḥmūd sent Khwājah-i’-Amid, Abū Naṣr-i-Mīghkān, Al-Zawzanī, to him about this misconduct. Naṣr’s reply was so becoming that Maḥmūd passed it over, at the same time saying to the Khwājah: “My brother Naṣr is a very prudent and sagacious man.” In 412 H., Tasdar [Naro] Jal-pāl, ruler of Hind [see Elliot, vol. ii. p. 12], was slain, and Bhīm-pāl, his son, succeeded to his sovereignty. In 414 H., Sulṭān Maḥmūd came to an accommodation, in a distant part [سوي] of Hind with Bedā [Nandā, in other works], on the latter’s presenting 150 elephants, after which he returned to Ghāzīn, and in the same year made a raid into the mountains inhabited by the Afgānīn [sic in M.S.], plundered them, and carried off much booty. This is the first time they are mentioned in the history from which I have taken these accounts. In 416 H. Maḥmūd made another raid upon them from Bālh, and fell upon them at night. In this same year, Jaghr Beg-i-Abū Sulṭān-i-Dā’ūd, son of Ṭughrīl Beg, son of Mīkā’il, the Saljūk, rose, and entered Khwārazm; and Bhīm-pāl also died. In 417 H. the expedition against Somnāṭh was undertaken, and a farther portion of Hind was subdued; some by treaty and agreement to pay the jasāk or captation tax, some by force of arms and plunder of the country, and making captives of the people, and some by the people becoming converts to Islām. In 419 H. Maḥmūd proceeded into Māwar-un-Nahr, and had an interview with Kādir Khān, sovereign of Turkistān, and the treaty formerly existing between them was renewed and confirmed, on the agreement
that a portion of Māwar-un-Nahr should be held by Maḥmūd, and some be incorporated with Ḫadr Khān’s dominions; and a fresh treaty was written out upon these terms, and duly signed. On his way back, Maḥmūd granted an audience unto Isrā’īl, son of Beğhū, son of Sallūk, son of Luḵmān, and brought him along with him. After a time Isrā’īl was immured within the fortress of Kālinjar, also called Talwārah, where he died. In 420 H. Maḥmūd slew [slain in battle with Maḥmūd] Majd-ud-Daulah, Buwfiḥ, and acquired sway over Ḥrāq [a portion], and overthrew that branch of the Buwfiḥ dynasty; and Ḥrāq was added to the dominions previously conferred upon Maṣ‘ūd. “On Thursday, the 14th of Rabī’-ug-ṣānīf, 421 H. [A.D. 1030, about the middle of April], Sulṭān Maḥmūd died, and was buried in the Frārūz Bāḏgh, or garden, of Ghurānīn, after he had reigned thirty-three years. Some say he died in 420 H.” These extracts were taken originally from the work entitled "Maḵḵmāt of the ‘Amīd Abū Naṣr," written by the ‘Amīd [Aḥmad] Abū-l-Faṣl, Al-Baiḥaḵšī, so called from Baiḥaḵ his birth-place, a small town in Zāwulḵistān, also called Mūḵīr.

There are many materials for a complete history of this reign which, as regards India, is the most important one. Our author’s account is, to use the words of Sir H. Elliot, “too curt;” and I have been compelled to make these notes much longer than I liked. Another reason, for my comparative minuteness, was, that the accounts of this reign, in most authors, are confused and erroneous, particularly in writers of modern times. As in other cases, the “classical” writers, and the old geographers, referred to by Abū-l-Faṣl, appear to have led their votaries astray; and the names of persons and places are as diverse and different as the authors and translators themselves. Elliot’s work contains a large amount of most valuable materials, but the mode of arrangement tends rather to confuse, as I have previously pointed out. Names of persons and places have been introduced from modern translations of works, instead of from the originals, where possible. Who would think of appealing to Dow or the like for the correct reading of proper names? For example: in note at page 19, vol. ii., wherein S. de Sacy is quoted, who says that Dow has “Abistagi, and Subuktagi for Alptehgin and Sebkteghin,” his own blunder is far worse than Dow’s, for neither of the words contains any gh in it. See note 1, page 58. In the extract from ‘Uṯbi, page 20, where mention is made of the “fountain in one of the ravines of a very lofty mountain called the ‘Ukba Ḡhûzāk [‘Ukbah,— means a pass], into which if any filth is thrown storms arise,” which is quite correct, Dow, in his “Hindostan,” page 27, interprets it, “if a small quantity of a certain drug should be thrown,” &c. Reynolds, in his version of the Kitāb-i-Yamīnī, has made terrible work of the proper names, which are written all sorts of ways. He has Simjūrī, Sinjūr, and Simjūr for one person; Bastī and Bostī; Muwīd-Addowlat and Muwāyyad-Addowlat, and the like, in scores of places.

1 Not mentioned in other authors, and very doubtful.
returned to Ghaznīn, where he died at the age of sixty-one, after a reign of thirty-three years, in 421 H.  

His sons were Muḥammad, Naṣr, Masʿūd, Sulṭān, Ḥusayn, Iṣmāʿīl, 'Abd-ur-Raḥīm, styled 'Īzz-ud-Daulah, Amir of Ghaznīn, and Ibrāhīm, which latter had a son named Sulṭān.

III. AMĪR MUḤAMMAD, SON OF MAḤMŪD.

Jalāl-ud-Daulah wa-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, was a learned and virtuous-minded prince; and they recite [upon his authority 4] a great number of poems in the Arabic language.

When his father, Sulṭān Maḥmūd, died, his brother, Masʿūd, was in 'Irāk 5; and the great nobles and chiefs of

---

3 For the precise date of his decease, see note 9, preceding page. Among the different coins struck in Maḥmūd's reign one bore the following inscription:—

"The right hand of the empire, Maḥmūd Sulṭān, son of Nāšir-ud-Dīn, Sabuk-Tūğlū, Breaker of Idols." This coin appears to have been struck at Lāhor, in the seventh year of his reign. The following territories are said to have been included in his empire:—Ghaznīn, Zābulistan, Khurāsān, Khwarazm, Chaghāūfān Ṭabaristān, Sipahān [Isfahān], Kābul as far as Khīnaaj [sic in MSS.], the country around Kālinjar, Multān as far as Nahrwālāh of Gujarāt, Somnāth, the territory lying on the sea-coast of 'Ummān, Kuḍār, Sīn as far as Sīwāstān bordering on Kirmān, Kij, and Makrān. His authority in a good many of these must have been very nominal.  

5 In two MSS. the name of Maḥmūd occurs in place of Sulṭān, but the latter seems to be correct.  

4 Most authors place Masʿūd before his brother Muḥammad, and only consider the latter's reign to have commenced after Masʿūd had been dethroned and imprisoned in 432 H.  

6 Other writers state that his title was Jalāl-ud-Daulah and Jalāl-ul-Millat. Guzīdah says 'Imād-ud-Daulah was his title. His coins have Jalāl-ud-Daulah, and Jamāl-ul-Millat.  

6 He was an authority with respect to the text of several Arabic poems. In poems like the Mu'allaḳat, for example, the texts furnished by various philologists differ considerably from each other. The original words are  

7 Masʿūd was, of course, in 'Irāk, as he held the government of all the western parts of his father's empire. He appears to have been at Hamadān—  

but one author, at least, says at Isfahān—when his father's death took place. See note 9 at page 87. Immediately on the decease of Maḥmūd, the Ḥājib, ʿAlī Khwāshwānd, who was a relative of the late Sulṭān, and the Ḥājib, Bāk-Taghūdī, who was commander of the Mamluks of the palace, entered into a compact "that they would act in concert with, and do nothing contrary to each other, but act in harmony in whatever might occur, and carefully hold the dargah or palace—until such time as one of the late Sulṭān's sons should ascend
the late Sultan's court, by mutual accord, raised Sultan Muhammad to the throne of Ghaznîn in the year 421 H. He was, however, a man of mild and unassuming temperament, and possessed neither sufficient resolution of heart, nor decision of character, to govern the kingdom. A party, who were favourably inclined towards Mas'ud, sent communications to him in 'Irâq, upon which he assembled the troops of 'Irâq and Khorasan, with the determination of proceeding to Ghaznîn; and he marched from 'Irâq in that direction.

When the news of his coming, and his intentions, reached Ghaznîn, Muhammad caused his forces to be got in readiness, and set out with the purpose of resisting his brother; and 'Alî Kurbat* was the Hajib-i-Buzurg [Great Chamberlain], and the commander of his army.

When the forces reached Tîgin-âbâd, information of the advance of Mas'ud having reached the camp of Muhammad,

the throne, when they would deliver it up, with the country [sic], into his hands." This compact was entered into by those officers, in the presence of, and with the advice, approval, and concurrence of the 'Amîd [not "A'mad"] Abû Naṣr-i-Mîghân, the minister of the late Sultan.

Faṣīb-i says, that in the same year, 421 H., through the endeavours and efforts of the Hajib, 'Alî Khwêshâwând, and Yûsuf, son of Sabûk-Tîgin, brother of the late Sultan, Muhammad was confined within the walls of the citadel of Tîgin-âbâd, and they awaited the arrival of Sultan Mas'ud. The Taṣkîrah-ul-Mulûk calls the first mentioned person 'Alî, son of 1-yal-Arsâlan, a relative of the late Sultan Maḥmûd; and says that Muhammad made his uncle [cousin?] Yâkûb, son of Yûsuf, commander of his forces, and Khwâjah Abû Sahîl [not "Suhal"], his minister; but, that a strong party were inclined to his brother Mas'ud. Accordingly, Amîr Iyâz, with the Ghûlâmâs, or slaves—the regular troops or guards as they may be termed—combined to espouse his cause, entered the royal stables, mounted the best horses therein, and set out to join Mas'ud, who was then at Iṣfâhân. They joined him at Nîshâpur on his advance towards Ghaznîn by way of Hirât. On this Muhammad, with all his followers, set out towards Hirât in order to submit to his brother. Other writers differ greatly from our author, on very good grounds, in their accounts of his reign. Mas'ud is said to have written to his brother to say that he had no intention or desire to interfere with his sovereignty over the dominions—the eastern parts of the empire—left him by their father's will, but that it was absolutely necessary that his, Mas'ud's, name should be first in the Khwâbah. Muhammad replied in a surly manner. Mas'ud's partisans then seized Muhammad, as above related; and it is farther asserted that Muhammad had not, as yet, been blinded by them, but that he was deprived of his sight by order of Mas'ud.

* 'Alî Kurbat and 'Alî Khwêshâwând refer to one and the same person. Kurbat signifies "kindred," "affinity," and Khwêshâwând, "a kinsman," "a relative." This is the 'Alî Karîb of Bahâkhî.
they seized his person, deprived him of his sight, and placed him in confinement. After this act 'Alî Kurbat marched the troops towards Hirât, in order to meet Sulţân Mas'ûd; and, having arrived within one stage of that place, he proceeded to present himself before the Sulţân. Mas'ûd gave orders to seize him, and Muḥammad's whole army was plundered \(^1\) and despoiled.

On this occasion his reign extended to a period of seven months. Subsequently, when Sulṭân Mas'ûd, the Martyr, became the victim of misfortune at Mārgalâh \(^2\), Sulṭân Muḥammad, although he had been deprived of his sight, was brought forth and placed upon the throne, and he brought the army from thence back towards Ghaznîn.

Sulṭân Mawdûd, the son of Mas'ûd, marched out of Ghaznîn \(^3\), with the determination to take revenge upon his uncle for his father's death, overthrew him in the battle [which ensued], and put to death his uncle Muḥammad with all his offspring \(^4\). Muḥammad, on the second occasion, exercised sovereignty for a period of four months. His martyrdom \(^5\) took place in the year 432 H.; and his age was forty-five years.

\(^1\) In Elliot’s “History of India,” edited by Professor Dowson of the Staff College, the latter is rather bitter [vol. ii., pref. ix], against the bad translation of extracts from our author, made for Sir H. Elliot, for his work, and, in several places, cries out against this kind of assistance. I doubt very much, however, whether any “officer,” with even a practical smattering of Persian or Urdu, would have translated "بجلی نکری ای را فارسی کر زاد - "Ordered his whole force to be destroyed." does not mean “to destroy.” Mr. Dowson also translates this passage -سلطان مسعود شهید در ماریکا ساحب واقع شد "When Mas'ûd was killed at Mârîkâlā;" but, as in the case above, "ساحب واقع "does not mean "killed." His own words disprove his own translation, for, two pages farther on, comes the passage, “but in Mârîkâlā his Turkî and Hindî slaves revolted, took him prisoner,” &c.

\(^2\) See note \(^4\) at page 95.

\(^3\) See note \(^2\) at page 96.

\(^4\) The Taṣkîrat-ul-Mulûk states that all were put to death by Mawdûd, except one son, 'Abd-ur-Raḥîm by name. "Amîr Mawdûd forbade that he should be injured, because he had been informed that, at the time of the murder of his father, Mas'ûd, one of 'Abd-ur-Raḥîm's brothers, out of insolence, had plucked the diadem which Mas'ûd wore from that gallant prince's head, but 'Abd-ur-Raḥîm took it from his brother, and replaced it on the brow of Mas'ûd again, and severely rebuked his brother for what he had done."

\(^5\) For particulars see reign of Mawdûd, and notes. His reign is said to have extended over a period of nine months. The word "shâh" signifying martyr, also means one who dies for a cause which he thinks just; and any Muḥammadan killed in battle is so called.
THE YAMINIAH DYNASTY.

His sons were 'Abd-ur-Rahman, 'Abd-ur-Rahim, and Ahmad.

IV. SULTAN NASIR-UD-DIN U'LLAH*, MAS'UD, THE MARTYR.

Sultan Mas'ud, the Martyr, bore the title of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn U'llah, and his surname was Abū Mas'ud. His birth, and that of his brother, Sultan Muhammad, took place on the same day. Sultan Mas'ud assumed the sovereignty in the year 422 H. He was generous and munificent to so great a degree that they called him a second Khalifah 'Ali—may God reward him!—and in valour and prowess he was a second Rustam. No man could lift his mace with one hand from the ground; and no iron target used to stay his arrow. His father, the Sultan, used to be envious of him, and constantly treated him with harshness and severity, to such degree that he preferred a request to the court of Baghdaď, that the name and title of Muhammad should have precedence in the Khuṭbah over those of his brother Mas'ud.

* Other writers style him Nāṣir-ud-Daulah, and Nāṣir-ud-Dīn. The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh gives him the title of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn U'llah, wa Mu'in-i-Khalifah U'llah; but Baihaqī, his biographer, styles him "Shihāb-ud-Daulah, and Khuṭb-ul-Millā Abī Sa'id-i-Mas'ud."

7 It does not follow that they were twins.

8 He ascended the throne of Ghazīnī, at Hirāt, on the 1st of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 422 H., soon after which he gave orders to put the Ḥājib, 'Alī Khwēshāwand, and his brother Mangīrāk, to death, and confiscated all their property. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh agrees in this statement, and adds farther, that 'Alī Khwēshāwand, the Ḥājib, had taken an active part in raising Muhammad to the throne, and had subsequently acted perfidiously towards him.

9 Mr. E. Thomas, in his numismatic "Chronicles of the Pathan kings of Delhi," asserts (p. 79), with respect to a coin of the Turkish slave-king, I-yaltimish, that the mace is "the special weapon of the great Mahmūd." The statement is erroneous, as shown in the text. The mace was, by no means, an uncommon weapon in those days. See also under reign of Sultan Tughrīl, son of Arsalān Shāh, last reign of Section XII.

1 Mr. Dowson translates this passage [in the original—و ترسم ؑرهمق يب إثمه تمصي، 3—"and even an elephant could not stand before him." The word here used signifies a plate of iron placed on a post used for tilting at, and as a butt for arrows.

2 Mas'ud, on one occasion, when writing to his envoy in Turkistan, mentions his father's having once ordered him back from Hirat, when there as governor, and sent him to Multān, where he was kept in durance, but that he was never considered in any other light than his father's heir.
Khwājah Abū Naṣr-i-Mishkān⁸ says: “When the [Khaliṣah’s] letters patent were being read out in the audience hall of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, a weight came over the hearts of the great nobles and chiefs, as well as my own, because the marks of majesty and nobility of mind were more prominently impressed upon the brow of Mas'ūd. When Sulṭān Mas'ūd came out from his father’s presence, I, Abū Naṣr-i-Mishkān, went out after him, and I said: ‘O Prince, a heavy load has overcome the hearts of us, your servants, on account of the reversal of your august title in the mandate of the Khalifah.’ Mas'ūd replied: ‘Do not you be grieved. Have you not heard that “the sword is a truer authority than any writing?”’ and commanded me to go back again.

By the time that I returned to the audience-chamber informants had already, without loss of time, acquainted the Sulṭān of this obsequiousness of mine, and he summoned me before him. When I came into the presence of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, he demanded, saying, ‘Wherefore didst thou go out after Mas'ūd, and what wast thou speaking about?’ I related all that occurred without withholding any thing, for, had I concealed any thing, my life would have been in danger. The Sulṭān said: ‘I am aware that, in every respect, Mas'ūd excels Muḥammad, and that after my time the sovereignty will fall into the possession of Mas'ūd⁴; and I use so much ceremony now that this poor Muḥammad may, during my lifetime, experience a little honour and

---

⁸ Mas'ūd, as soon as he assumed the sovereignty, appointed this same person—whose proper name is Khwājah-i-'Amīd, Abū Naṣr-i-Mishkān, Al-Zawzanī—his confidant and secretary, which was the same office as he had held under the late Sulṭān Maḥmūd; and Ṭāhir, the Dabīr [secretary], who had previously held that office, was removed. In 423 H., Ḥasan, who bore the title of Shaikh-ul-Khaṭīr [great, honourable, &c.], who had been Wazīr to Sulṭān Maḥmūd, and had also held the same office under Muḥammad, was giddeted by order of Mas'ūd, because he had been the most active in depriving him of the throne. He had, in all probability, influenced Maḥmūd in his harsh treatment of Mas'ūd. In 426 H. Mas'ūd ordered Khwājah-i-Fāsīl, Aḥmad, son of Ḥasan, Al-Maimanīf [from his native place, Maimand, a small town of Ghaznīn], who had been long kept in prison by his late father, to be set at liberty, after which Mas'ūd made him his Wazīr. It was on this occasion that he drew up his celebrated Mūṣafat, or stipulations on his duties, to be observed between his sovereign and himself, and which each of them swore to observe.

⁴ Our author does not appear to have known that Maḥmūd, his father, had declared Mas'ūd his heir, and made the whole of his šāhs or tribe swear allegiance to him in 408 H. See note ⁸, p. 85.
gratification, which, after I am gone, will not be left to him.' The mercy of God be upon them!"

The Khwājah, Abū Naṣr-i-Miṣḥkān, says, "In this occurrence two things astonished me: one was the answer of Mas'ūd to me, spoken with such wisdom and discernment, and the second, the greatness of mind, and the perfect supervision of Maḥmūd, that such a trivial act of attachment could not escape him."

When Maḥmūd subdued Irāk he bestowed the throne of that territory upon Mas'ūd; and, previous to that event, the city of Hirāt, and Khurāsān, had been ruled in Mas'ūd's name. When he ascended the throne of Ṣafahān, he seized the territory of Rai, Kāzwin, and Hamadān, and the country of Tārām, all which he conquered, and he likewise overcame the Dīlamān. On several occasions he donned robes of honour conferred upon him by the Court of the Khalīfs. After the decease of his father, Maḥmūd, he came to Ghaznī, and took the government of his father's dominions into his own hands. Several times he led armies into Hindūstān, and carried on holy wars as by law enjoined. On another occasion, he marched into Šabaristān.

---

8 See note 9, p. 85.
9 Ṣafahān or Ṣafahān.
7 Tārām is in Lār, or Lāristān, a province of Persia.
8 Mas'ūd, in 424 H., wrested Kirmān from the Buwījah dynasty, who had long since declined; and sent Ahmad, son of 'Alī, son of Nūsh-Tīgīn, thither as governor. This, however, could have been temporary only, for in 433 H., after Mas'ūd's death, Kārā-Arsalān Beg, son of Jāghar Beg, wrested Kirmān out of the hands of Bahram, son of 'Alī, the governor on the part of the Dīlamān sovereign, Abū Kālinjār, son of Sulṭān-ud-Daulah, son of Bāhā-ud-Daulah, son of 'Irz-ud-Daulah, son of Rukn-ud-Daulah. See note 7 to page 66. After this, eleven princes of the race of Saljūk reigned in Kirmān.
9 In the year 772 H., Sulṭān Fīrūz, Tughluq, was encamped near a place named Zafar-ābād, on his return from Bangāl. This was before he gave orders to found Jūnpu[r [vul. Jounpor]. "At this place were the ruins of several idol-temples, destroyed by Sulṭān Mas'ūd, the Victorious, during one of his campaigns in Hindūstān. A fort there still retains [i.e. when the author, from whom the extract is taken, wrote] the name of Karā-kot, from Karā-Bīr, a demon killed by Rājah Rām Ghand, in the Tretā Jug." If it had not been stated that Mas'ūd destroyed these temples, I should be inclined to think this must refer to Mus'ūd-i-Kārhīm, only he sent his Hajīb, and did not make a campaign in India in person, that I am aware of. Baihaqī mentions nothing more than the expedition against Hāmīs, in his work. Our author does not mention his authority for the statement that Mas'ūd led armies into India upon several occasions.
1 Not "twice."
and Mazandaran; and, at the end of his reign, the Saljuq rose against him. On three several occasions he overthrew them in battle within the confines of Marw and Saraqsh; but, in the end, since it was the Divine will that the country of Khurasan should pass unto the race of Saljuq, he encountered them in battle in Dae-khan [Tal-khan], and for

8 Israil: Begh, son of Sulimân, son of Saljuq, who had been immured within the walls of the fortress of Kālinjar, died there in 426 H. In the same year, Jaghar Beg, or Jagharī Beg, as he is also called [سیریاج]-a name which most oriental writers, and all English writers but one, have, most erroneously, supposed to be “Ja’far” Beg—son of Abū Sulimān-i-Dā’ūd, son of Mīkā’il, son of Saljuq, son of Luqmān, rose, and took up his quarters at Marw. In the following year, Mas‘ūd made all those persons who had received grants or presents from his brother, Muḥammad, refund them. This was done quite against the urgent remonstrances of his Waṣīr. The sum produced is said to have amounted to eighty times a thousand thousand of dirams. In 429 H., Tughril Beg, son of Mīkā’il, son of Saljuq, assumed sovereignty at Nishāpūr, and from that date their dynasty commenced.

8 This battle was fought in 431 H., but some writers differ as to 430, 431, and 432 H. The scene of the encounter is said to have been “the desert tract between Marw and Saraqsh, three marches from the former, near the fort of Dāndankād of Marw,” which name is sometimes written Dāndankān, Dīnakān, and in other ways. It occurs, with a slight variation, in the Masālik wa Maamlīk in one place, but it is correctly called Tal-kān in another; and also occurs in Ibn Haukal, in Baihaqi, Yāsfī, Guzdah, Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīkh, Lubbut-Tawārīkh, and the works of some other writers who copy from them, the only difference in writing the words being دانکاد-دانکاد-دینکاد-دانکاد-دانکاد—and the like. It is the “Dandaneakan” of Abū-l-Fidā [Geo. Reiske, p. 345], who describes it as a small town of Khurasan celebrated for its cotton manufactures.

These names are however mere errors for Tal-kān, which famous place, and Tae-kān of Tukharistan, are commonly mistaken the one for the other, as done by our author in the text above, or rather some scribe for him, because, at page 46, and other places, and in the last Section, the name is correctly given, and also an account of the siege of Naṣîr Koh of Tal-kān by the Chingiz Khan. In carelessly written MSS., scribes make very little difference between the letter t [t here] without the points, and l—t—thus Qatlan and Tlān. The way in which the error of Dae-kān arose can thus be accounted for. Some early scribe read the letter b—t—as the two letters bā-dā—and the l was mistaken for t [t]. The other words mentioned above evidently arose in the same way, through some scribe, writing carelessly or quickly, prefixing two letters—o—one without points, which was subsequently read by some for e—and by others for n—or through writing dī—the first syllable of Sī-am—twice over, or putting one letter before the other.

Mr. Dowson [Eliot’s INDIA, Vol. II., page 273], who appears to have implicitly followed the printed text, has “Talikān.” This incorrect name, sometimes varied to “Talikhan,” is generally applied by European writers to Tae-kān of Tukharistan, without being aware of the existence of Tal-kān of Khurasan, or at least, without being aware of the difference between the names of the two places.
three successive days he assailed and struggled with them; and on the third day, which was Friday, the Sultan was defeated, and retreated to Ghazvin by the way of Ghurjistan.

Through the great dread which had now overcome him, he collected his treasures together, and came towards Hindustan; and at Mārigalah⁴, his Turkish and Hindu slaves revoluted against him, seized his person, and [again] set up his brother, Muḥammad, upon the throne, and sent Mas'ūd to the fortress of Gīrī⁵; and, in 432 H., he was martyred⁶. His age was forty-five years; and the period of his reign was nine years, and a little over. His sons were Maudūd, Majdūd⁷, Muḥammad, Ibrāhīm, ʿĪṣā-yār, Farruḵh-zād, Shujāʾ, Mardān Shāh, and 'Alī.

V. SHIḤĀB-UD-DAULAH, MAUDŪD, SON OF MAS'ŪD.

Shiḥāb-ud-Daulah, Abū Saʿd-i-Maudūd⁸, son of Naṣir-ud-dīn Ullāh, Masʿūd, when the tidings of his father’s murder reached him⁹, ascended the throne of his father’s dominions.

---

⁴ A pass, in ancient times somewhat difficult, situated between Rāwal Pindī and Attak, a few miles east of Ḥasan Abdāl. The hills around used to be infested with robbers, who generally chose this pass for attacking travellers and caravans of traders, hence the name “Mārīgalah.” The emperor Akbar had a good road carried through the pass for about two miles. I have noticed it in my paper—“Diary of a March with the Bombay Column of the Army of the Panjāb,”—contained in the Transactions of the Bombay Geographical Society for 1850-51.

⁵ Baihaḵī writes it Gīrī [گیری] and others write it Gīrī [گیری] and Gīrā [گیرا].

⁶ He was not murdered until the 11th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal of the following year, 433 H., at which time, his nephew, ʿĀḥmad, son of the blind Muḥammad, pretending it was his father’s command, put Masʿūd to death, after a reign of a few days over eleven years, not nine as our author states, because he ascended the throne on the 1st of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 422 H., and was murdered in the very same month of the year 433 H.; but he had certainly been in confinement since the previous year. Muḥammad is said to have lamented this act, and greatly reproached the murderers.

⁷ Appointed governor of the territory east of the Indus, with his headquarters at Lāhor, in Ẓī Foster, 427 H. Baihaḵī mentions two others, but merely gives the title of one—Amīr-i-Saʿīd—to whom Masʿūd was much attached, and whom he proposed to make his heir, but he died at Ghasmān in 429 H. The other was named Ṭab-ur-Razzāk.


⁹ Maudūd was at Balkh, when the tidings of his father’s imprisonment and murder reached him. He set out for Ghasmān without delay. See note ⁹, p. 96.
At the period that Sultan Mas'ud was about to proceed into Hindustan, he had established Maudud as his lieutenant over the territory of Ghaznin, and its dependencies. Maudud assumed the throne in 432 H., and assembled an army, in order to revenge his father, and commenced his march towards Hindustan.

Sultan Muhammad, son of Mahmud, who was Maudud's uncle, had been brought forth from his place of confinement, by the rebellious retinue [of Mas'ud], and had been raised to the throne by them, who, with their loins girded, stood before him [to do his behests]. The great nobles of Hindustan submitted to him; and the Turkish slaves of Mahmud and of Mas'ud, who had acted so perfidiously and with such hostility towards the latter, all had gone over to Muhammad, and espoused his cause. After he had been made sovereign by them four months, an encounter took place between Maudud and his uncle; and, by the will of the Most High, the victory was bestowed upon Maudud, within the limits of Nagrahār [Nangrahār], and Muham-

---

1 Guzidah differs in the account of this affair. "When hostilities arose between Mas'ud, and the Saljuks, and Mas'ud had been defeated, he had to retreat to Ghaznin. He then determined to retire into Hindustān [which in nearly every case should be understood to mean the Panjāb, except in the case of occasional expeditions beyond]. After Mas'ud had passed the Jfam [?] his troops mutinied against him, and carried away the blind Muhammad from him, after which they placed a throne upon the back of an elephant, and seated Muhammad thereon. They then conducted him through the whole army; and Mas'ud was seized and brought before his sightless brother." The Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīm, while confirming this, with the exception of mentioning the Āb-i-Sind, instead of the Jfam, adds that Muhammad gave up the direction of the affairs of government to his son, Aḥmad, and that Muhammad only imprisoned his brother Mas'ud; but Aḥmad directed that he should be put to death. This statement is confirmed by most other historians. Mas'ud's object in proceeding into India, or rather his territory on the Indus and in the Panjāb, was to raise a fresh army in order to take vengeance upon the Saljuks.

2 Maudud, on hearing of his father's murder, advanced with his troops towards Ghaznin to secure the capital; and Muhammad, who was on the confines of Sind [i.e. on the Indus, in the Sind Sāgar Do-āb], also hastened towards Ghaznin for a similar purpose. Every copy of the work I have seen has the name Nagrahār as plainly written as it is possible to write, yet Mr. Dowson translates it by the impossible name of "Takarkhulād," and makes the error worse, by adding, in a note [Elliot, vol. ii. p. 274]—"or 'Bakhrāh,' perhaps Bakhrāla [Firishta's text says 'Depūr,' not 'Duntoo,' as in Briggs' translation]." Why "Bakhrālā" is fixed upon thus at hap-hazard, it would be highly interesting to know. Was it because there is a place ast of the Margalah Pass called Bak-ralā, which happened to be not far off
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mad was taken prisoner, together with his children and dependents. Sulţān Maudūd wreaked vengeance upon him for his father's fall; and the murderers of his father, both Turk and Tāzik, he put to death, and thereby gained fame and great distinction. Whoever were implicated in the shedding of his father's blood, the whole of them he put to death.

He returned again to Ghaznīn, and took possession of the different parts of his father's dominions. He reigned for a period of nine years, and died; and his age was thirty-nine years.

His sons were Manşūr, Muḥammad, and Maḥmūd; and the latter had a son named Sūlimān.

VI. 'ALĪ, SON OF MAS'ŪD, AND MUḤAMMAD, SON OF MAUDŪD, IN ASSOCIATION.

These two princes, uncle and nephew, were raised to the

towards the Jihlam [?]? Which is the most natural—one force marching from Ghaznīn, and another marching towards it from the Mārgalāh Pass—that they should meet about half-way, or at Bak-ralah? A glance at a map would show at once where those places lie. Maudūd founded a Bāzār or emporium, at the place where he gained this victory, which Baihaḵṭ calls Dīnūr, and named it Faṭḥ-ābād, which, in the advance to Kābul, in 1842, was occupied by the troops under the command of Gen. Sir R. Sale, G.C.B. The name has been incorrectly spelt, as usual, Futtahabad. Maudūd gained this battle 434 H.

3 Our author has omitted to mention some of the chief events of his reign, as well as the date of his death. Both Guzidah and Faṣiḥ-i, as well as several other writers, state that Maudūd died in the month of Rajab, 441 H., of colic, when on his way to meet Jaghar Beg, his father’s old foe, whose daughter he had married. The capital of Jaghar Beg, at this time, was Marw.

4 A very unlikely arrangement, to say the least of it. Our author, here, is at variance with all works of undoubted authority. Yāṣa't, Faṣiḥ-i, the Nīsam-ut-Tawārīkh of Baiṣawf, Guzidah, Jāhān-Ārā, Lubūn-ut-Tawārīkh, Fanākatf, and several others state, generally, that on the death of Mau-
dūd, his son Mas'ūd, in accordance with his father’s will, was raised to the throne, and that his mother, the daughter of Jaghar Beg, Saljūḵ, began to administer the government in his name, he being a child of three years of age. After he had been one month on the throne—some say ten days—with his mother’s consent and approbation, the great nobles and grandees, by mutual agreement, set the child aside, and raised his uncle, Bahlī-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, to the throne. No writer that I am acquainted with says one word about two rulers in joint occupation of the throne, except our author, who also makes a great blunder in calling Maudūd's infant son, Mas'ūd, by the name of "Muḥammad." A very good reason is given in Guzidah for the child’s being set aside. Bahlī-ud-Daulah, 'Alī, married his brother Maudūd’s widow, on which she, probably, did not much mind her infant son being set aside for her new husband.
throne by the Turks and the chief men of the kingdom. Each and every person took possession of some office or other. As the two princes possessed neither capacity nor ability, and neither authority nor control, the utmost disorder and detriment continued to arise in the affairs of the country, the condition of the soldiery, and of the people in general. After two months they raised Sultan 'Abd-ur-Rashid to the throne, and sent the two princes back to a fortress again.

VII. 'ABD-UR-RASHID, SON OF MAHMUD.

Sultan 'Izz-ud-Daulah-i-'Abd-ur-Rashid ascended the throne in 441 H. He was an enlightened and intelligent man, and was a depository of the oral traditions, which he was wont to narrate; but he did not possess much strength of mind or intrepidity.

Seeing the repeated and successive changes and revolutions in the sovereignty, the Saljuqs on the side of Khurassan coveted the throne of Ghaznin. The sovereignty of

8 Fanakatf and Tarikh-i-Ibrâhîmî say 'Alî reigned two years, after which, on 'Abd-ur-Rashid rebelling, he fled from Ghaznin. Guzfah agrees as to the number of years that 'Alî reigned, but says that his reign terminated in 443 H., and calls 'Abd-ur-Rashid his uncle.

9 Under the events of the year 443 H., Faqih-f notices—"a battle between Majd-ud-Daulah, Abû Mansûr-i-'Abd-ur-Rashid, son of Mahmud-i-Ghâzî, and Bâhâ-ud-Daulah, 'Alî, son of Mas'tâd, and the overthrow of 'Alî after a reign, at Ghaznin, of one year, and the accession of Majd-ud-Daulah before mentioned." Other authors also call him Majd-ud-Daulah. Yâfât says that 'Abd-ur-Rashid, who had for years been imprisoned in a fortress, escaped, raised forces, overthrew 'Alî, and ascended the throne.

10 Translated by Mr. Dowson—"used to listen to chronicles and write history!" The original is اخبار سماج داشت و روايت كردي

11 A much more probable cause is given for the advance of the Saljuqs in other histories, which is as follows:—"After 'Abd-ur-Rashid had reigned one year, the daughter of Jaghar Beg, in order to revenge the loss of her second husband, 'Alî, brought an army of Saljuqs against him." It is farther stated that among the slaves of the Mahmûdî dynasty was one named Tughril, who was Amfr-ul-Umrâ, who went and joined the Saljuqs, conspired with them, fought a battle against 'Abd-ur-Rashid, and took him prisoner. The daughter of Jaghar Beg, widow of Maudûd and 'Alî, made 'Abd-ur-Rashid over to Tughril, and returned herself to Khurassan. Tughril imprisoned him in a fortress in the district of Maidân [near Kabul]. 'Abd-ur-Rashid was of such weak intellect that on one occasion, when Tughril was playing at Chaugan there, 'Abd-ur-Rashid came forth to see the sport, and applauded Tughril. After a time 'Abd-ur-Rashid was put to death, at which period nine of the
Khurāsān had passed to Dāʿūd; and Alb-Arsalān, his son, having become the commander of his forces, they determined to advance against Ghaznīn. Alb-Arsalān entered [the country] by way of Tukhāristān, with a numerous army; and his father, Dāʿūd, advanced upon Bust, by way of Sīstān.

Sūlṭān ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd caused his forces to be got ready, and made Tūghrīl, who was one of the slaves of Māḥmūd, and a man of consummate valour, general over them, and sent him against Alb-Arsalān. In front of the darah 9 of Khumār he inflicted a defeat upon Alb-Arsalān, and from thence pushed on towards Bust, and arrived there with the utmost expedition. When he came up with Dāʿūd, the latter retired before him, and Tūghrīl pursued him into Sīstān, and overthrew Beghū, the uncle of Dāʿūd.

Tūghrīl having gained two or three such like successes, returned to Ghaznīn, seized Sūlṭān ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd, and put him to death, after which he ascended the throne himself.

‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd’s reign was two years and a half, and his age was thirty years 1.

VIII. Tūghrīl, Al-Mal‘ūn, or the Execrated 2.

Tūghrīl was one of Māḥmūd’s slaves, and was endowed
grandsons of Māḥmūd were still living. Yāfāʾī states that ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd reigned nearly seven years, and died 450 H. No mention of Tūghrīl is made; and the author passes immediately on to Ibrāhīm, without any notice of Farrukh-zād; but that work only contains a brief notice of the Ghaznavī rulers after Māḥmūd the Martyr. The Taṣkirat-ul-Mulūk states that he reigned four years. Faṣīḥ-i states, and the Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh agrees, that ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd succeeded in 443 H., was imprisoned in 444 H., by Tūghrīl, who was put to death the same year, and that Farrukh-zād succeeded; but makes no mention of ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd’s death. Faṅākatī says he died 450 H., and then makes a sudden jump from ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd to Sūlṭān Ibrāhīm. Baiṣawī, in the Niṣām-ut-Tawārīkh, makes no mention of Tūghrīl or the reign of Farrukh-zād, and says that ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd reigned seven years, and died in 445 H., and yet states that his successor, Ibrāhīm, reigned from 450 H. to 462 H.

9 A “Darāh” signifies a valley between two hills, through which a stream flows, and a pass between two mountains.

1 ‘Abd-ur-Rašḥīd was present with his brother Māḥṣūd at the battle of Danjānkd, or Dāne-kān.

2 Authors of any authority do not give Tūghrīl a place among the sove-reigns, because he was an usurper of forty days.
with great intrepidity and valour. During the reign of Sultan Maudūd, he left Ghaznī, and went into Khorāsān, and entered the service of the Saljuqs. He remained there for a considerable time, and made himself acquainted with their mode of warfare; and returned to Ghaznī again in the reign of 'Abd-ur-Rasḥīd. He seized 'Abd-ur-Rasḥīd, and slew him, along with eleven other princes, and usurped the throne of Ghaznī, and reigned over the country for a period of forty days, during which he practised great injustice and tyranny.

They inquired of him, saying: "Whence didst thou acquire ambition to reign?" He replied: "At the time that 'Abd-ur-Rasḥīd was sending me forth to do battle against Alb-Arsalān and Dā'ūd, and was giving me my instructions, and had placed his hand in mine, terror had overcome him to that degree, that I could hear his very bones rattling from the state of trembling he was in. I knew that this pusillanimous man was incapable of sovereignty, and the ambition of reigning entered my heart."

After forty days of his rule had expired, a Turk named Nūsh-Tīgīn, a Silāḥ-dār, or armour-bearer, who happened to be standing behind Tughrīl, entered into an agreement with another, his friend, and they slew Tughrīl upon the throne itself; after which they brought out his head, and fixed it upon a pole, and had it paraded round the city; so that the people became free from anxiety and care.

IX. FARRUKH-ZĀD, SON OF MAS'ŪD.

At the time that Almighty God brought down upon Tughrīl the just reward of his crimes, and delivered the

---

3 The mode of making a compact—giving one's right hand.
4 After Tughrīl had put all the princes he could lay his hands on to death, he compelled a daughter of the late Sultan Mas'ūd to become his wife. Soon after he made a great entertainment, when a number of champions, filled with loyalty to the Maḥmūd dynasty, attacked him, and cut him to pieces.
5 Guzādah, Faṣīḥ-ī, and Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī, strange to say, call Farrukh-zād son of 'Abd-ur-Rasḥīd. His title was Jamāl-ud-Daulah, but, in the Muntakhāb-ut-Tawārīkh, he is styled 'Imād-ud-Daulah, son of Mas'ūd. Belhaḵī, in commencing one of the chapters of his work, states that he "began it in 21- Hiljah, 450 H., in the reign of the Sultan-i-Muṣṣam, Abu Shajī'-i-Farrukh-zād."
people from his unbearable tyranny, and unlimited oppression, two princes of the Masūd family remained alive immured within the fortress of Bar-ghund— one Ibrāhīm, the other Farrukh-zād.

The accursed Tughrīl had despatched a party to that fortress for the purpose of putting them to death; but the seneschal, who was stationed therein, had taken one day to consider the matter, and had kept the party in question without the gates, under the agreement that they should be admitted on the following day, to carry out that wicked mandate. Suddenly, carrier pigeons arrived there, bearing the news of Tughrīl the Accursed having been killed.

After that execrable [man] was slain at Ghaznīn, by the hand of Nūsh-Tigīn, the chief men of the empire, and the Malik, and Hājibs, sought for a sovereign. It was found that two princes still remained, immured within the walls of the fortress of Bar-ghund; so all of them set out towards that fortress, and desired to raise Ibrāhīm to the throne; but his august frame had become overpowered by infirmity, and, as delay was impossible, they brought forth Farrukh-zād, and congratulated him on his accession to the sovereignty, on Saturday, the 9th of the month Zī-l-Ka'dah, 344 H.

Sultan Farrukh-zād was a man of mild and amiable disposition, and just. As soon as he ascended the throne, he

8 Every copy of the work collated has [with two exceptions, which have جلیا] the word یکفر signifying "birds," &c., as plainly written as it is possible to write; but in the printed text یکفر has been substituted, and Mr. Dowson, of course, follows the printed text. That carrier pigeons, or rather doves, were in use long before, for transmitting news speedily, see note 8 at p 37. When the Crusaders under Godfrey were passing through the narrow defiles of Judea, a white dove, with a letter tied under its wing, from one Musalmān Amīr to his superior, gave information to the Crusaders of the foe's designs. This was but a short time previous to Farrukh-zād's reign. Salāḥ-ud-Dīn, subsequently to this, also established "pigeon posts" for the conveyance of news; and, in the latter part of A.D. 1179, when defeated by the Crusaders under Baldwin IV., the Count of Tripoli, the Grand Master of the Hospitallers, and the Templars, near Jerusalem, "a victory was proclaimed at Cairo [Kāhirah], and pigeons spread the triumphant news over Egypt, to quiet the spirits of the public," by Salāḥ-ud-Dīn's desire.
remitted the revenue of the territory of Zawulistan, which had become ruined through [the levying of] heavy contributions in taxes and supplies, so that it became prosperous again. He brought under his control the frontier provinces of the empire, and governed his people with benevolence. He reigned seven years, when, suddenly, he was carried off by colic, in the year 451 H., at the age of thirty-four years.

X. Sultan Ibrahim, Sayyid-us-Salatin.

Sultan Zahir-ud-Daulah, Nafr-ul-Millat, Razz-ud-Din,

9 The original text is "Awaris-wa-munat [not "mutan"] which Mr. Dowson renders "disease and murrain," and adds, in a note—"Awdris-o-multan. The former words [sic] mean literally diseases, but it [sic] is also used for those diseases of the body politic, extraordinary imposts." Does "munat" also mean "murrain" in the body politic?

1 The Ta'krikat-ul-Muluk mentions that, soon after the accession of Farrukhzad, the Saljukss advanced towards Ghazvin in great force, and were encountered by Farrukhzad and his forces. The Saljukss were defeated and numbers slain, and some made prisoners. Subsequently, Alb-Arsalan advanced against Ghazvin, fought a battle, and gained a victory, in which most of the Mahmud's chiefs were made captive, and carried away into Khurasan. At last an accommodation was come to, and some of the captives were set free.

8 Farrukhzad, according to Guzidah, reigned six years, in which several other authors agree; but the former gives the year 450 H., as that of his death, and says he bequeathed his sovereignty to his cousin, Ibrahim. Faqih agrees in this, and also as to the year; but states that he reigned seven years, which is apparently correct, he having ascended the throne in the eleventh month of the year 443 H., and died in 450 H. According to Baihaqi, just quoted, we find he was alive in the last month of 450 H., but, as he died suddenly, he might have died in that same month. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawafik, however, says he began to reign Saturday, 9th of Zil-Ka'dah, 444 H., and died in Safar, 451 H. Yasa'i agrees with Faqih, and states that Ibrahim succeeded in 450 H. In the latter part of the year preceding Farrukhzad's death, Alb-Arsalan, who had succeeded his father, Jaghar Beg, over the territory of Khurasan, ousted his great uncle, Beghun, from Hirat, and had the Khutbah read there for himself.

3 The word used for colic is "and described as a pain in the bowels and in the side, but I suspect it must be some type of cholera or inflammation, as it seems to have carried off several of this dynasty.

4 Among the Wazirs or Ministers of Farrukhzad was Khwajah Abu Birk-i-Sali, who had previously held the government of Hindustan. Among the celebrated personages who died during his reign was Abu-Najm-i-Iyaz, Ul-mak or I-mak, the slave of Sultan Mahmud, famed under the name of Iyaz. He died in the month of Rabii-ul-Awwal, 449 H.

5 Sayyid here means "lord," "prince," "chief of," &c. His correct title, as given by most authors, is Zahir-ud-Daulah, Abu Musaffar-i-Ibrahim.
Ibrāhīm, son of Mas'ūd, the Martyr, was a great and illustrious monarch, learned and accomplished, just and God-fearing, benevolent and compassionate, the friend of the learned; and supporter of religion.

After Furrūkh-zād had ascended the throne, Ibrāhīm had been removed from the fortress of Bar-ghund to the fortress of Nāe⁴; and, when Furrūkh-zād died, all hearts decided upon the sovereignty of Ibrāhīm. The Sarhang⁷, Hasan, proceeded to his presence, and, accompanied by the chief persons in the state, conducted him from the fortress; and, on a Monday, at an auspicious conjunction of the planets in the high vault above, he ascended the throne. The day after he performed the customary mourning ceremonies for the Amir-i-Ḥamīd—the Laudable Amir—Furrūkh-zād, his brother, and paid a visit to his tomb, and to the tombs of his ancestors; and all the great nobles, ministers, and most distinguished personages accompanied him on foot, for he did not show [particular] favour or familiarity towards any person soever, and, on this account, awe of his authority was implanted in the hearts of all people⁸.

When the intelligence of his accession to the throne reached Dā'ūd, the Saljūk⁹, he sent an embassy into Khu-rāsān; and entered into a treaty of peace with him. After Dā'ūd [died] his son, Alb-Arsalān, continued to abide by it; and Ibrāhīm brought under his entire control the other titles, given by our author, are not mentioned by other writers. He was abstemious and continent, and renowned for his tacit and excellent judgment. He wrote a beautiful hand, and every year sent a copy of the Kur'ān, written by himself, to Makkah, with other valuable offerings. Guzīdah says the Saljūkī monarchs used to style him “father;” and, when they addressed a communication to him, used to write his titles at the top of it.

* This fortress was situated in the district of Wajfrīstān.

⁷ The meaning assigned to this word generally is—“A commissary, a serjeant, a commander, a superior officer,” &c. ; but, in the Burhān-Kīti, and other works of authority in these matters, it seems, more correctly, an officer who marched in front of the troops bearing the standard—equivalent to the Italian gonfalonier.

⁸ Mr. Dowson translates this: “He bestowed no favours upon any one, and hence apprehensions about his rule took possession of the hearts of the people.”

⁹ Dā'ūd died, according to most authorities, in Rajab, 451 H., though one says it took place in 452 H., and another in 453 H. Faṣīb-ī says, “In the year succeeding that in which Ibrāhīm ascended the throne, Jaghar Beg died.” At all events he died a considerable time before Tughrīl, his brother.
dominions of his ancestors. The troubles and disorders which had fallen upon that empire, through the vicissitudes of the times, and continual warfare, were all, during his reign, remedied and rectified, and the affairs of the empire of the great Maḥmūd assumed fresh vigour. The ruinous places in the country were again repaired and restored, and he founded several towns, such as Jatrābād (?) Khair-ābād, Aimin-ābād, and others in different parts.

During his reign many astonishing and uncommon occurrences took place; and Dāʿūd, the Saljuḵ, whose ravages, inroads, conflicts, and conquests might vie with the flashing lightning, died.

The birth of Ibrāhīm took place in the year of the conquest of Gurgān, in 424 H., in the province of Hīrāt, and that monarch had forty daughters and thirty-six sons. All the daughters were given in marriage to illustrious Sayyids, and dignified 'Ulamā'; and one of those princesses was married to the great-great-grandfather of [the author] Minhāj-i-Sarāj, and this was the cause of the removal of the writer's ancestors from Jūrjān. Imām 'Abd-ul-Khālik, Jūrjānī, who lies asleep within the Sarāe of Ṭāhir-ābād of Ghaznīn, saw in a dream, whilst dwelling in Jūrjān, in his youthful years, that an angel said unto him in the vision: "Arise, and proceed to Ghaznīn, and seek a wife." When he awoke, he imagined that this dream might have been prompted by the devil; but, having dreamt the same dream three times successively, as therein commanded, he came to Ghaznīn, and one of those daughters was bestowed in marriage upon him. That princess bore him a son, whom he named

1 This is not correct, because the Saljuḵs held a very considerable portion of them.

2 In Elliot's India, vol. ii. p. 277, this passage is translated—"Several fortified places and towns were founded," &c., but ḥabūb does not mean fortified places; and, even were "ḵas" read for it by mistake, it would not mean "fortified places." All authors agree that Ibrāhīm, during his reign, founded naught but masjids, colleges, buildings for the accommodation of travellers, and works of public utility; and that he built nothing for himself.

3 Here Sayyid is the title of the chiefs of the family of Muḥammad, descended from 'Alī, and his daughter Fāṭimah. 'Ulamā signifies the learned— theologians, ecclesiastics, doctors of law. Mr. Dowson translates the sentence, "nobles or learned men of repute."

4 Our author is so much taken up with his ancestor's grand alliance that he leaves out most of the principal events of the reiga of Ibrāhīm. After he
Ibrāhīm—Maulānā, Minhāj-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān-i-Ibrāhīm—upon whom be the mercy of the Almighty! He was the father of Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn, who was the father of Maulānā Sarāj-ud-Dīn, 'Ujūbāh-uz-zāmān [the Wonder of his Age!], and he was the father of [the author] Minhāj-i-Sarāj.

Sultān Ibrāhīm was a monarch of felicitous and prosperous career, and his reign extended over a period of forty-two years, and his age [at his death] was sixty years. He died in the year 492 H. 1

His sons were Maḥmūd 4, Is-hāk, Yūsuf, Naṣr, 'Alī, Bihzād, Khūrshid Malīk 7, Khūb-chihr, Azād Malīk, Malik-Chihr 8, Tughān Shāh, Azād-Mīhr, Daulat Shāh, Azād-Chihr, Amīr Shāh, Nih-Firūzah 9 Tahamtan Shāh, Turān Shāh, Malik-Zād, Malik-Dād, Shams-ul-Mulk, Malik Sher, Sher Malīk, Mas'ūd, Irān-Malik, Kāihān Shāh,

arranged matters with the Saljūks, by marrying his son, Mas'ūd, to a Saljūk princess, daughter of Malīk Shāh, and sister of Sultān Sanjar, and had no cause for farther anxiety respecting them, he carried his arms into Hind upon several occasions, and reduced many strongholds, and other places, among which is said to have been a populous city, inhabited by Khurāsānīs, whose ancestors had been expelled from their native country by Afrāsiyāb. There was a large ḫawṣ, or reservoir, there, said to have been half a league in diameter; 100,000 persons were made captive, and taken away to Ghaznī, and booty, in proportion, was captured. During the reign of Ibrāhīm, in 470 H., Abū-Faṣl-i-Muḥammad, son of Hūsain [not Hasain], Al-Baihaḵī, who had been secretary in the “Dīwān-i-Inšāḥ,” of Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sabuk-Tīghīn, but, as the Deputy of the Khwājā-i-'Amīd, Abū Naṣr-i-Mīḥkān, Al-Zawzanī, and a pupil and disciple of that great man, died. Abū-i-Faṣl was the author of the work entitled the “Maḵmāt-ul-'Amīd-i-Abū Naṣr-i-Mīḥkān,” and the “Tārīḵ-i-Al-i-Sabuk-Tīghīn,” in twelve books or volumes, [called by our author the Tārīḵ-i-Nāṣīrīf, entitled Tārīḵ-i-Yamīnī. The first portion of the work, containing the reigns of Sabuk-Tīghīn and Maḥmūd, does not exist, and appears to have been lost for some centuries.

5 On the 5th of the month of Shawaḵ. One author says in Rajab, but gives no date. Faṣīh-i mentions the taking of Jerusalem by the Christians [August 15th, but some say 15th July, A.D. 1099] in this same year, and the slaughter of 80,000 Musalmāns. The year 492 H. began 27th of November, A.D. 1098.

6 In 471 H. Sultān Ibrāhīm was apprized that his son, Saif-ud-Daulah, Maḥmūd, meditated flying to Sultān Malīk Shāh, the Saljūḵ; and accordingly confined him within the citadel of Ghaznī, and his partisans were sent to other fortresses.

7 One MS. has Munawwar Shāh.

8 Malik Mīhr.

9 So in two MSS., but doubtful. The whole number forty. I expect the text should be, “He had forty sons and thirty-six daughters.”
Jahān Shāh, Firūz Shāh, Mirān Shāh, Yaghānī Shāh, Turkān Shāh, Arsalān Shāh, Tughrīl Shāh, Kutlug Shāh, Muayyid Shāh, Sulṭān Shāh, Malik Shāh, Khusrau Shāh, Farrukh Shāh, and Bahram Shāh.

XI. ‘ALĀ-UD-DIN 2 MAS’ŪD, AL-KARĪM, OR THE BENEFICENT, SON OF IBRĀHĪM.

Mas’ūd, son of Ibrāhīm, who bore the title of Karīm, or the Beneficent, was a monarch of excellent disposition [and temperament], blessed with many virtues, just and equi-
table, and of auspicious reign.

He ascended the throne during the Khilāfat of the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Musta’ẓhar B’illah [Abū-l-’Abbās], i-Aḥ-
mad, son of Al-Muḥtadī 3 Bi-amr-ullah. He was endowed
with humility and beneficence to an extraordinary degree,
and he suppressed all the oppressive usages which, before
his time, had been established. The contingent taxes,
which were exorbitant, he abolished throughout the Maḥ-
mūdī dominions and in Zawulistān; and likewise remitted
all tolls and imposts throughout the whole empire.

All the great chiefs and nobles and grandees of the
country were left in undisturbed possession of the [offices and
possessions] which they had held during the reign of Sulṭān
Ibrāhīm 4; and he adopted the most beneficial regulations
for the government of his dominions. Amir ’Uzd-ud-Daulah
wa ud-Din 5 was continued in the government of Hindūstān

1 Tughrīl, in one copy.

2 The proper title of this monarch appears to be ’Alā-ud-Daulah.

3 Every copy of the work [and the printed text also], with one exception,
perpetrates the great blunder of calling this Khalfsh “son of Muḥtadīr,”
instead of Muḥtadī. In Section IV., on the Khalfshs, our author gives
the correct name.

Under the occurrences of the year 493 H., Faṣīḥ-ī mentions an important
matter, from which it would appear that the chiefs of Ghūr were not, at the
time in question, such great or powerful personages as Minhāj-i-Sarāj would
lead us to believe. It says: “Husain, son of Šām, by command of ’Alā-ud-
Daulah, Mas’ūd, son of Ibrāhīm, obtained the government of Ghūr.” I shall
have more remarks to offer on this subject when I reach Section XVII.

4 Mr. Dowson renders this passage in the following manner: “He restored
to the princes, nobles, and grandees, their possessions,” &c. They must have
been dispossessed of them in order to have them restored; but ار ناار نو-تلهم شت
does not happen to mean “restored.”

5 From the word “Amīr” I should imagine this personage must have been
either a brother or uncle of Mas’ūd’s.
[as before]; and, during Mas'ūd's reign, the Ḫajib-i-Buzarg [Great Chamberlain] died, and the Ḫajib, Tughā-Tīghn, crossed the river Gang, in order to carry on holy war in Hindūstān, and penetrated to a place where, except Sultān Maḥmūd, no one had reached so far with an army before.

During the sovereignty of Mas'ūd all the affairs of the state were conducted with perfect order and regularity, and no heart had any cause of care from any quarter. He was born at Ghaznīn in 453 H., reigned seventeen years, and died in 509 H., at the age of fifty-seven. The sister of Sultān Sanjar, Saljūḵī, who was styled the Mahd-i-'Irāk ⁶ [or the 'Irāḵi spouse], was wedded to him.

His sons were Bahā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, who had a son named Khaṭlīr-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad; Šer-zād ⁷, Malik Arsalān, Farrukh-zād, who had three sons, 'Alī, Irān Malik, and Šah-zād; 'Alī, Bahram Šah, Malik-Čihhr, Malik-zād, Maḥmūd, Sultān Malik, who had three sons, Arsalān Malik, Al-Ḥasan, and Mīr-Nūk; and Jamshed Malik, who had two sons, Khūrshād, and Tūrān Malik.

XII. MALIK ARSalAN, SON OF MAS'UD.

Malik Arsalān-i-'Abd-ul-Mulūk ⁸, son of Sultān Mas'ūd, ascended the throne in the year 509 H. at Garmsir itself ⁹.

⁶ In Elliot's INDIA, vol. ii. p. 278, "Mahd-i-'Irāk" is translated "Cradle of Irāk." One of the meanings of mahd [mād] is certainly a cradle, and also a seat for the back of an elephant or camel; but another is "making a bed," and here mahd has the metaphorical meaning of a wife, hence the meaning is the 'Irāḵi wife. Baiḥakī, in his History, makes constant use of the word in this sense.

⁷ Our author, like some others, has left out one sovereign. Faṣḥī=f says that 'Alī-ud-Daulah, Mas'ūd, son of Ibrāhīm, died in 508 H., after a reign of sixteen years; and that he was succeeded by KAMĀL-UD-DAULAH, SHER-ZĀD, his son, in the same year; and in the following year Sherzād died, after reigning about one year, when Arsalān Shāh succeeded. Guzīlah confirms this succession of Kamāl-ud-Daulah, Sherzād, but says that he succeeded to the throne according to his father's will, and ruled for about a year, when his brother, Arsalān Shāh, rose against him, and put him to death, in 509 H. Other writers of authority likewise confirm the accession of Sherzād, who was the second son of Mas'ūd, while Arsalān was the third. Yaṣâfī and Fānākafī also state that Mas'ūd reigned sixteen years, and Baiṣafī confirms it.

⁸ His correct title is Sultān ud Daulah, Arsalān Shāh, son of Mas'ūd, son of Ibrāhīm; and, according to the Tārīkh-i-Yaṣâfī, he succeeded to the throne in accordance with his father's will. Some call him Abū-l-Mulūk.

⁹ The original is The passage is translated in Elliot's INDIA, vol. ii. p. 278, thus: "Malik Arslān Abu-l-malāk [sic] ascended the throne
and assumed the sovereignty of the empire of Ghaznī. Bāhrām Shāh, his brother 1, fled from him, and proceeded into Khurāsān, to the court of Sultān Sanjar.

During the reign of Malik Arslān some remarkable events occurred, one of which was that fire, accompanied by a thunderbolt, fell from the heavens, so that by that fire all the bāzārs of Ghaznī were consumed 2. Other untoward events and occurrences likewise took place during his sovereignty, so that people held his rule in detestation 3. He was possessed of great nobility of mind, energy, courage, and valour.

When he came to the throne he treated his step-mother 4, who was [styled] Mahd-i-'Irāk, with indignity 5, and on that

A.H. 509 [A.D. 1115], and brought Garmsh and the kingdom of Ghaznī under his rule.” I wonder what throne he ascended if it was not that of the kingdom of Ghaznī?

1 Some copies say “his uncle,” but this is an error, for Bāhrām was his brother, as the names of the sons of Mas'ud confirm.

2 The I. H. L. MS., No. 1952, and R. A. S. MS. are both very defective with regard to this reign. In those copies Bāhrām is said to be uncle of Arslān; and in the sentence referring to the destruction of the bāzārs of Ghaznī they have the word قُرُب—people—which is totally meaningless.

3 These matters are not alluded to in the works I have been quoting, and seem to have been taken from our author by more modern writers.

4 عادر سبکی means a step-mother.

5 He is said to have requested her to dance before him, for his amusement. This may have been one reason why Sultān Sanjar took up the insult to his sister, and the cause of his nephew, Bāhrām. When Arslān came to the throne, he imprisoned the whole of his brothers except Bāhrām, who succeeded in reaching his uncle’s court. Fanākatī makes a mistake in this matter. He says Sanjar was the son of Bāhrām’s maternal uncle; but, as Mas’ud, Bāhrām’s father, married the daughter of Malik Shāh, she was Sanjar’s sister [as our author also states], he being Malik Shāh’s son. According to Gusdah, Faṣīh-ī, and others, in 509 H., Sultān Sanjar, finding Arslān Shāh deaf to all the expostulations which he had made in behalf of Bāhrām, set out along with the latter for Ghaznī, attended by a numerous army. Arslān came forth to meet them with 30,000 horse, but, after an obstinate engagement, was defeated and retired to Lāhor. Having placed Bāhrām on the throne, and fixed a yearly tribute, Sanjar returned to his own dominions; but, in the same year [509 H.], Arslān returned with an army, and defeated Bāhrām, who again took shelter in Sanjar’s dominions. It was only in the following year that Sanjar became sole monarch of the Saljūks, after the death of his brother Muḥammad, and had only a few months before acquired sway over ‘Irāk and Khurāsān, his dominions before that having been but a portion of the latter territory. It was only in 511 H., that Bāhrām, having obtained the aid of an army from his uncle, who did not accompany him the second time, was able to move against his brother Arslān again. In the encounter which ensued, Arslān was taken prisoner, and thrown into confinement. Bāhrām’s reign really commenced in
account Sanjar became his foe, and gave assistance to Bahram Shah. Sanjar came against Ghaznin, and Malik Arsalan fought a battle with him, and was defeated, and retired towards Hindustan, where he fell into misery and wretchedness. He died* in the year 511 H., after a reign of two years, at the age of thirty-five years.

XIII. MU'IZZ-UD-DAULAH WA UD-DIN?, BAHRAM SHAH.

Mu'izz-ud-Daulah, Bahram Shah, was a person of handsome exterior, manly, munificent, just, and the sustainer and protector of his subjects. At the outset of his career, when Malik Arsalan ascended the throne, after the decease of their father, Sultân Mas'ûd, the Beneficent, Bahram Shah proceeded into Khurâsân, the throne of which country was adorned by the great and inestimable sovereign, the august†, the martyr Sultân Sanjar; and Bahram Shah resided at his court for a considerable time. Sultân Sanjar led an army towards Ghaznin, and Malik Arsalan, after an engagement, was defeated, and Bahram Shah ascended the throne. Sanjar treated him with great honour, and Sayyid Hasan, a celebrated poet of Ghaznin, recited this ode [on that occasion] in the Audience Hall, in the presence of Sultân Sanjar, on whom be the mercy and the pardon of the Almighty! One quatrain* of the ode in question is here inserted:

"Of the eloquent of the world what is the strain,
That shall ever on earth be proclaimed?—
A shout emanated from the seven heavens,
That Bahram Shah is of the universe king."

511 H. In the following year Arsalan was released, but, being again found plotting, was put to death.

* At Shâh-âbad, in Shawwâl, 511 H.
† Faâšîh-I states that his title was Yamîn-ud-Daulah, in which Guzîdah and other writers agree; but there are others also, but chiefly modern authors, who agree with the title in the text.
* The word Sa'îd—august—is not a proper name here. As Sanjar died a natural death it is difficult to conceive how he was a "martyr."
* It is the commencement of the poem. As Bahram was a patron of learning and literature, a number of authors flourished in his reign, and numerous works, both poetry and prose, were written. The celebrated work, known as "Kalilah and Damneh," was translated from the Arabic [âœ] into Persian by Nasîr-ullah, son of Muhammad, son of 'Abd-ul-Majîd, [called "Hamîd" by Eastwick], in his reign, and was dedicated to Bahram Shah. Subsequently, the same work was translated in the reign of Sultân Husain, of the race of Tâmûr, by Mullâ Hasan-i-Wâ'îs-ul-Kâshîf, and entitled Anwâr-i-Suhaiîf.
Sultan Sanjar returned to Khurasan again, and Bahram Shah assumed the government of the country. He carried on holy wars in the direction of Hindustan; and, on the 28th of Ramazan, in the year 512 H., he took Muhammad Bahlim prisoner, and put him into confinement; but at last released him, and made over the whole of Hindustan to him. Again he rebelled, and founded the fortress of Naghawr, in the territory of Siwalikh, in the neighbourhood of Birah; and he had likewise numerous sons and followers and dependents. Bahram Shah, with the determination of extirpating him, advanced into Hindustan against his stronghold, and Bahlim moved forward towards the confines of Multan, and fought an engagement with Bahram Shah. The Almighty rewarded Muhammad Bahlim for his base ingratitude, and he, with his ten sons, together with their horses and arms, on the day of the battle, sank in a morass, so that no trace of him and them remained.

Bahram Shah returned to Ghaznī again, and between him and the Malikus, or chiefs of Ghur, hostilities arose; and an engagement took place between them, in which Daulat Shah, a son of Bahram, was slain. During that one campaign Bahram Shah sustained three defeats from Sultan

---

1 One of Bahram’s coins struck at Lahir in 548 H., contained in a work on the subject, bears the following inscription. Obverse—“Coin of the Dār-us-Sultanat-i-Lahir, in the fifth year of his prosperous and happy reign.” Reverse—“A proclamation issued from the seven heavens, that Bahram Shah is of the universe king.” Anno 514.” This inscription, it will be noticed, constitutes the two last lines of the quatrain given by our author, who, in another place, states that the coin of Bahram was stamped in Sanjar’s name. See under his reign, next Section.

2 Two MSS. have مه and لآم in place of مه نم, but either of them is a strange name for a Musalmān.

3 A few copies have “two” sons; but, as he is said before to have had “numerous” sons, ten is the more probable number.

4 Mr. Dowson, Elliot’s India, vol. ii. p. 280, says, with reference to this passage, “The text has some unintelligible words, which vary in different MSS.”, and then quotes “Briggs.” The words are رني وربني or رني and are quite plain and intelligible. رني, which is also sometimes written بني, signifies a ditch, a marsh, a place where water stagnates; and بني is the adjective derived from it.

5 Among the events of 521 H. Fasih mentions that “a battle took place between the troops of Ghaznī, and ’Ala-ud-Din, Husain, son of Hasab, Ghur, at Tighnālād. Hostility had arisen between them on account of that place, which was a city situated between Ghaznī and Ghur. The city was taken, and Bahram fled. In 522 H. ’Ala-ud-Din took Ghaznī, and made it over to his brother. See Section XVII.
'Alā-ud-Din, Ghūrī, and Ghaznin fell into the hands of the Ghūrīāns. They set fire to it, and destroyed the whole [!] city. Bahram Shāh retired into Hindūstān at this time, but, on the withdrawal of the Ghūrī forces, he returned to Ghaznin again, and there died after a reign of forty-one years 6.

His sons were Jalāl-ud-Daulah, Daulat Shāh, slain in battle with the Ghūrīāns; 'Alā-ud-Daulah, Dā‘ūd 7 Shāh; Bahā-ud-Daulah, Sultan Shāh; Fakhr-ud-Daulah, 'Alī Shāh; 'Īzz-ud-Daulah, Muḥammad Shāh; Samā-ud-Daulah, Mas‘ūd Shāh; Shihāb-ud-Daulah, Mansūr Shāh; Mu‘ayyan-ud-Daulah, Shāhan-Shāh; Mu‘izz-ud-Daulah, Khusrau Shāh; and Sayyid-ud-Daulah, Farrukh Shāh.

XIV. KHUSRAU SHĀH, SON OF BAHRAM SHĀH.

Sultan Mu‘ayyan-ud-Daulah-wa ud-Din 8, but, according to some statements, Tāj-ud-Daulah, Khusrau Shāh, ascended the throne in the year 552 H.

As the Malikis and Sultanis 9 of Ghūr had shaken the empire of the house of Maḥmūd to its very foundations, and had wrested Ghaznin, Bust, Zamīn-i-Dāwar, and Tīgīn-ābād out of their hands, and had ravaged and desolated them, feebleness had come upon its government, and its glory and splendour had passed away. When Khusrau Shāh ascended the throne he was weak and powerless, and was unable to maintain his rule over the country.

A horde of the tribe of Ghuzz 1, who had acquired dominion and power in Khurāsān, in the reign of the august Sultan, Sanjar, who had now passed away 2, marched an army against Ghaznin. Khusrau Shāh was unable to resist

---

6 Great discrepancy exists with respect to the dates of Bahram Shāh’s death, and the accession and death of his son Khusrau Shāh, and also of Khusrau Malik, the last of the dynasty. For farther notice of this, see note 8, next page.
7 In one copy Zāwul Shāh.
8 In a few copies he is styled “Yamīn-ud-Daulah” only; but the title above agrees with the statements of several other authors.
9 That is, “who were Malikis and also Sultanis” from the text.
1 Some lexicographers spell the word Ghazz, and some Ghuz.
2 Sultan Sanjar died on the 16th of Rabi‘-ul-awwal, 552 H., but a few writers say in 553 H. The former is correct.
them, and he accordingly retired into Hindūstān, and Ghaznīn was lost to him, and fell into the hands of the Ghuzz. They retained possession of that territory for a period of twelve years, until the august Sulṭān, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn Muḥammad, Sām, led an army from Ghūr to Ghaznīn, overthrew Burāk, the Ghuzz chief, retook Ghaznīn, and established [his brother] Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn Muḥammad, Sām, the martyr, upon the Ghaznīn throne. Khusrau Shāh had retired to Lāhor, of Hindūstān. His reign extended to a period of seven years, after which he died.

The Taškīrat-ul-Mulūk contains a very good account of the reign of Khusrau Shāh, which I here make an extract from. "He succeeded his father, and as 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Ḥasan, Ghūrī, was in full march upon Ghaznīn, he, being unable to resist him with hopes of success, retired into Hindūstān [here signifying the Panjāb] and took up his residence at Lāhor. He turned his attention to the government of the western portion of his father's dominions, which were now left to him; but, when 'Alā-ud-Dīn retired, after the plunder of Ghaznīn, Khusrau Shāh returned to Ghaznīn, and again took up his quarters there. Soon after, when the Ghuzz tribe took Sulṭān Sanjar, his great uncle, captive, and were advancing towards Ghaznīn, Khusrau Shāh, who, probably, while Sulṭān Sanjar was in power, might have expected aid from him in some shape or other, now that he was a prisoner, was totally unable to resist them, and he again retired to Lāhor, and died there in 555 H., after reigning eight years."

In one copy Turāk.

Great discrepancy prevails among authors respecting the latter part of Bahrām Shāh's reign, and the reigns of Khusrau Shāh, and Khusrau Malik, which I will notice as briefly as possible.

The first events noticed in Faṣīḥ-ī, under the year 523 H., are, "the return of Bahrām Shāh to Ghaznīn, his encountering Saif-ud-dīn, Ghūrī, and the capture of the latter." He was placed upon a bullock—not "a cow"—and paraded through the streets of that city, and afterwards put to death. 'Alā-ud-Dīn, his brother, determined to revenge him, and marched towards Ghaznīn with a numerous army; but Bahrām died before his arrival, in that same year [523 H.]." An account of the plunder of the city, and massacre of the people then follows; and it is farther stated therein, that 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jahān-soz, made over the sovereignty of Ghaznīn to his nephews, the brothers Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, and Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, and that "Khusrau Shāh, who succeeded his father, Bahrām, was inveigled by them, that same year, and immured within the citadel of Ghaznīn, and the dynasty of the race of Maḥmūd, son of Sabūk-Tīgīn, ended:"—that is, terminated over the Ghaznīn territory.

Yāsāfī, Kāf Balīzawī, Guzādah, Tārīkh-i-Alfī, and some others agree with the above statement, except as to the year of Bahrām's death, and the termination of the dynasty. These four works also mention 'Alā-ud-Dīn as the first of the Malikūs—here, doubtless, signifying independent rulers—of Ghūr; and they, correctly, it appears to me, account those previous to him to have been mere subordinate chieftains, for, if we consider the small extent of territory they could only have possibly possessed, their statements are to be relied upon.
His sons were Maḥmūd, Khusrau Malik, and Kair-Khusrau.

Guzfeldah says Bahram died in 544 H. after a reign of thirty-two years, while Fanākātī asserts that he reigned twenty years, and died in 532 H. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh, which is generally most particular and correct as regards dates, agrees with Guzfeldah as to the year, but confirms the statement of Yaṣa'i, Faṣih I, and the Niqām-ut-Tawārīkh, as to Khusrau Shāh having reigned but one year, after which the tribe of Ghuzz came against Ghaznī, and he, being unable to cope with them, retired into Hind, and took up his residence at Lāhor, where he died in 545 H. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh however adds, that, in the Raṣṣat-us-Ṣafā, the year 555 H. is given. Guzfeldah also says this event occurred in 555 H., and in this Kāst Baijawaī agrees. Among more modern works, the Taṣkirat-ul-Mulūk and Tāfīkh-i-Allī state that Bahram died in 547 H., after reigning thirty-five years, and Khusrau Shāh in 555 H., and in this the Taḥkāt-i-Akbarī, Badāūnī, and Firīshta, and other modern writers agree.

Our author states that Bahram ascended the throne in 511 H., and died in 552 H. after a reign of forty-one years; and that Khusrau Shāh, his son, succeeded, and reigned seven years, but does not give the date of his decease; but, by his statement, it would have been in 559 H., after which date his son, Khusrau Malik, succeeded. Their coins, mentioned farther on, tend to show the contrary.

As to 'Alā-ud-Dīn's making over the government of Ghaznī to his nephews, there is not so much discrepancy in the earlier writers, with the exception of our author, who expressly states that they were detained within the walls of a fortress by him, and were only set at liberty by his son and successor, as mentioned in Section XVII., which see. This was the year after Saif-ud-Dīn's death, who, according to Faṣih-I, was slain in a battle with the Ghuzz near Balkh, in which same year his nephew, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, succeeded him, and inflicted a defeat upon the Ghuzz, with considerable slaughter, and imposed tribute on them.

After Khusrau Shāh comes his son Khusrau Malik, or Malik Khusrau, as he is also styled. Yaṣa'i, Baijawaī, Guzfeldah, and Fanākātī say the dynasty terminated with Khusrau Shāh, and make no mention of his son, as his successor. Perhaps they considered him as ruler of the Panjāb only. The Taṣkirat-ul-Mulūk states that Khusrau Malik succeeded his father as ruler of the Panjāb in 555 H., and was put to death in 583 H., after reigning twenty-eight years, while the Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh, which agrees in the date of his accession, says that he was immured in a fortress in Ghurjastān in 583 H., and in 588 H. was murdered along with his son Bahram Shāh, and the whole of the remainder of the Ghaznavī family then left. Raṣṣat-us-Ṣafā, Ḥabīb-us-Seyr, Firīshta, and others say this occurred in 582 H., and Budāūnī, who merely gives this ruler a place “because the author of the Taḥkāt-i-Akbarī does so,” as he remarks, says 583 H. Our author states that the Ghūrīs first appeared before Lāhor in 577 H., and gained possession of it in 583 H., thus agreeing with some of the above statements, but mentions the year 598 H., as the year in which Khusrau Malik and all his family were murdered.

Faṣih-I mentions the Ghūrīs as powerful in Ghaznī and Hind in 566 H., that Ghīyās-ud-Dīn took that capital from the Ghuzz tribe [What an excellent opportunity this would be, to the “comparative” or rather superlative “philologists,” to have derived the name of Ghaznī from the Ghuzz tribe] in 569 H., and made it over to his brother, Mu'izz, as Wall. After referring to
XV. Khusrau Malik, Son of Khusrau Shāh, the Last of the Maḥmūdī Dynasty.

Tāj-ud-Daulah, Sulṭān-i-Ḥalīm, or the Mild Sulṭān, Khusrau Malik, ascended the throne at Lahor.

He was a monarch of excessive mildness and beneficence, unassuming, and endowed with many good qualities, but addicted to pleasure. As he came at the close of the sovereignty of his family, no prepossessing memento of him has survived, and the sovereignty of that dynasty terminated in him. Anarchy and disorder at last showed itself in the affairs of his government, and all the Amirs and lesser officials of the country, both the Turks and the free-born [natives], all became too powerful for him to deal with, and the servants of the state and governors of provinces and districts exercised independent power, whilst their sovereign abandoned himself wholly to pleasure.

the defeat, by him, of a horde of the Sanḳarān, a sept of the Ghuzz tribe [not "a mountain" or "a town"] in 571 H., and his expedition against Nahrwālah in 575 H., the same work states, under the occurrence of the year 581 H.—"In this year an engagement took place between Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn Muḥammad, son of Sām, son of Ḥusain, son of Sām, the Wālī of Ghaznī, and Khusrau Malik, at Lohor, in Hind. Khusrau was taken captive by stratagem; and the Sipāh-sālār, 'Alī Karmān, who was Wālī of Multān previously, was left at Lohor as Wālī, but some writers say this took place in 582 H."

In Mr. Thomas's paper on the Ghaznī Coins there is, unfortunately, no notice of the last two monarchs of the house of Sabuk-Tīgīn, and there are no coins of theirs, or the dates above referred to might have been tested; but a work I have by me supplies some information on the subject, and confirms the statements of Faṣīḥ-Ī, and the older writers. A coin of Khusrau Shāh's therein noticed, contains the following inscription, which I translate literally:—

Obverse—"Stamped coin in the universe, with magnificence and grandeur, the great Bāḏgāh Khusrau Shāh."
Reverse—"Struck in the city of Lohor, A.H. 552, the first of his reign."

Another coin of his son, Khusrau Malik, also struck in the Panjāb, contains the following inscription:—

Obverse—"Zahl-ud-Daulah wa ud-Dīn, Sulṭān Khusrau Malik."
Reverse—"Struck in the city of Lohor, A.H. 555, the first of the reign."

All writers agree as to the deceitful and treacherous conduct of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Ghurī, towards Khusrau Malik. After he had inveigled that unfortunate prince by his oaths and promises, he broke them, and sent him and the whole of the family then remaining to his brother Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, to be immured in a fortress in Ghūr. Subsequently, when these very pious and model Sulṭāns, as our author considers them, found those unfortunates in the way, they massacred the whole of them.
Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn Muḥammad, Sām, used to advance every year from Ghaznīn, and to possess himself of portions of Hind and Sind, until in the year 577 H., when he appeared before the gate of Lahor, and extorted a son and an elephant from Khusrau Malik, and then retired. Thus matters went on until the year 583 H., when he brought an army against Lahor and reduced it. Khusrau Malik was induced, under the faith of a treaty, to come out, upon which he was taken and sent off to Ghaznīn, and from thence was removed to the capital, Firuz-koh, which was the seat of government of the elder Sultān, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn Muḥammad, Sām. That sovereign gave orders that Khusrau Malik should be immured within the fortress of Balarwān ⁶, in Gharjistān.

When the affair ⁷ of Sultān Shāh occurred in Khurāsān, and the two Sultāns turned their attention to that important enterprize, they put Sultān Khusrau Malik to death in the year 598 H., and the latter's son, Bahrām Shāh, who was confined within the fortress of Saifrūd of Ghūr, was also murdered, and the dominion and dynasty of Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Sabuk-Tigīn, became obliterated, and the sovereignty of Irān, the throne of Hindūstān, and the territory of Khurāsān came under the sway of the Malikus and Sultāns of the house of Shansabānī.

Khusrau Malik's sons were Bahrām Shāh, Maḥmūd Shāh, Jahān Shāh, Mas'ūd Shāh, Malik Shāh, and Khusrau Shāh.

⁶ In the greater number of places where this name occurs in the different MSS., بلال وان is given; but it is also written Yalarwān, Badwān, and in various other ways. Saifrūd is also written Sanḍkarān in some copies. See note to Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's reign, Section XIX.
⁷ See under Section XVII.