SECTION XII.

THE DYNASTY OF THE SALJUKIAH.

The author of the Tārīkh-i-Ṣānī, who was Ibn Ḥaiṣam, has thus related: that when the victorious Sultan, Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tigin, crossed the Jihūn, and the territory of Māwar-un-Nahr was left clear in his hands, Kadr Khān, who was the brother of the late I-lak [Khān], and of the Afrāsiyābī dynasty, entered into negotiation with the Sultan. Between the two potentates treaties of alliance and amity were entered into, and confirmed and cemented, and an interview took place between them.

After Kadr Khān had been received by the Sultan, the latter commanded, after the public reception, that the privy apartment should be cleared; and they held private conference together, and consulted confidentially on all the affairs of Irān and Tūrān. Kadr Khān preferred many requests to the Sultan, one of which was that he would remove the son of Saljūk, the Turkmān, with his followers

---

1 At Section VII. page 11, the author calls the work Kašaš-i-Ṣānī, but the signification is the same. See also note 2, page 56.

2 This interview took place in 419 H. They entered into a treaty of friendship and alliance, the principal stipulation in which was, that a portion of Māwar-un-Nahr should remain in the possession of the Sultan, and that some should belong to Kadr Khān, who is styled Bāḏghāh of Māwar un-Nahr. The Khwājah-i-'Amīd, Abū Naṣr-i-Miḡkān, Al-Zawzanī, relates that at that time the forces along with Sultan Maḥmūd were so numerous, that no monarch had ever so many under his standard before.

3 With respect to the Saljūks and their rise to power, Oriental historians differ considerably; but space will not permit my noticing their discrepancies, except very briefly. Several authors altogether deny that Sultan Maḥmūd suffered the Saljūks to enter Khurāsān, and assigned them lands therein—among whom is the author of the Raẓūq-ūṣ-Ṣafā—and contend that the two brothers, Dā'ūd-i-Jaghār Beg and Tughril Beg [but our author states they were altogether separate from those under Yagh-mū or Yagh-nūr; still his statement is so confused as to be scarcely reliable], with their dependents, did not cross the Jihūn into Khurāsān, until the reign of Mas'ūd, when they appropriated Nisā and Ablīward, but, at the same time, sent to tender their allegiance to that monarch. See note 3, p. 120. In the Tārīkh of Abū-l-'Alā-i-Aḥwal, or the "Squinter,"
and dependents, from the country of Māwar-un-Nahr and Turkistān into Khorāsān. These followers and dependents

Saljuḵ is said to have been a descendant of Afrāsīyāb, and had four sons—Isrā’īl, Mīḵā’īl, Müsā-i-Beghū [i.e. son of Beghū], and Yūnas. The Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīḵ says he had five; and that the name of the fourth son was Yūsuf, and the fifth Yūnas. Finding the lands they occupied too circumscribed, they were compelled, in 375 H., to leave their native pastures in Turkistān—one author says the Dašt-i-Khur— and entered Māwar-un-Nahr, and took up their quarters in the Nur of Bukhārā, and the Sughd of Samrḵand, making the former their winter, and the latter their summer quarters. Maḥmūd, according to the “Squinter,” was on friendly terms with them [see under his reign], and Isrā’īl came and waited upon him, when that monarch entered Māwar-un-Nahr, and was treated with great distinction. This was the occasion when Isrā’īl told the Sulṭān the effect which the sending of his two arrows and his bow would have, so well known as not to require relation here. [Gibbon incorrectly calls him Ismael!] The Sulṭān, it is stated, became suspicious of the Saljuḵs on this, and had Isrā’īl seized, when in a state of intoxication, and sent to the fortress of Kālinjar in Hind; but a few authors, including our own, say “to the fortress of Multān.” The former statement I think the most reliable. Isrā’īl remained in durance till his decease seven years after; but, previous to his death, he sent messengers to his brothers, sons, and kinsmen, and incited them to rebel. They sent to ask Maḥmūd’s leave to cross over the Jhūn into Khorāsān; but Arsalān the Ḥājīb, who was governor of that province, refused to grant it, and strongly advised the Sulṭān to refuse permission. Contrary to Arsalān’s advice, he gave them permission; and they passed the Jhūn, and took up their quarters in the pasture-lands about Nīsā and Aflīward. Mīḵā’īl had two sons, Tughrīl, and Dā’ūd-i-Jaghār Beg, who, from their talents and superior accomplishments, became the leaders of the tribe.

Other writers, however, say that Saljuḵ had four sons, Isrā’īl, Mīḵā’īl, Müsā, and Yūnas; and that Beghū was the son of Müsā. Mīḵā’īl having been slain in one of the battles of that period, “leaving” two sons, Saljuḵ named those two grandsons, Dā’ūd-i-Jaghār Beg and Tughrīl Beg, rulers of the tribe after his decease. When Maḥmūd of Ghaznī subdued the territories of Māwar-un-Nahr, among other chiefs, Dā’ūd and Tughrīl, who had fought several battles with the rulers of Turkistān, and had acquired fame for valour, waited on Maḥmūd, and solicited that some portion of territory should be assigned to their tribe, as grazing-grounds for their flocks and herds.

Faṣīḥ-I states that, previous to Maḥmūd’s crossing the Jhūn and entering Māwar-un-Nahr, as early as 416 H., Dā’ūd-i-Jaghār Beg, son of Tughrīl Beg, son of Mīḵā’īl, son of Saljuḵ—by this account Dā’ūd-i-Jaghār Beg was Mīḵā’īl’s grandson—had risen and entered into the Khwārazm territory, thus, in a measure, confirming a part of our author’s statement. The same authority mentions that it was in 419 H., on the Sulṭān’s return from Māwar-un-Nahr, that Isrā’īl, son of Beghū, son of Saljuḵ, son of Luḵmān, had the interview with the Sulṭān, who brought him along with him; but soon after, on some account or other, Isrā’īl was seized and sent to the fortress of Kālinjar. For Fānaḵāt’s statement on this subject, see note 2, p. 126.

The above notice of the Saljuḵs has been taken from the Tārīḵ-I-Abū-I-‘Alā, Guzidaḥ, the Lubb-ut-Tawārīḵ, Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīḵ, Abū-I-Faṣīḥ-I-Baihaḵī, Tārīḵ-I-Alī, Muṣʿam-I-ul-Khiyār, Jahān-Ārā, and the Muntaḵab-ut Tawārīḵ, and others. Vīṣṭī differs considerably from these works and
of Saljūk and his son were a tribe whose dwelling-place was the Nūr of Bughārā, and they were all subject and obedient to the Sāmānī dynasty.

At the period in question the son of Saljūk had attained to man’s estate, and, on account of his prowess and valour, his arrow and his sword, all the Malikīs of Turkistān and the Afrāsiyābī rulers were continually in fear. Not a bird in the air nor a deer of the plain escaped his arrow; and, like a whirlwind and a thunder-cloud, he was wont to enter the chase or the conflict, and used to vanquish every man who entered into a personal contest with him. Upon this occasion when Ḥadr Khān joined and accompanied Sultān Maḥmūd, and all were in attendance at his stirrup, and proceeding towards the Sultān’s own tents, the son of Saljūk continued to ride on before them all, a Turkman cap placed jauntily on one side of his head, and bestriding a horse like the spur of a mountain, galloping about like a roaring lion, or the flickering lightning, in such wise that the forces of Turān and Irān were amazed at his agility and horsemanship.

As Ḥadr Khān had requested of the Sultān, so it was carried out; and, at the very time that Ḥadr Khān set out on his return [to his own territory], they brought a mandate [from the Sultān] to the son of Saljūk to remain in his tent, and gave orders that his followers, with his and their effects, should cross the river Jihūn into the confines of Khurāsān in company with the Maḥmūdī forces. Agents were directed to take care of them, and look after them; and, when they reached the bank of the Jihūn, they crossed the river along with servants of the Sultān.

At the time the command was issued that the son of Saljūk, along with his followers and dependents, should embark on boats, and pass over the Jihūn with their property and effects, the Ḥājib, Arsalān Khān, who was

authors, but least from Guzīdah. I have not completed the translation of that portion of Yūhāf as yet, therefore cannot make much use of it at present.

It will be noticed that our author repeatedly quotes “the son of Saljūk,” but gives no name; and, moreover, Isrā’īl, to whom he must refer, was, by some accounts, Saljūk’s son, and by others, his grandson.

4 A district of the territory of Bughārā so called.

5 His correct name is Arsalān Khān. Jāḥib [جاهب] seems to have been an error on the part of some early copyist for Ḥājib [جاجب], and copied accordingly by Firīṣhtah, and other modern authors.
the Amir [Governor] of Khurāsān, and the greatest of the retainers of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, made a representation to that monarch, saying: "This which your Majesty has commanded is far from the cautious counsel of your servant, for, with your own hand, you have placed power in the hands of the enemies of your country, over the dominion of your descendants; and, in the end, by this tribe, disorder and tumult will be brought upon the empire." The Sulṭān, in reply, said: "What is your opinion in this matter?" The Ḥājīb, Arsalān, answered: "My advice is this, that the whole of them be commanded to re-embark on board the boats, and then to sink them in the river; or otherwise to have their thumbs cut off*, so as to render them incapable of discharging arrows in future." Sulṭān Maḥmūd answered: "Arsalān, thou art a hard-hearted man, indeed! To break one's promise, and slay the helpless, are not acts becoming a sovereign who possesses any feelings of honour, or a man who has any magnanimity in his nature; and, moreover, destiny cannot be averted by perfidy any more than by valour." However, after the son of Saljūk had been conveyed across the Jihūn, it was commanded that he should be brought to Multān, while his kinsmen, and his other followers and dependents were assigned pasture-lands for their flocks and cattle in the territory of Khurāsān, such as Nisā, Nishāpūr, Bāward†, and other tracts in Upper Khurāsān.

As the Almighty had willed that, subsequently, this race should become great and powerful, and that from their posterity should spring puissant and mighty monarchs and rulers, notwithstanding Sulṭān Maḥmūd afterwards regretted what he had done, still regret was of no avail, for regret cannot avert destiny.

Īmām Abū-l-Faḍl-i-Baiḥaḵī states in his Tārīḵh-i-Nāširī*,

---

* So in the text; but it must be presumed that the author meant the thumb of the right hand of all the males.
† Also called Abiward; but, correctly speaking, Abiward is the name of the town, and Bāward the name of the district. Guzīdah states that the people of Khurāsān, in the parts where the Saljūks were located, became attached to the brothers Tughril Beg and Jaghar Beg.
* This portion of Baihaḵī's work has not come down to us. He mentions the names of these chiefs in one or two places in the part relating to the life of Maʿṣūd, and says that the people who entered Khurāsān under Yaghūm-mūr and other chiefs were Turkmāns; and he always makes a difference between them and the Saljūḳs.
that, at the time that Sultan Mahmud carried across the Jihun four thousand Saljuq families, their Mihtars, or chiefs, were four persons, Yagh-mur, Buhak, Kuk-tash, and Kazil, and in different parts of Khurasan pasture-lands were assigned to them, and they were made over to [the guardianship of] the great nobles of Khurasan, and instructions were given to them that the Saljuq should, in no way, and on no account, be permitted to carry arms. Their chief, who was the eldest son of Saljuq, and famous for his manhood, was sent to Multan, along with two of his sons likewise; and at Multan, after some time had passed away, they also died. The remainder of the Saljuq tribe, who had remained behind in Mawar-un-Nahr, were in the habit every year of migrating from Nur of Bukhara to Darghan of Khwarazm, to the pasture-lands therein. They entertained innate enmity towards the Malik [chief] of Jund, whose name was Shih; and, in the reign of Sultan Mas'ud, the Martyr, the Amir [Governor] of Khwarazm, the son of Altun-Tash, rebelled against the Sultan's authority. The

9 Also written Yagh-mur.
1 It will be doubtless noticed here that our author stated just a few lines above, quoting Baihaqi, as he says, that the Saljuq, who crossed the Jihun into Khurasan, had four chiefs, and immediately after says, "their chief, who was Saljuq's son," died at Multan. He evidently confounds those of the tribe who entered Khurasan with the remainder who stayed behind. See p. 121. Yaqa' states that their place of abode was twenty farsakh, or leagues, distant from Buhkara.
8 All the copies of the work do not contain this last sentence about the sons.
8 Faqih-i, Biaawif, and other authorities, mention the death of Isra'iil, son of Beghui, son of Sulaiman, son of Saljuq, at Kalianjar, in 426 H. His son had come with a party of followers from Mawar-un-Nahr to effect his release and carry him off. They had succeeded in getting him out of the fortress, but missed the road, were pursued, and overtaken. When his pursuers were in the act of securing him, he cried out to his son: "I shall never be released; do you seek to acquire territory." That same year Daud-i Jaghar Beg broke out into open rebellion, and took up his quarters at Marw.
4 Considered generally as belonging to Samarkand.
8 Altun-Tash, the Hajib, was appointed viceroy of Khawarazm by Sultan Mahmud in 407 H.; after he [Mahmud] had proceeded thither in person, and had defeated the rebels, who had slain his son-in-law, Maimun, son of Maimun, and had put Nafi-Tigin to death, as related in the events of Mahmud's reign. When the Sultan returned to Balkh, after his raid upon the Afghans, Altun-Tash-i-Khwarazm Shih, as he is styled, was sent for. He came and remained at Court three months. He then obtained permission to return; and, in the presence of Khwaja Ahmad-i-Hasan, Maimandif, the Wazir, and the Khwaja-i-'Amid, Abu Nasr-i-Mishkan, gave his word, and swore, that he would never
Saljuã ks joined him in that outbreak; and, in the year 425 H., he bestowed upon them a tract of country belonging to the territory of Khwârazm, which they call Rabã-í-Mãsah, as grazing ground for their flocks and herds. The chief of Jund, having received information as to their situation, made a raid upon them, and slew about eight thousand of the males, and but few of them remained, and they became totally at a loss as to what they should do in this state of affairs.

The Governor of Khwârazm, Hãrûn, the rebel, the son of Altûn-Tãsh [with whom the Saljuã ks had sided, as before stated] had [lately] been killed, and they found it impossible to continue to dwell in the territory of Khwârazm; and, through fear of the sons of 'Ali Tîgîn, the late ruler of Bukhãrã, who was one of the Afrãsiyãbî Khãns, or chiefs-tains, they were unable to enter that territory. Out of necessity, therefore, they moved towards Nisã and Marw—in all about seven hundred horsemen—with their property, and their families and dependents.

Yagh-mûr, who was one of their chiefs, had died previously to this, and a son of his remained; and, when that portion of the tribe [who had escaped the sword of the Malik of Jund] came towards Nisã and Marw from Khwârazm, the son of Yagh-mûr 6 was unable to cope with them, for, although they were weak in numbers themselves, other tribes, such as the Nfâlîs 7, and others, had joined them. The son of Yagh-mûr [with his tribe, who had first crossed the Jîhûn] retired before them, and entered 'Irãk, and seized upon Rai; and the Saljuã ks took up their residence in the

act contrary to the Sultãn's wishes and commands; and he left two sons, Saib [?] and Yûsuf, at Court. In 422 H., after the accession of Mas'ûd, the Martyr, Altûn-Tãsh presented himself at Court, and was soon allowed to return. After he had departed, a number of the Sultãn's advisers worked on the mind of the Sultãn so much about it, that he regretted he had allowed him to leave. A message was sent for him to return, but he made excuses, and did not do so. It was thought he had penetrated into the design against him; but subsequently he became satisfied, after receiving kind messages from the Sultãn. No mention is made in Fâshi-î respecting this grant of lands by the "son of Altûn-Tãsh," to the Saljuã ks.

6 Here again our author says the son of Yagh-mûr, but does not give any name. This is his constant failing.

7 The Nfâlîs refer to the adherents of Nfãl-Tîgîn, viceroy of the Panjãb, who had rebelled, and had been removed. See Bâhaãktî.
grazing lands on the border of the desert [in the districts of Nisā and Marw].

The Almighty gave them strength and power, so that they possessed themselves of the territories of Khurāsān; and the east, and the west, and whatever the dominions of Islām were, wholly and completely came under the sway of their descendants, in such wise that their fame will remain upon the records of time unto the judgment day.

I. Ṭughril, Son of Mīkāʿīl.

The author of the Tārīkh-i-Nāṣiri, Imām Abū-I-Faẓl-i-Baihaḵt, relates after this manner: that, at this period when the Saljūḳs entered the skirt of the desert of Khurāsān, and the son of Yagh-mūr retired discomfited before them, their Mihtars [chiefs] were three persons—Ṭughril and Dāʿūd, two brothers, the sons of Mīkāʿīl, and their uncle Beghū; and all three in accord determined to tender their services to Sulkān Masʿūd, and despatched a confidential agent to the Sultan's presence—he, at that time, having come to Nishāpūr from Gurgān—and solicited that the districts of Nisā, Farāwah, and certain places at the head of the desert might be assigned to them in fief. In the missive

---

* The commencement of the outbreak of the Saljūḳs was in 423 H.; and, in the same year, Kadr Khaḥ, the Turk, ruler of Māwar-un-Nahr, died. Jaghar Beg, son of Abū Sullivan, seized Marw, and took up his quarters there in 426 H. The Saljūḳs made an attempt upon Hirat in 428 H., but were repulsed, and forced to retire. They returned however in the following year, and compelled the place to capitulate, and the territory was annexed in the name of Sulkān Ṭughril Beg; but Sulkān Masʿūd subsequently gained re-possession of Hirat, and severely punished those who had, as he considered, so tamely capitulated to the Saljūḳs. See note 9, p. 129.

9 His correct name is Abū Tālīb, Muḥammad, and his title, Rukn-ud-dīn, Ṭughril Beg, Yamlīn-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn, or “The Right Hand of the Lord of the Faithful.”

1 This work is styled Tārīkh-i-Muẓaddas-i-Nāṣirī in two copies of the text at this place.

2 The word here used is "munkasim," signifying routed, put to flight, discomfited in battle, dispersed, &c.

3 As from other writers, our author has not quoted Baihaḵt correctly. The text states that they sent a trustworthy agent to the Sultan. The following is condensed from what Baihaḵt says in this matter. Soon after Masʿūd arrived at Gurgān, a despatch reached his minister from Bu-Faṣl, Sūfī, Diwān of Nishāpūr, which had been brought by horsemen in two days and a half from that city, intimating an irruption of Saljūḳs and Nīfāls from Marw, who had
in question they had written their own names in the following manner:—"Tughril, and Beghū, and Dażūd, who proceeded to Nisā, where they had joined the Turkmans [see note 8, page 119] there, and that they had been reinforced by other Saljūks and Khwārazms; and further, that he, Bū-Fāsl, enclosed therewith a communication addressed to him by Beghū, Tughril, and Dażūd, in order that the Sultān might give such orders upon it as he might deem fit. The communication began thus: "To his Excellency the Shaikh, the Illustrious Lord, the Sayyid Maulānā Abī-ul-Faṣl-i-Sūfī, from his servants, Beghū [it will be noticed that the uncle here takes precedence of the nephews], Tughril, and Dażūd, the Muwāṣīf or lieges of the Amīr-ul-Mūminīn;" and began, "We, your servants." They went on to state that they found it impossible to dwell in Māvar-un-Nahr and Bukhārā since the death of Alī-Tigīn, who had been kind and friendly towards them, as his affairs were now administered by his two sons, inexperienced boys, who were hostile towards them. On account of the distracted state of Khwārazm, through Hārūn, its ruler, having being killed, they found it impossible likewise to remove thither; and therefore they had come to put themselves under the protection of the Sovereign of the World and Lord of Beneficence, the great Sultān. They hoped the Khwājah [Abī-ul-Faṣl] would aid them at this juncture, and write on their behalf to the Khwājah, 'Abū Naṣr [the Wazīr], and advocate their cause as they were known to him. They farther solicited that, as through that minister's good offices [Khwājah Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad had previously been Wazīr to Hārūn and his father], the late Hārūn, Khwārazm Shāh, used to allow them to remove with their families and flocks into his territory in winter, he would assist them now. If the Sultān, they said, would accept their vassalage, one of them would constantly attend at Court [as a pledge of good faith], and the other two would serve him in such manner as he might command; and they would rest under his great shadow. They asked that the territories of Nisā and Fariwāh, which lay on the edge of the Desert [between the mountains bounding Khurāsān on the north-east, and the Jīhūn or Oxus], should be conferred upon them, in return for which they promised they would undertake to prevent any rebel from raising his head in Balkhān Koh, Dihištān, the direction of Khwārazm, or the Jīhūn; and would assail the Irākīs [the Turkmans under Yagh-mūr's son are here referred to] and drive them out. Their request was couched in civil words, to all appearance, but concluded as follows: "but if, which God forbid, the Sultān would not grant their request, and should refuse his permission, they did not know what the state of affairs might become, because they had no place on earth, and none remained to them. Not having the boldness to venture to address such an august person [as the Sultān's Wazīr], they had addressed the Khwājah [Abī-ul-Faṣl] to solicit him, Please God ! to bring their request to a favourable issue."

Sultān Mas'ūd wished to move at once against them, so wrath was he at this insolent demand; and bitterly complained of the injury and trouble his father had entailed upon the empire and upon him, through allowing any of those "camel-drivers," as he styled the Saljūks, to pass the Jīhūn, in the first instance. The Wazīr and some others counselled the acceptance of the allegiance of the Saljūk chiefs; but another party at the Court advised the Sultān not to think of marching against them himself, or at the present time, as they would have it that the cattle of his army, after the late expedition, required rest. They advised that a reply should be sent to Abī-ul-Faṣl, telling
are the Mawāli [lieges] of the Lord of the Faithful, represent unto your presence,” &c. The Almighty had been pleased to fill their hearts with much arrogance and contumacy; and, when the purport of their request was made known to the Sultān, he at once commanded that they should have a reply couched in courteous words, but a force of about 15,000 horse, under the command of the Salār [general], Bak-Taghdī, was told off in the year 420 H., to proceed against them.

When that force reached the Saljūks, it fought a stubborn battle with them, and the Sultān’s army sustained a defeat, and the Sultān, out of necessity, had to come to him to acquaint the Saljūk chiefs, in reply to their demand, “to be under no concern, as they had come to their own homes [as it were], and that they were in his dominions, and under his protection;” and to pretend that he was going to march to Rai, but instead to proceed to Nīshāpur, and get a force ready to send against them unawares. The Sultān was induced to follow this advice, and the upshot was the despatch of 15,000 horse to Nīsā, under the Ḥājib, Bak-Taghdī. He, on first coming upon the Saljūks near Sarakhs, defeated and routed them; but, soon after, his troops, who were already encumbered with baggage and women, having taken to plunder, he was himself overthrown, by the Saljūks, who had again rallied and attacked him. This took place in Sha'bān, 427 H., not in 420 H., as our author relates, and as is written in the ten copies of his work collated. After this affair, Mas'ūd had to agree to their demands, they being the first however to open negotiations, and Farāwah was given to Beghū, Nisā to Tughhril, and Dihistān to Dā'ūd. Having obtained their demands, they became more insolent than ever.

Several other writers differ here, not only from our author, but also from Baihaḵī, who is very particular respecting dates. In the beginning of 426 H., the Khāṣah Khādīm, Nūsh-Tigīn, routed a body of Turkmāns near Marw; and in the same year, a force of 17,000 horse, under the Sālār, Bak-Taghdī, was sent against them. He was at first successful; but, the enemy having drawn him into the desert, where water was not procurable, and his troops being careless and over confident, he sustained a complete defeat in the eighth month of that year. In the following year, a force of 10,000 horse and 5000 foot was prepared to operate against the Saljūks, under the command of the Ḥājib-i-Buzarg, Subāṣī. In the first month of 429 H., in fulfilment of a vow made during illness, Mas'ūd undertook an expedition against Hānṣīf, captured it in the third month of that year, and in the fourth returned to Ghaznī. In the same year, Mas'ūd, being unable from the state of affairs to proceed against the Saljūks as he was desirous of doing, despatched orders to the Ḥājib to expel them from Khurāsān. Subāṣī sent a reply to the effect that they were far more than he could cope with. Mas'ūd imagined the Ḥājib was enhancing, or desirous of enhancing, his services, and sent him orders to march against them without farther delay. He did so, and his meeting them, and his defeat followed. The Ḥājib is styled Surbāṣī, and Surpāṣī by Guzīdah, Sanbāṣī in the Tārīḵh-i-Ａlīf, and Subāṣī by our author. The name mentioned by Baihaḵī is no doubt correct.
an accommodation with them. He bestowed Nisā upon Tughril, and the Dihistān on Dā'ūd, and gave Farāwah to Beghū. The Sultan then proceeded towards Balkh, and conferred the government of Hindūstān upon his son Maudūd.

In 429 H., the Saljuks possessed themselves of the towns on the skirt of the desert, such as Marw, Sarakhs, and other places besides, and solicited that Khurāsān should be made over to them. The Sultan thereupon despatched the Ḥājib, Subaṣṭ, with a large army to expel them. An engagement took place between the Sultan's forces and the Saljuks, and the Sultan's troops were defeated, and the Saljuks acquired power over the territory of Khurāsān. They sent Ibrāhīm, Niālih, to seize upon Nishāpur, and, subsequently, Tughril himself followed him thither. At Nishāpur he ascended the throne, and became a sovereign; and the Khutbah was read in his name. He despatched Dā'ūd to Sarakhs, and nominated Beghū to proceed to Marw; and they took possession of Khurāsān, and one-half of that territory passed from the sway of the servants of the Mas'ūdī dynasty.

8 Not so: Majdūd was viceroy of the Indian provinces, Maudūd was left at the capital; and subsequently, when Mas'ūd retired into the Panjāb, the latter was sent to Balkh, and he was with his father in the battle of Dandānkād.

6 Farther on, our author, when mentioning the council held by the Saljuks when they thought of leaving Mas'ūd's dominions, says, "They are said to have been defeated by the Sultan's troops several times." See p. 130.

7 Ibrāhīm, son of Ni'āl, was Tughril's mother's brother.

8 Tughril Beg assumed sovereignty over a portion of Khurāsān, and ascended the throne at Nishāpur in 429 H.; and the Saljuḳ dynasty is considered by several authors to have commenced from that year. Others, however, with very good reason, say that the Saljuks only assumed independent sovereignty after the defeat of Sultan Mas'ūd at Dāe-ḵān or Dandānkān [Dandānkād], as stated by our author farther on. He acquired sway over a large portion of Western Asia, Khwārazm, Dihistān, Tabbas, Rai, Kaẓwīn, &c., in 447 H., in which same year the Khalifah, Al-Ḳa'īm, summoned Tughril to Baghdaḏ, and ordered his name to be entered in the Khutbah, and impressed upon the coin. Fanākāt states that the Khalifah sent a commission with a robe of honour to Tughril.

9 A paradox of our author's.

1 Tughril Beg died at Turuṣht [طرش] near Rai, Friday, 8th of Ramaṣān, 455 H., at the age of seventy. His reign is variously computed: Fanākāṭ states that he died in 442 H., after a reign of ten years! From 429 H. to 455 H., however, is a period of twenty-six.
II. MALIK DĀ'ŪD-I-JAGHAR BEG², SON OF MĪKĀĪL.

When Dā'ūd, after leaving the presence of his brother Tughril, came for the purpose of taking possession of Marw and Sarakhs, Sulṭān Mas'ūd was at Balkh, and he sent an agent to him [Dā'ūd] to see whether or not an accommodation could be brought about⁸.

At that time Dā'ūd was in the neighbourhood of Marw, with his forces, and it was he who was the mover in all this boldness and audacity. He advanced to the gate of Marw. It was at the dawn of the morning, and the Mu'azzin from the top of a Minārah was proclaiming this verse:—

“O Dā'ūd, verily we have made thee a sovereign prince on earth: judge therefore between men with truth.” Dā'ūd, hearing his own name, inquired of a learned person what was the meaning of this. The signification was explained to him, upon which he again drew his sword, and pressed forward after the troops of the Sulṭān, which were in Marw, and put the whole of them to the sword⁸.

At this period, when the Sulṭān's envoy from Balkh presented himself before him, a Mu'azzin at Marw was repeating this verse:—“Thou givest dominion unto whom Thou wilt, and Thou takest away dominion from whom Thou wilt.”

² Also written Jaghar Beg. Guzldah has both Jaghar and Chaghhar Beg. His title is Amir 'Imād-ud-Daulah, Abū Sulmān-i-Dā'ūd-i-Jaghār Beg. Guzldah, Faṣīḥ-ī, Fanākātī, and several others, do not consider Dā'ūd as a sovereign, and Alb-Arsalān is, by them, very properly, accounted the second monarch of the Saljūkī dynasty, having succeeded his uncle Tughril. Dā'ūd had died some years before. Fanākātī likewise says that on the death of Isrā'il, at Kālinjar, his son, Tughril, broke out into rebellion in 432 H., in the reign of Sulṭān Mas'ūd. This would imply that Tughril and the Saljūks had been quiet up to this time, but such is not the case; and Isrā'il died in 426 H. See note ⁸, p. 120.

⁸ This is not correct. A person was sent, according to Baihaḵī, to sound the Saljūks, and, as if coming as a friend to them, to induce them to open negotiations. They appeared quite willing to do so, and at once sent an agent to the Wazīr. It was on this occasion that Mas'ūd gave them the territory mentioned in note ², page 122-3. The author makes great repetition through mixing up the events of Tughril's reign with Dā'ūd's affairs.

⁴ Kurān, chap. xxxviii.

⁶ The above sounds all very well, and may be true; but it is not contained in Baihaḵī or any other historian with whom I am acquainted. The last sentence here, it would require the author himself to explain.

⁶ A portion of the 25th verse of chap. iii. of the Kurān.
The envoy of Sultan Mas'ud perceived Dā'ūd, who had spread his felt saddle-cloth under him, seated on the ground, with his saddle placed on one side of him. Sometimes he would rest his head upon the saddle, and stretch himself out [on the felt] on the ground, and then again he would sit up, and support himself resting on his elbow. His quiver of arrows was placed near him, and at times he would draw forth an arrow from the quiver, and he would sharpen the head of the arrow, and then again he would smooth out the feathers of it. The envoy of the Sultan, having concluded his message, asked for an answer. Dā'ūd replied:—"What was this Mu'aqqīn calling out about 'Thou givest,' 'Thou givest'? Write that down." A scribe accordingly wrote down this verse on paper:—"Possessor of all power, Thou givest dominion unto whom Thou wilt, and Thou takest away dominion from whom Thou wilt; Thou exaltest whom Thou wilt, and Thou humblest whom Thou wilt," &c., and gave it to the envoy. When the envoy reached the presence of Sultan Mas'ud, and made known to him the condition and mode of life of Dā'ūd, and placed before him the verse in reply to his message, he understood that the period of the sovereignty of the Maḥmūdī dynasty over the territory of Khurāsān had come to an end, and, in his heart, he relinquished all hope of holding it.

The Saljuqs having acquired Sarakhs and Marw, and being left in undisturbed possession of the whole of those districts, Dā'ūd determined to attack Upper Khurāsān. Manifesting the utmost daring and boldness on that occasion, he again assembled together a force of 11,000 horse, and pushed on to the gates of Balkh, where the Sultan was at the time, with all his great nobles and his forces.

An elephant was tied up in a place in the outskirts of the city, and an elephant-driver had fallen asleep upon the animal's back. Dā'ūd came during the night, unfastened

7 It is strange that all this is neither to be found in Baihāqī nor in the other authors I have been quoting.

8 The author here contradicts himself, as is not unusual; for the battle of Dāe-kān [Dandānkād] had not yet been fought, even by his own account.

9 Most copies of the work have "he came with eleven horsemen," which is absurd.

1 Our author does not quote Baihāqī correctly here, as the following extract, which I have made from the original, a good MS. copy in my posses-
the elephant, and drove it off, and, by the time the driver had awakened from his slumbers, the elephant had been

sion, and the printed edition of his work edited by Morley, will show. It will be found rather different to the translation given in Elliot, vol. ii. p. 142, "The Amr halted to celebrate the festival of No-roz, on Wednesday, the 8th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir. On Friday, the 10th of the same month, other news arrived [the sentence following and part of next is not in my MS.] that Dā'ūd had come to Tae-kān [Morley has Tāl-kān] with a strong force, and well prepared. On Thursday, the 16th of the month, farther information was received that he had reached Fār-yāb [Fār-yāb is equally correct—φ and θ are interchangeable], and that from thence he would speedily advance to Shīwār-kān [Shāburghān of course is meant—the name is spelt both ways] and our author, as well as Bhaiṭāf, is perfectly correct as to the name, notwithstanding the efforts of editors to make out otherwise. In the Persian, .AUTO is often interchanged for 𝐣, and ٗ for ژ, and so, in reality, both ways of writing may be, and were adopted; but never with ژ for ژ, except through an error of a copyist. The Burhān-i-Kāta' says, Shāburghān, in ancient times, was the name of the city of Balḵ, but now it is the name of a kassak near it. Compare Elliot's India, vol. ii. p. 142, and that wherever they appeared [Dā'ūd and his troops] there plunder and slaughter followed. On Saturday [here the quotation which our author states he had taken from Bhaiṭāf follows], the 18th of this month, at night, ten Turkmān [no such mode of spelling as Turkomān will be found in any lexicographical work: the derivation is from Turk, and mānind—Turk-like = Turk-mān] horsemen came by stealth, close to the Bāgh-i-Sulān [the Sulān's garden—the garden in which the Sulān's palace was situated], and slew four Hindū foot soldiers. From thence they pushed on near the Kuhandūs [citadel], and there the elephants were kept. They espied one elephant, and on it a youth who had fallen asleep behind the neck of the animal [any one who has seen elephants and their drivers will know what is meant by this]. These Turkmāns came up and began to drive the elephant, the youth being [still] asleep. The Turkmāns passed on a farsang [or league] from the city, and then they awoke the youth, and said, 'Drive the elephant faster, otherwise we will kill thee.' He replied, 'I am obedient to your commands;' and began to urge the animal on, the horsemen following close behind, urging it onwards, and goading it with their lances. By the time day broke, they had gone a considerable distance; and they brought the elephant to Shāburghān. Dā'ūd gave a present to the horsemen, and directed them to take it to Nishāpūr. From this the troops [of Mas'ūd] acquired a very bad name, for people said, 'Among these men such neglect exists, that enemies are able to carry off an elephant from them.' The next day the Amr heard of it, and became very much irritated thereat, and reproved the elephant-drivers severely, and commanded that 100,000 dirams, should be deducted from them, for the price of the elephant, and several of them were castigated. [There is no mention of 'Hindū elephant-riders' in the MS., although Hindū Fīlīhāns are mentioned in the printed text, but even then it would not follow that they were Hindūs in faith.]

""On Monday, the 20th of this month, Ālt Šakmān, the Ḥājib [Chamberlain] of Dā'ūd, with 2000 horse, came up to the [very] gate of Balḵ, and took up a position at a place called the Band-i-Kāfārān or the Infidels' Dyke, and plundered two villages. When the news reached the city, the Amr became very angry because the horses were in the Darah-i-Gaz, &c. There is not one word
taken away some five leagues, and the driver dared not utter a word.

Dā'ūd [then] advanced with his forces from Shafūrkan to 'Ali-ābād of Balkh, and fought an engagement with the Sultān, but, notwithstanding all the efforts and endeavours of Dā'ūd, he was defeated.

In the month of Shawwāl of the year 429 H., the whole of the Saljūks assembled together, Tughrīl, Beghū, and Dā'ūd, and also the Nōlīs, and the Masūdī and Maḥmūdī Turks, some of whom had joined the Saljūks. The Sultān marched from Balkh with his forces, and led them towards Marw and Sarakhs; and in the desert of Sarakhs an engagement ensued, which was contested from day-dawn until the time of afternoon prayer, when the Saljūks were overthrown.

about Dā'ūd's coming up to the gates of Balkh, for Sakmān was driven off in the afternoon by one of the Ḥajībs with a small body of troops, and some under the Sipah-sālār; and the Turkmāns retired to 'Ali-ābād again, where they remained that night. He reported what had happened to Dā'ūd, who then advanced to 'Ali-ābād from Shapurghān. As soon as Amīr Masūd heard of his movements, he moved out to the Pul-i-Kārwān until troops arrived; and, on the 9th of Rajab, routed Dā'ūd and his troops as soon as they reached 'Ali-ābād from the direction of the desert.

Several partial engagements took place up to the 5th of Shawwāl; and, whenever the Sultān's troops could get at the Turkmāns, they overthrew them, and scattered them "like thin clouds before a Biscay gale," but the difficulty was to bring them to close quarters: they would not stand. At last, the Wazīr contrived to come to an accommodation with the Saljūks, who appeared as willing as he was for that course, and tracts about Nīsā, Bāward, and Farāwah, were assigned to them; but Masūd agreed to it, fully determined to attack them next year. He then returned to Hirat. Our author, as on many other occasions, has misplaced events, putting those first which happened last, and vice versa, as Balhaḵī's history shows; and in some cases, as in the following page, has mentioned the same events twice over.

2 The Turkish slaves who had been first entertained by Maḥmūd and others, and since taken into pay by Masūd, are here referred to. They may have been in some way kinsmen of the Saljūks. Some of them had deserted some time previously.

3 The Sultān marched against them by way of Hirat, because the Saljūks, after having been compelled to withdraw from that place in 428 H., as already stated, had returned in the following year, and had compelled the defenders to surrender it, and the Khūţbah had been read there for Tughrīl. Sultān Masūd took the opportunity, on this occasion, when marching against the Saljūks, to punish the Hiratīs for surrendering so easily. He reached Hirat in Zīl-Kā'ūdah, 430 H., and proceeded by way of Mīhanah [ mentioned it is spelt both ways: European writers have transformed it into Maimanah].

4 The author here is quite confused: he makes out a second engagement, but no other engagement took place than is mentioned in the preceding note 1,
The Sultan, after this, returned to Hirat; and the Saljuks, becoming aware of it, again sought an accommodation; and, as a matter of necessity [on the part of the Sultan], once more a peace was concluded. However, Sultan Mas'ud summoned troops, with all requisite stores and war-material, from Ghaznin; but, when those reinforcements reached him, famine prevailed in Khurasan, and there was a great scarcity of forage. The forces of the Sultan had become quite powerless and ineffective, and the horses and camels had grown weak and emaciated. The Sultan, with his whole army, advanced towards Tus; and Tughril retired from Nishapur, and fell back upon Saraḵhs.

All the Saljuks now met together, and came to the unanimous conclusion, that they had no longer any power to oppose Sultan Mas'ud and his forces; and, as they had been defeated several times, that it was advisable to make terms with the Sultan, or otherwise to move towards the territory of 'Irak, and abandon Khurasan altogether. The lion-hearted Amir Dau'd, who had no compeer in loftiness of spirit and energy, said:—"Confidence is necessary in making conquests," even though it were necessary to devote [one's] life a thousand times over. I have no means or appliances to depend upon save war; so—Sovereignty or destruction!—Victory or death!" When the Saljuḳ chieftains beheld this bold and intrepid bearing on the part of Dau'd, they coincided with him with one accord. Having come to this determination, they sent away all their families, and dependents, and effects, into the desert; while the horsemen, alone and unencumbered, took up a position on the skirt of the desert, at Dae-kān, prepared for war and conflict.

in which also the accommodation is also referred to, but it took place before the Sultan's return to Hirat.

From the description here, the reader would scarcely understand that the Sultan had advanced in the meantime from Hirat to Nishapur. See note 7, next page.

8 Nearly all copies of the text have the words—"should not have confidence of heart;" but I read it as above, and the context proves the correctness of that reading.

6 There is nothing of this kind in Baihaḳī. What Dau'd said was to the effect, that the heads of the tribe made a great mistake in imagining that they would be able to obtain territory so easily in 'Irak and farther west; and, that if they should move one step out of Khurasan, Sultan Mas'ud would not allow them to rest upon the face of the earth, and would raise up powerful enemies against them every where. He ended by saying that, at least, they should try the upshot of another engagement before deciding upon abandoning Khurasan.
When the Sultan reached the spot, the battle commenced; and for three days, from morning's dawn to the setting of the sun, the conflict went on, until, on Friday, the 9th of the month of Ramazan, in the year 431 H., the troops of Sultan Mas'ud became hard pressed, and his own Turkish troops even began to give way legion after legion. Sultan Mas'ud was defeated; and the Saljuks gained the victory, and assumed independent sovereignty.

7 This was Mas'ud's second expedition in person against the Saljuks, although his officers had previously encountered them upon several occasions. He had passed the winter of 430-31 H. at Nishapur, with his forces encamped in and about Baihaq [not Baihakl's native place], Khwarazm, Bakhurz, Isfand, Tusi, and other places facing the desert. The utmost scarcity prevailed, and grain had to be brought from a great distance. On the 28th of Jamad-ul-akhir of 431 H. was the vernal equinox [about the end of March, 1039 A.D.], and Mas'ud prepared for a fresh campaign. He had really made no preparation for it; but the Saljuks had issued from the Balkhan mountains and the desert, and were assembled around Sarakhs. The scarcity was so great that the force could hardly be prevented from melting away; yet the Sultan determined to advance to Marw, notwithstanding his Wazir and nobles advised him against it [but Abü Nasir-i-Mishkân, the only one who could venture to speak his mind and expostulate effectually, was dead], as the greater part of his men had lost their horses, and had to march on foot. The animals that remained also were nearly useless, whilst the Saljuks were in possession of Marw, and were well supplied with all things. He moved from Sarakhs on the 19th of Sha'bân towards Marw. The Turkmans soon appeared, and among them were many rebels who had deserted from the Turkish troops in India, and others; and, according to their usual mode of fighting, continued to harass Mas'ud's troops, who wanted for every thing. The details are far too long for insertion; but I may mention that Mas'ud and his troops fought under the greatest disadvantages, for the enemy had either emptied or filled up the few wells which the desert tract contained, while they themselves wetted their clothes beforehand, and carried water along with them. Mas'ud's men and their cattle suffered from heat and extreme thirst; and some of his Ghulams [Turkish slaves], who, on the march, had been obliged to ride on camels, in the confusion that ensued, made all the Tazik horsemen they met dismount and give up their horses to them, after which a large body of them deserted to the enemy. Mas'ud's forces became separated and confused; order was at an end; and leaders became separated from their men. "The Turkish troops," says BaihaqI, who was present, "went one way, and the Hindû [i.e. natives of Hind, whatever their creed] another, and neither Kurds nor 'Arabs could be distinguished. A few Khawâjis or bodyguards, who remained near the Sultan, made several and repeated charges upon the enemy; and Mas'ud himself, who carried a poisoned halberd or short spear in his hand, slew every one that came within arm's length of him—man and horse. I saw Mawdud [the son of Mas'ud] myself, who was galloping his horse here and there endeavouring to rally men around him, but no one gave ear to him, for every one was for himself." This occurred on the 9th of Ramazan, 431 H., beyond the river Marw-ar-Rud, two stages from Marw-i-Shâb-i-Jahan.
After the battle was over, a throne was set up upon the battle-field itself, and Tughril became sovereign. Beghū proceeded to Marw, and Amir Dā'ūd led a force towards Tukharistan and Balkh, and subdued the territories of that region. Subsequently, Tughril and Dā'ūd marched into Khwārazm, and secured that country; and some time after they had brought those countries under subjection, Tughril died, and Dā'ūd entered into a treaty with the Maḥmūdis and the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn, and became sovereign of Khurasān and the territories of 'Ajam, and the universe was given up to him.

He reigned for a period of above twenty years, and died in the year 451 H., and the throne of sovereignty became adorned by the victorious Sulṭān, Alb-Arsalān.

III. SULTĀN ALB-ARSAŁĀN-I-GHAZĪ, SON OF DĀ'ŪD-I-
JARGHAR BEG.

He ascended the throne of Khurasān after Dā'ūd, in the year 451 H., and the territories of Khurasān, 'Ajam, with

---

8. Baihaqī does not say anything about a throne.
9. Yāfā'ī says that great discrepancy exists among chroniclers respecting the date of the first assumption of sovereignty by the Saljūqs, and differs much from them. Guzīdah, Faṣīḥ-ī, and other writers of authority, state that Tughril Beg assumed independent sovereignty over the greater part of Khurasān, at Niḥāpur, in 428 H., while some few writers say, in 429 H. In 431 H., after the defeat of Sulṭān Mas'ūd, and his retreat to Ghaznīn, all Khurasān fell into the hands of the Saljūqs; and the two brothers, and Beghū, their uncle, divided the territory between them. In 432 H., Tughril, who had acquired territory farther west, in 'Irāk-i-'Ajam, obtained the Khalīfah's consent to his assuming sovereignty, and the title of Sulṭān. He made Rai his capital, and chose 'Irāk-i-'Ajam, with its dependencies, as his portion. Khurasān was reserved for the elder brother, Jaghār Beg-i-Dā'ūd, who made Marw [some say Balkh] his capital; and Beghū, the uncle, obtained Kirmān, Tabas, Harāf [Hīrat], Bust, and as much of the territory of Hind as he could lay hands upon and fisch from the Ghaznīn rulers. [See page 99, in which his and Dā'ūd's defeat by Tughril, the slave of 'ABD-UR-RASHĪD, is mentioned by our author only.] He has made a complete muddle of Tughril's reign, as well as Dā'ūd's proceedings, and it is difficult to separate them, without a much longer note, than space will permit.

1 This is a good specimen of our author's random mode of writing history. Tughril, who was considered the head of the family, survived Dā'ūd some years, and died in 455 H., as previously stated. Guzīdah says he died in 453 H., Faṣīḥ-ī 451 H., and some say 452 H. In nearly every copy of the text he is styled Alb-Arsalān-i-Tughril Beg, a blunder sufficiently apparent. His name was not Tughril.

2 Alb-Arsalān ascended the throne of 'Irāk and Khurasān in Ramaṣān 455 H.
the whole of I'raf, Khwārazm, Tabaristān, Kirmān, Fārs, and Sistān he brought under his sway. He also led an army into Turkistān and Tūrān, and the Maliks of Turkistān, and the Afrāsiyābī Amīr, submitted to his authority.

The vastness of his forces, the immensity of his war-material, and the military resources of his empire, attained to such extent, that the intellect of the geometrician would remain in the labyrinth of helplessness, in an attempt to compute the quantity: as a poet—in all probability the Ḥakim Ṣanā'ī—who, after Alb-Arsalān's decease, composed a dirge, says of him, in the following strophe:

"Thou sawest the head of Alb-Arsalān elevated to the sublimity of the seventh heaven:

Come to Marw that thou mayest see the body of Alb-Arsalān buried in the dust.

Attended neither by train or guards, nor the moon-faced, dimple-chinn'd;

Nor the steed press'd by his thighs, nor the reins within his grasp."

When Alb-Arsalān ascended the throne, he despatched ambassadors to the Court of Ghaznīn, and entered into the strongest terms of friendship and amity with Sultān Ibrāhīm, and did not interfere with the Ghaznīn dominions. He occupied himself in holy wars against Turkistān and Rūm, and in securing possession of the territories of Hijāz

not before; but he succeeded to his father's dominions in Khurāsān, at his father's death in 451 igit., subject to Tughril of course. His correct name and title is 'Uṣyd-ud-Daulah, Abū Shujā'-i-Muḥammad, Alb-Arsalān.

2 Our author forgets to state, or did not know, that, by the will of Tughril Beg, Sulfān, son of Jaghūr Beg-i-Dā'ūd, succeeded; but Kāl-timish [also written Kāl-mish], son of Isrā'il, Tughril's uncle, with the aid of the Turkmāns, fought a battle with Sulfān, at Damghān, and overthrew him. On this Alb-Arsalān came against Kāl-timish, and in the action which ensued, near Damghān, Kāl-timish was killed by a fall from his horse, and Alb-Arsalān was left without a rival. The Khalifāh, Al-Kā'im Bi-amr-ullah, conferred upon him the title of Būrān-ul-Mūmīnīn. Ya'farī, however, says that as no successor had been named by the will of Tughril, Sulfān, half-brother of Alb-Arsalān, ascended the throne, and that Kāl-timish joined Alb-Arsalān against him.

4 This verse, minus the last half, is what Gibbon would lead us to believe was the inscription on Alb-Arsalān's tomb. The third line is different in some copies, and might be rendered: "Neither with the glittering blade at his side," &c., or, "Neither attended by his train with the star [one of the emblems of royalty], nor the moon-faced," &c.

6 See page 103, and note 9.
and Mīr; and, influenced by the sense of pure faith and belief, he began to render services to the Court of the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Kā'im. He was distinguished upon several occasions with honorary dresses from the Khālifah's Court, and the lieutenancy of the capital, Baghdād, was conferred upon him.

The writer and author of this Tabākāt, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, Al-Jūrjānī, intimates that, in the year 613 H., he was at the Court of Sijistān, and in that capital there was an Imām [Patriarch], the teacher of the doctors in wisdom and philosophy, and the asylum of the learned of the time, whom they called Imām Raḥīd-ud-Dīn-i-'Abd-ul-Majīd. I heard him, when speaking of the magnificence and majesty of Alb-Arsalān, state, that that monarch, in the year 453 or 454 H., had undertaken the subjugation of the territory of Turkistān. When he reached the frontiers of Kāshghar and Balāsāghūn, messengers followed him thither, bringing intelligence that the Lord of the Faithful, the Khālifah, Al-Kā'im B'llah, had sustained a great mis-

---

It will, doubtless, be noticed that our author seldom quotes the writings of others, and that most of his information is hearsay. The value, or otherwise, of his statements may be judged of accordingly. How he had been deceived by his "asylum of the learned of the time," may be seen from note 2, page 135. He only quotes Abū-l-Faṣl-i-Baihaqī for the Saljuq dynasty, a very good and trustworthy authority, but often quotes him incorrectly, as shown in the preceding notes.

The meaning of which is, that he was, by our author's account, one of the most learned men of his time.

A city of Māwar-nn-Nahr, near Kāshghar, and the capital of Afrāsiyāb, which continued the seat of government of his descendants until the time of Gūr Khān [not Kor Khān, as Europeans generally write it]. ḡ stands for ḡ in Persian, unless explained to the contrary.

Al-Kā'im Bi-amr-'ullah. The Kāiser of Rūm, Armanūs [Romanus], entered the dominions of Alb-Arsalān with the intention of invading Īrān, but the greater part of his army perished through the excessive heat, and the Kāiser retired. Subsequently, Armanūs again invaded Alb-Arsalān's dominions, and the latter, with 12,000 horse—a rather improbable number—marched to encumber him. They met at a place named Malīzah-gird [the ancient Mauro—Castrum], in Azarbāījān, in the vicinity of Akhāt, in which action the Kāiser was taken captive by a Rūmī [Roman] slave in Alb-Arsalān's army, whose person was so weak and so contemptible, that at the time of mustering the army the 'Aris [muster-master, not a "general"] refused to take his name down, when Sa'ad-ud-Daulah, the Shaḥnah or agent of Alb-Arsalān, at Baghdād, said:—"Write down his name; who knows but that he might take the Kāiser prisoner!" Gūzdah states that Alb-Arsalān himself ordered that his name should be taken down. The emperor Armanūs [Romanus] was defeated and taken prisoner in 459 H. [after the death of Al-Kā'im], but was set at liberty the same year, on undertaking to pay "a early tribute at the rate of 1000 dinārs a-day, or 360,000 dinārs every year."
fortune—that an action had taken place between him and the Christians of Rūm, and that the troops of Islām had been overthrown; and further, that the Khalīfah himself had been taken prisoner, and had been immured within the walls of a fortress, situated in the lofty mountains of the territory of Anbār¹ and the Jazīrah [Mesopotamia] on the frontiers of the empire of Rūm. The fortress in question is situated on a high hill, or mountain, on the bank of the river Furāt [Euphrates].

Alb-Arsalān, with a force of 180,000 horse, all brave and veteran soldiers, returned with the utmost expedition, in order to release the Lord of the Faithful, and revenge the defeat of the army of Islām. He pushed on with such speed, and made such long marches, that in the space of sixteen or seventeen days—God knows the truth of the statement—he appeared at the foot of the walls of that fortress, which was situated on the bank of the Furāt, from Balāsāghūn. Adopting such means of procedure as the occasion demanded, he called upon the governor of that fortress to embrace the Muḥammadan faith, and caused him to be ennobled with the robe of Islām; and, with the aid of Almighty God, he released the Khalīfah from confinement². He accompanied the Khalīfah’s sacred caval-

¹ There is a place of this name on the Euphrates, Felugia or Anbar, mentioned in Julian’s campaigns as Pirisabar, and called the second city in Assyria. The Khalīfah was confined at 'Ānāh. See next note over leaf. A copyist might write أنا for الرأية.
² Our author has made a muddle of the reigns of these Salsūk monarchs, and betrays such complete ignorance here, that we may doubt his correctness in many other cases after and before. Both in the text above, as rendered faithfully, and word for word, and in the six lines devoted to the history of Al-Ḳāʾīm’s Khilāfah, in Section IV., our author plainly asserts that the Khalīfah’s troops were defeated by the Naṣārāns or Christians, and that the Khalīfah was made prisoner by them, and confined in a fortress on the frontier until released by Alb-Arsalān. The author, apparently, had either no written authorities to refer to, or did not trouble himself to do so, and composed his work chiefly on hearsay, hence the woful blunder he has herein made. The Lubb-ut-Tawārikh, strange to say, has made the same error. The Khalīfah Al-Ḳāʾīm never fell into the hands of the Romans, and was never confined in a fortress by them.

Our author has confounded the events of Tughrīl Beg’s reign with those of Alb-Arsalān’s. In 448 H. [Muntasab-ut-Tawārikh says in 447 H.] Al-Ḳāʾīm summoned Tughrīl Beg to Baghdad, and directed that his name should be read in the Khutbāh after his own, and also be impressed upon the coin; while the name of the Malik-ur-Ṣāḥīb-i-Abū Naṣr, son of 'Imād-ud-dīn, son of Sulṭān-ud-Daulah, Buwrah, was to come in after Tughrīl’s. Tughrīl finding his oppor-
cade to the precincts of the capital of Islam, and then solicited permission to return [to his own dominions]. Having obtained it, at the time of taking leave, Al-Barsalān dismounted from his horse, and honoured his imperial lips by placing them to the hoof of the animal which bore the Lord of the Faithful, and kissed it. On this occasion, in return for these signal services rendered by him, during all this time, to the Court of Islam, he received this much commendation and esteem, that the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Kā'im Bi-amr-'ullah, thus expressed himself:—"Thou hast saved the servants of God from slaughter, and the country from destruction." Let those who read these words calmly ponder in their minds between the extent of the services of Alb-Arsalān-i-Ghāzi, and on the sublime fortitude and high resolve expressed in the words of the
tunity, after pretending friendship towards, and alliance with, the Buwāfā ruler of Baghdad, seized and imprisoned him. In 448 H. Al-Kā'im espoused the daughter of Tughril's brother [daughter of Dā'ūd-i-Jaghar Beg], Khādijah by name. In 450 H. Basāirsīrī rose against the Khalifah, and put him in confinement in the fortress of 'Ānah, a town of Diyār-i-Bakr, or Mesopotamia, on the east bank of the Furat, four miles from Rāwā, and seven days' journey from Baghdad by kārwān route. The Khalifah appealed to Tughril Beg, not to Alb-Arsalān, who did not come to the throne until nearly five years after. Tughril reached Baghdad in 451 H., Basāirsīrī fled, the Khalifah was set at liberty, and Tughril went to meet him, and walked, on foot, at the head of the Khalifah's horse. On that occasion Al-Kā'im hailed him—"Ya Rukn-ud-dīn!"—"O Pillar of the Faith!"—and his title, which had been Rukn-ud-Daulah; or Pillar of the State, was changed to Rukn-ud-dīn. Tughril entered Baghdad on the 14th of the month of Safar; and in that same year also Dā'ūd-i-Jaghar Beg, his elder brother, died. Some few authors say these events happened in 452 H. Basāirsīrī was soon after captured and put to death, but Fasihī says he was captured before the Khalifah's release. In 455 H. Tughril espoused a daughter of the Khalifah's. The betrothal took place at Tabrīz, but Tughril was desirous that the marriage should be consummated at his capital, which was Rai, and he set out for that city; but before he reached his palace, having halted a short distance from the city, to enjoy the cool air, hemorrage came on [not "dysentery"] and could not be stopped. He died 8th of Ramaṣān; and the Khalifah's daughter hearing of his decease, when on the way to join him, returned, a virgin bride, to her father at Baghdad.

I may mention that the Tārīkh-i-Yasāfī, which is generally so very correct and minute in the description of important events, says not a word respecting any hostilities between Alb-Arsalān and the Romans, and nothing whatever about Armanūs [Romanus] having been captured.

The Khulāṣat-ul-Akhbar turns the two expeditions of the Romans, in the last of which Romanus was taken captive, into one, and again makes the same Romanus a prisoner in Malik Shāh's reign. There is much similar discrepancy in some other authors, which I have not space to notice here.
Lord of the Faithful, and what amount of eulogium every one of them conveyed.

Alb-Arsalān’s reign extended over a period of fourteen years. He ascended the throne in the year 451 H., and in the month of Ṣafar, 465 H., he was martyred. May the Almighty again raise up their pure souls with like glory, and reserve them to Himself in Paradise above!

IV. SULTĀN JALĀL-UD-DĪN, MALIK SHĀH, SON OF ALB-ARSALĀN.

Sultān Malik Shāh ascended the throne at Marw, after the death of his father, and took possession of the whole of the territories of I-rān, Tūrān, the Jībāl [Highlands of ‘Irāk], ‘Irāk, Dīlam, Ṣabāristān, Rūm, Miṣr, and Shām, besides Dīyār-i-Bakr, Arman, Sistān, and Fārs; and in all the pulpits of Islām the Khūtbah was read in his name, and the coin, both diram and dinār, became ennobled by his titles.

He was, himself, a victorious and a conquering monarch, and governed with a firm hand; and was sagacious, brave, and just, and endowed with all the accomplishments besetting a sovereign and empire. He brought under his sway the whole of the countries of Turkistān, and sub-

---

8 The length of his reign depends upon how it is computed. If his accession to his father’s territory be reckoned, of course it is considerably longer; but he succeeded as an independent sovereign in the tenth month of 555 H.

4 Our author does not say how his martyrdom took place. Perhaps his authority for the Khilafah’s captivity in the Roman territory did not inform him. It is very interesting, but much too long for insertion here; but his assassin was Vūsuf, a native of Khwārazm, the governor of the fortress of Barzam [on the Jībūn], which Alb-Arsalān had taken. The murderer was nearly escaping, when a Fārāsh, or tent-pitcher, beat in his head with a wooden mallet, used for driving tent-pegs. This took place in Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 465 H. Other authors state that the name of the fortress in question was Fīrbađ, or Fīrbaż.

8 His title, according to most writers, was Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, and his patronymic, Abū-l-Fath. The Niẓām-ut-Tawārīkh and Jahān-Ārā say his title was Jalāl-ud-Daulah. The correct titles appear to have been Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mu‘izz-ud-Daulah, Malik Shāh, Yamīn [some say Kašīm]-i-Amīr-ul-Mīmīnīn.

6 In 468 H. Malik Shāh entered Māwar-un-Nahr, and subdued that territory, and took the Khān of Sambūnd captive. He was taken all the way from Sambūnd to Iṣfahān on foot; but, subsequently, he was taught better behaviour, and restored. In 471 H. Malik Shāh again entered Māwar-un-Nahr, and
duced the territory of Rûm; and the vice-royalty and sovereignty of Baghdād, subordinate to the Dār-ul-Khilāfat, were conferred upon him. In Makkah and Madīnah, and in Yaman and the country of Ḥijāz, in the whole of the pulpits of Islām, the Khuṭbah was read in his name.

He carried on various hostilities, and undertook many holy wars in various parts of the country of the Turks and the territory of Rûm; and, on every side of the territories of the east and of the west, he acquired a kingdom, and placed viceroys of his own therein. He conferred the kingdom of Rûm upon one of his brothers, and, after him, he gave it to his own son, Maḥmūd7; and, up to this period, that territory is still in the possession of his descendants, as will, hereafter, please God, be mentioned8.

removed, for the second time, Sulṭān Khān from the government. He was subsequently sent to the fortress of Üz-gand [Ür-gan] of the present day, and there immured. This is, no doubt, the same event as is referred to in the Jāmi’ut-Tawārīkh, and in Alfāh, but under a wrong year. In those works it is stated that Malik Shāh, in 482 H., annexed the territory of Samrāk, taking it from Aḥmad Khān, son of Ja’far Khān, who was a great tyrant. He was the brother of Turkān Khātūn, the consort of Malik Shāh, who was mother of Sulṭān Sanjar.

7 This is totally incorrect: Maḥmūd, son of Malik Shāh, was never ruler of the territory of Rûm. See note 4, page 157.

8 Our author’s account of this reign is much the same as the tragedy of “Hamlet” would be with the part of the Prince of Denmark left out. I must give a brief outline of the chief events that occurred to make it intelligible:—

The year following his accession, 466 H., his brother, Takīsh [Tughān Shāh], rebelled at Hirāt. He was taken and imprisoned at Iṣfahān, the capital. Then followed the rebellion of his uncle, Kāwurd, according to Guzīdah; but he was the founder of the Kirmān dynasty of the Šaljūḳs, which our author says not one word about. They met in battle at Karkh, near Baghdād, and Kāwurd was defeated and slain; but his son succeeded him in Kirmān, and was allowed to hold that territory. In 467 H. [Jāmi’ut-Tawārīkh and Alfāh, mistaking the dates, or wrongly written in the copies of those works, say in 473 H.] his brother, Takīsh [this name is written by our author Takīsh; in the Shams-ul-Luḥat, Tagiāh [Takīsh?]; and in the Burhān-i-Katī’, Takaṣh] rebelled, and seized several districts in northern Khurāsān, and shut himself up in Nīshāpūr. Malik Shāh sent an army against him [Jāmi’ut-Tawārīkh and Alfāh say he went in person, and that it was in 476 H.]. In 468 H. he subdued Māwar-un-Nahr for the first time, previously mentioned. In the following year Anṭāḵšah [Antioch] was taken, and the territory as far as the sea-coast. In 471 H. Samrāk was taken, and Sulṭān Khān, the ruler, again deposed, and confined in the fortress of Üz-gand. On this occasion, Malik Shāh demanded the hand of Turkān Khātūn, daughter of Tūmghāsh [also written Tughmākh] Khān, a descendant of Bughrā Khān. In 475 H. Khwārajm was subdued, and conferred upon Nīshā-Tīghn, who founded the Khwārajm-Shāhī dynasty. [See note 7, page 169.] The follow-
In the Muntakhāb-i-Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī, which work was composed by one of the great men of the Court of Ghaznīn, I read that, upon a certain occasion, Sultan Malik Shāh requested his Wazīr, Nizām-ul-Mulk, to make ready his forces, as he had resolved upon proceeding into the territory of Miṣr [Egypt]. The Wazīr, Nizām-ul-Mulk, represented, saying:—“It is right for the Sultan to ponder well over this undertaking, because that country contains the Ḳarāmīṭah sect, and other heretics, and something of the profanities of their creed might come to the hearing of an orthodox monarch like his Majesty; and I do not consider it right that such depravity should find access to the royal mind.” Sultan Malik Shāh enjoined that they should be diligent in making due preparation for the expedition, as for him to repudiate that determination of his was impossible. Nizām-ul-Mulk [consequently] made great preparations, and got all things in readiness; and the Sultan, with a numerous army, set out in the direction of Miṣr.

When he arrived in the vicinity of it, the people of Miṣr hastened forth to perform the duty of receiving the Sultan; but he paid no regard to any one, neither did he turn his eyes towards any thing, until he arrived before the gate of

ing year saw the rise of Ḥasan-i-Ṣabāḥ, and the heretic sect of Mulāḥidahs. In 480 H. Malik Shāh gave the territory of Rūm to Sulṭān, son of Ḳalṭīnish, which his descendants held for a long period of years. Shāh he bestowed upon his brother, Tutash [ターش not “Tunish”], who gained successes over the ‘Arabs, Rūmīs, and Farangs. Other territories were conferred upon some of his Mamlūks or slaves, as will be mentioned hereafter. In 482 H. [the period assigned in Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh and Allī for the expedition into Māwar-un-Nahr, just referred to,] Malik Shāh undertook a campaign against the Kāṣar, as the Greek emperors of Constantinople are termed by Muḥammadan writers; upon which occasion, as related by all authors of repute, Sultan Malik Shāh fell into the hands of a party of the Kāṣar’s soldiers; but, not having been recognized by any one, he was released through the great tact of his minister, Nizām-ul-Mulk. Next day, a battle took place between them, when the Kāṣar was taken prisoner, on which occasion Malik Shāh set him at liberty. In 481 H., as has been mentioned farther on, Malik Shāh went on a pilgrimage to Makkah. In 484 H., Nizām-ul-Mulk was deprived of the Wazīrship through the intrigues of Turkān Khāṭīn. In 485 H., Malik Shāh sent a force against the Mulāḥidahs, but it was defeated by those schismatics; and, in that same year, Nizām-ul-Mulk was assassinated by them. He was the first that fell beneath the daggers of that sect; and, within a few days over a month, Malik Shāh himself departed this life at Bāghdād.

1 Ḥaṣrat, signifying the Court, the presence of the sovereign.
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the city of Miṣr. When he had passed over the ferry of Miṣr, and the river Nil, he inquired which was the palace of Fir'awn [Pharaoh].

On being told where it was situated, he turned towards that direction, and ordered his army to halt on the spot where it then was. Sulṭān Malik Shāh, attended only by a single stirrup-holder, set out alone towards the place indicated. He then dismounted from his horse, and, at the place where was the palace of Fir'awn, performed a prayer of two genuflections. He then laid his forehead in the dust, and lifted up his voice in supplication, saying:—"Oh God, Thou didst bestow the dominion of Miṣr upon one, Thy servant, and he proclaimed, saying:—'I am your most supreme Lord;' but this Thy erring servant, having been exalted [by Thee] to the sovereignty of the countries of the east and the west, has come hither, and, bowing his forehead in the dust, says:—'Great God! O Lord most High! be pleased of Thy grace and goodness to have mercy upon this Thy servant.'"

Then, raising his head from his posture of adoration, he came back, and, without entering the city of Miṣr [at all], returned to Khurāsān. This anecdote is related to show the exalted nature of the faith of that just and victorious sovereign.

---

3 Al-Miṣr—The City—Old Cairo, as it is called by the Chroniclers of the Crusades. Its inhabitants, in ancient times, were rated at two millions; and those of New Cairo [Kāhirah] at four millions. The old city stood on the east bank of the Nile, and was some twenty two miles in extent. Some say its extent was thirty miles. Old Cairo, or The Miṣr, was, perhaps, deducting exaggerations, the largest and most densely populated city the world ever contained, after Kāhirah, ancient Thebes, and Babylon on the Euphrates. The name Miṣr is generally applied at present to the whole of Egypt, but should be Diyar-ul-Miṣrīh, as in ancient 'Arab writings.

4 Lit. "Where was the place of Fir'awn's throne," signifying his Court, residence, &c.

5 Kurān, chap. lxxix.

6 Whatever the author of the Muntakhab-i-Tārīkh-i-Nāṣīrī may have said on the subject, I may here mention that this statement of Malik Shāh's having made a journey, accompanied by a "large army," into Egypt and crossed the Nile, is not confirmed, in fact, is not recorded in any history with which I am acquainted. Malik Shāh certainly made a tour throughout his dominions, "from Anṭāḵlih of Shām and Ladāḵlih of Rūm to Māwar-un-Nahr, the frontiers of Khaṭāf and Khutan; and from the Bahr-i-Khur [the Caspian] to Yaman and Tāyi." He also performed the pilgrimage to Makkah and Madīnah; but there is no mention of Miṣr or the Nile. Some of the story-
Another anecdote, respecting the same monarch, is narrated in the Muntakhab-i-Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī; that some persons in Kuhistān sent in a memorial to the Wazīr, Nizām-ul-Mulk, to the effect that a wealthy person had died, leaving no other heir behind him than a sister's child, and that he had left great wealth, and further that it ought to go to the Bait-ul-Māl⁴ [the royal treasury]. Nizām-ul-Mulk, at a convenient opportunity, represented the matter to Malik Shāh, but he obtained no answer, and did not receive one, until after mentioning it three times. Malik Shāh said he would give him a reply respecting it on the following day; but, when it came, he set out for the chase.

Nizām-ul-Mulk, in his eagerness to augment the royal treasury, followed after the Sulṭān [to obtain the promised reply]. Malik Shāh had to pass the camp bāzār on his way; and, when he returned from the hunting-ground, gave directions to one of his attendants, saying:—"I am hungry; and in the bāzār I saw some wheaten cakes', and my appetite has a mind for some. Go and purchase as many as you can procure, and bring them hither."

When Malik Shāh approached the precincts of the camp, he ascended a rising ground, and sat down, until such time as they brought the wheaten cakes. He then made all the nobles with him sit down to partake of the cakes. There was one very large dish full⁶, which sufficed for more than fifty Malikls and Amirs, with their attendants. After he had eaten, Malik Shāh arose and inquired of his attendant:—"For how much didst thou purchase these?" The man, with eyes bent on the ground, replied:—"For four and a half dāngs⁷ [little pieces] of coin." The Sulṭān then asked the whole of those present, whether they had had sufficient, to which they replied, that through the Sulṭān's liberality they had eaten all that they desired. Malik Shāh, on

books mention it, but the account is evidently copied from our author. The Ismā'īlī Khallfahs were independent of Malik Shāh.

⁴ See note ⁴, p. 62.
⁵ Thin cakes of paste called "tutmāj."
⁶ All the copies of the work but two say there were ten large dishes full. One copy says two; but, as one large dish is mentioned in another work, which gives this same anecdote, I have adopted that reading.
⁷ A dāng signifies a grain in general, either of wheat, barley, or the like, and is used to signify the fourth part of a dram. It is also used to signify the sixth part of a city, and the like.
hearing the price, defrayed the amount out of his own private purse; and, turning towards Nizām-ul-Mulk, he said:—"A poor frail creature like Malik Shāh, and a minister such as Nizām-ul-Mulk, and so considerable a number of followers, have eaten their fill at the cost of four and a half little pieces of coin; therefore it would be the height of inhumanity to covet the property of orphans. Whosoever hath amassed wealth, and hath accumulated both lawful and unlawful gains, did so in order that, after his decease, his property should go to his progeny and his dependents, and not that I should take possession of it arbitrarily. Therefore give up the matter, and say no more on the subject." The mercy of the Almighty be upon him! and may those, who read this, utter a benediction to his memory and to mine.

Many monuments of the goodness and wisdom of that excellent monarch remain in the world, among which one is, that the astronomical calculations were, during his reign, tested anew, and the calendar reformed; and it was after the following manner:—It had been discovered from observations, that, from the want of an intercalation, very great confusion existed with regard to the lunar months, and that calculations had fallen into disorder, and that the zodiacal signs in the almanac had become involved in error. Sultan Malik Shāh commanded that the most learned men in the science of astronomy, and the most profound arithmeticians, should make fresh observations, and that the seasons and months should be again tested and adjusted; and the first day of spring, which is the first degree of the sign Aries, became named, after that monarch, the No-roz-i-Jalālī.

Nizām-ul-Mulk, Tūsī, who has left in the world so many proofs of his goodness and nobleness, was his Wazir; and Shaikh Abū Sa'id-i-Abū-l-Khayr, and Imām Ghazzālī lived in his reign. Sultan Malik Shāh's reign extended over a period of twenty-six years, and, in the year 491 H.,1 he died. God alone is immortal.

1 Sic in all copies of the work. Our author is greatly out of his reckoning here. According to the Jámi'-ut-Tawârīkh, Guz̄dah, Alīf, Faṣih-ī, Lubb-ut-Tawârīkh, and all others of authority, Malik Shāh died at Baghdad in the month of Shawwāl, 485 H., six years before the date our author gives; and, according to the Nizām ut-Tawârīkh and others, in 471 H.
V. MUḤAMMAD, SON OF MALIK SHĀH.

When Sultān Malik Shāh took his departure from this world, three sons survived him. Muḥammad, the elder,

Here we have a specimen of our author's mode of writing history; and, if we may judge of the rest of his work from this part, but little dependence can be placed in him. He leaves out the reigns of MAḤMŪD and BARKIĀRŪK, the successors of Malik Shāh, entirely, a period of thirteen years! Space will only permit me to give a brief summary of those events.

After Malik Shāh’s death, at Baghdaḏ, his consort, Turkān Khātūn, who had previously been plotting to secure the succession of her son, Muḡīṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, set him up at Baghdaḏ, and had the Khuṭbāh read for him. She sent off swift messengers to Ḩisbān to secure the person of Barkfārūk, the eldest son, who had been nominated heir and successor by his father. Having succeeded in securing him, Turkān Khātūn, with her son Maḥmūd, advanced towards Ḩisbān, the capital. Barkfārūk, aided by the slaves and partisans of the late Wazīr, Niẓām-ul-Mulk, who had been removed from office at Turkān Khātūn’s instigation, because he opposed her views, succeeded in escaping from Ḣisbān to Raʿī, where forces flocked around him from all parts. He defeated bodies of troops sent against him upon two occasions, but was not powerful enough, as yet, to attempt to regain Ḣisbān, and so he remained at Raʿī. Turkān Khātūn having died in Ramaṣān, 487 H., he moved against the capital, and Maḥmūd, his brother and rival, came forth to submit to him, and the brothers embraced each other. Some of Maḥmūd’s partisans, however, succeeded in seizing Barkfārūk, and were going to deprive him of his sight, when Maḥmūd was seized with small-pox, and died on the third day. There is some discrepancy here, among a few authors of authority, who state that Barkfārūk’s escape took place in 488 H., and that he again retired to Raʿī, where he was crowned and enthroned, and that he was again seized and imprisoned in 489 H., at which time his brother Maḥmūd died, as above related. However, on the death of his brother, Barkfārūk was brought forth from his prison, and raised to the throne; and, from this date, his reign properly commences. The Khālidshah acknowledged him, and the titles he conferred upon him were, according to Vāfaʾī, Gūzīdah, and others, RUKN-UD-DĪN, ABŪ-L-MUʾAZZAFFAR, BARKIĀRŪK; but Fasḥ-ī and others say, RUKN-UD-DĪN, ABŪ-L-FAWĀRĪS, were his titles. There was no peace for him still, and he had constantly to take the field. In 488 H., his uncle, Tākīsh, revolted, but he was defeated; and, in the following year, he was moving against another uncle, Arsalān-i-Argūsh, when a slave of the latter put his master to death, before Barkfārūk arrived. On the death of Arsalān-i-Argūsh, who had held the greater part of Khūrāsān, in 489 H., Sanjār, the third son of Malik Shāh, and full brother of Muḥammad, was set up in Khūrāsān; and, in 490 H., when in his eleventh year, his brother, Sultān Barkfārūk, nominated him to the government of Khūrāsān as his deputy. In 492 H., the year in which Jerusalem was taken by the Crusaders, and Sultān Ibrāhīm of Ghaẓān died, Barkfārūk’s troops revolted against him, and he retired into Khūzistān. On this, his other brother, Muḥammad, who appears to have been in revolt since 489 H. [some say 490 H.], moved from Arrān of Ḩasbarātjān to Hamadān, during Barkfārūk’s absence, and assumed the throne. In Rabīʿ of the following year, Barkfārūk marched against him, but was defeated, and had to retire into Khūzistān again.
they called by the name of Tīr, and the second son was named Sanjar, and the youngest, Maḥmūd. Muḥammad Tīr, the eldest, ascended the imperial throne,

He, however, regained sufficient strength during the next year to be able to march against Muḥammad again; and, in Jamāḥ-ul-ʿĀkhir, he defeated him in 'Irāk, and Muḥammad fled to Rai, at which time, according to Fāṣīḥ-ī, Sanjar joined him from Ḫurāsān. In 493 ʿH., according to Fāṣīḥ-ī, Barkfārūḵ was again defeated by Muḥammad; and, in the same year, the former had to encounter Sanjar in Ḫurāsān, but he was again unsuccessful, and had to fly. Barkfārūḵ, notwithstanding he was exceedingly weak from severe illness, set out from Baghdaḏ to oppose Muḥammad; but the great nobles on either side succeeded in effecting an accommodation between the brothers, and Muḥammad returned to ʿAṣwān, of which part he had held the government previously. Muḥammad, however, soon regretted what he had done, and further hostilities arose. Barkfārūḵ again marched against him, and, in Rabīʿ-ul-ʿĀkhir, 495 ʿH., a battle took place between them near Sāwah, in which Muḥammad was defeated and routed, and he fled to Iṣfahān, followed by Barkfārūḵ, who invested him therein. Muḥammad ventured out to try and raise the investment, but was again overthrown, and fled towards Ḫūṭ. Barkfārūḵ followed, and came up with him near Ganjah, and again defeated him. In Jamāḥ-ul-ʿĀkhir, 496 ʿH., a peace was brought about, on the agreement that Muḥammad should have the western parts of the empire, ʿAṣarbaḵšān, ʿAṣrān, Arman, Gurgāntān, and a part of 'Irāk, and Barkfārūḵ the remainder of the empire. This having been agreed upon, Barkfārūḵ set out on his return to Baghdaḏ; but his illness assumed a more dangerous form on the way thither, and he died on the 12th of Rabīʿ-ul-Awwal, 498 ʿH., after a stormy reign of twelve years, having nominated his son, Malik Šāh, his successor. This is a mere outline of the events entirely left out by our author; and, in the account which he gives of Muḥammad's reign, he makes still more serious errors than before. Gibbon [chap. iv.] destroys the empire of the Saljuḵs in a few words. He asserts that "The greatness and unity of the Turkish empire expired in the person of Malēk Ṣahār, and of course never mentions his successors, Maḥmūd, Barkfārūḵ, or Muḥammad. A little farther on he does say that "Sanjār, the last hero of their race," was unknown to the Franks, and that he "might have been made prisoner by the Franks, as well as by the Uzes." He means the Ghuzz tribe probably; but he omitted to state that the first Crusaders were opposed, really, by about the least powerful of the Satraps of the Saljuḵ empire. The eight successors of this "the last of his race," as well as himself, will be mentioned farther on.

8 Our author is totally incorrect here again. Muḥammad did not succeed his father, as already shown, neither did three sons [most of the copies of the work say "two"] only survive Malik Šāh. There were four, the eldest of whom was Barkfārūḵ; the youngest, Maḥmūd, an account of whom I have just given. The other two sons were Muḥammad and Sanjar, who were full brothers: an adopted son is also mentioned. The name Tīr [†] and Tabr [†], for some copies say one, and some the other, given to Muḥammad by our author, is not mentioned in any other work, and the significations of either do not appear applicable. I am inclined to consider that he has confused the name of Muḥammad with that of his uncle Tutāḫ [†], the progenitor of the Saljuḵ dynasty of Šām, out of whose hands the Franks wrested Antioch, in the first Crusade.
and all the Maliks and great nobles, with their loins girded, stood before him ready to do his bidding. The Wazırs, or ministers of the east and the west, by their tact and experience, succeeded in securing possession of the whole of the territories of the empire; and the Sultāns of the neighbouring countries submitted to his suzerainty.

Sultān Muḥammad Tīr, however, was a person wholly given to pleasure; and, having found his dominions tranquil and undisturbed, he was in the habit of abandoning himself wholly to wine. He never led his forces in person towards any part of the frontiers of his empire, neither did he nominate any forces [under others for that service]; consequently, no event worthy of record took place during his reign, nor did his territories acquire any extension. His life of pleasure soon terminated; and, after passing two years in gaiety and jollity, he died; and the sovereignty passed to Sultān Sanjar.

Muḥammad, born 474 H., whose correct titles are Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Abū Shujā’, Muḥammad, Kāṣf-ī-ʿAmīr-ul-Mūminīn, whom our author calls a wine-bibber, and wholly addicted to pleasure, and who, according to his account, but on what authority he does not mention, never led his troops or despatched any under his nobles upon any expedition whatever, was, on the testimony of authors of undoubted authority, one of the most intrepid of the Saljūk sovereigns, of high principle, faithful to his engagements, truthful, just, a cherisher of his subjects, and moreover pious and temperate. See Rauzaṭ-uṣ-Safā for his character. At the very outset of his reign, having claimed the whole empire as his right, he moved to Baghdād, against the adherents of Malik Shāh, son of Barkfārūk, who had been set up as successor to his father’s dominions, according to the terms arranged between Barkfārūk and Muḥammad already explained. Ṣadakāh and Ayāz were defeated, Ṣadakāh slain [Faṣīḥ-ī, however, says he was put to death in 501 H.], Ayāz taken prisoner, and Malik Shāh was seized and kept in confinement. In 504 H. Muḥammad defeated the Mulāhidahs, who had acquired great strength during the stormy period of Barkfārūk’s reign, and had occupied a strong fortress of Iṣfāhān, named Kala’-i-Shāh. The place was reduced, and the leader put to death. After this, an expedition into Hindūstān—the western frontier must be referred to—the destruction of a famous idol-temple, and the removal of the idol to Iṣfāhān, is mentioned in some authors of authority. It seems improbable, but is distinctly mentioned, and further research may throw some light upon it. Faṣīḥ-ī, however, does not mention it. Subsequently Muḥammad despatched an army, under the command of one of his great nobles, against Almūt, the stronghold of Ḥasan-i-Ṣabbāḥ, the head of the sect of Mulāhidahs, but the Sultān’s death happening soon after prevented the expedition succeeding. Muḥammad died in 510 H., but some authors say in 511 H., so that he reigned twelve years and nine months.
VI. SULTĀN-UL-A’ZAM, MU’IZZ-UD-DUNYA-WA-UD-DĪN⁶, SANJAR, SON OF MALIK SHĀH.

Sultān Sanjar was a great, dignified, and mighty monarch. His birth took place in the country of Sanjār, in the year 479 H., at the time when his father, Malik Shāh, was engaged in the service of the Court of the Khilāfat, and occupied in the disposal of the affairs of the Lord of the Faithful.

When his father died, Sultān Sanjar was in his tenth year, and his brother Muḥammad ascended the throne⁶. After his brother’s death, Sanjar was raised to the sovereignty; and was distinguished by the Court of Bagh-dād with a dress of honour, a standard, and a commission of investiture. At the capital, Marw of Shāh-i-Jahān, and throughout the whole of the territories of Islām, over which his father and grandfather had held sway, the Khuṭbah was read for him, and his name was impressed upon the coin.

When he attained unto years of discretion, the flower of youth, and the bloom of manhood, the dominions of the east and of the west came under the control and administration of the slaves and vassals of his empire⁷. His first

⁶ Yāfā’ī says his titles were Sultān-ul-A’zam, Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, and his patronymic Abū Ḥārīs-i-Sanjār. Farākātī calls him Mu’izz-ud-Daulah; Faṣih-ī, Saif-ud-Daulah; Mirat-i-Jahān Numa styled him Sultān-us-Salāṭīn, Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Abū-Ḥārīṣ, &c.; and Niṣām-ut-Tawārikh and Muntakhāb say his patronymic was Abū-Ḥārīs-i-Aḥmad.

⁷ On the death of Muḥammad, Sanjar, then the only surviving son of Malik Shāh, who had held the government of Khurāsān since his brother, Barrāfūr, conferred it upon him, assumed sovereignty over the whole empire, notwithstanding Muḥammad had bequeathed the sovereignty over Irāk to his son Maḥmūd. An engagement took place between Sanjar and his nephew, in which the latter was defeated; but Sanjar allowed him to retain the sovereignty, subject to himself. Maḥmūd did not enjoy it long, for he died the same year, and his son, Tughrīl, succeeded; but he too died the same year, and Mas‘ūd, another son of Sultān Muḥammad, succeeded. There having been two Mas‘ūd’s and three Tughrīl’s, several authors, one of whom is generally so correct as to dates—the Muntakhāb-ut-Tawārikh—have confounded them. See note ⁶, p. 151, and note ⁷, p. 173.
hostile operations were directed against Muḥammad, Khan* of Samarkand, whom he defeated; and, subsequently, Sultān Sanjar fought sixteen different engagements on different frontiers of his territories, and came forth victorious from the whole of them.

His reign extended over a long period of time; and public affairs went on in the highway of legality, and on the beaten track of equity and justice. The ordinances of the sacred law of Muḥammad, and the canons of the faith of Islām, conformable with the Divine commands, acquired fresh vigour and newness.

The countries of Khurāsān, 'Irāk, and Mawar-un-Nahr, became exceedingly populous and flourishing; and, at Baghdād, royal palaces were erected in his name. The viceroyalty, and the command of the troops of Baghdād, under the same conditions and provisions as those under which his forefathers had held these offices, indeed upon even more favourable terms, came into the possession of him, and of his representatives.

He installed his slaves in the government, and administration of every country⁹. Arrān, 'Irāk, and Āzarbājjan he conferred upon Iladd-giz¹, who was his slave; and he

---

Sanjar fought several battles before he became supreme ruler, on the death of his brother, Muḥammad. His first was with Daulet Shāh, Wālī of Balkh, who was his cousin-german. This took place in 491 H.; but, as Sanjar was only then in his twelfth year, he could not have taken part in it. He may have been present with the army. The second encounter was with his elder brother, Barkhārūk [who had nominated him to the government of Khurāsān in 490 H.], in 493 H. The third was with Kundūz Khān, near Tirmiz, in 495 H. The fourth with Arsalān Shāh, Ghaznavī, in 511 H. The first battle fought, after he became supreme sovereign in 511 H., was against his nephew, Maḥmūd, in the neighbourhood of Sāwah, in 513 H., which appears to be that said to have been fought with Masʿūd. See page 151, and note ¹. Sultān Sanjar fought nine battles, in the whole of which he was victorious; and was defeated in two, as our author himself allows a few pages farther on. The expedition against Aḥmad [also called Muḥammad] Khān, son of Sullāmān Khān, styled “Bādshāh” of Mawar-un-Nahr, took place in 524 H. The Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh mentions an expedition against “Muḥammad Khān, Wālī of Samarkand,” in 514 H. It appears to be the same which Fasīb-ī, Guzīdah, and Jahān-Ārā place ten years after. Aḥmad Khān was taken prisoner, but he was restored to his sovereignty in 530 H.

⁹ Our author’s statements here are contrary to facts. See note ² at page 168.

¹ This name is wrongly given here in all the copies of the work but one, although, subsequently, when giving an account of him, the author calls him by his right name. As ḍ is interchangeable with d, it can be, and sometimes is,
was the father of the Atā-bak, Muḥammad; and the Atā-bak, Uz-bak, and the Atā-bak, Akhtān, are both descendants of his. The territory of Fārs was given to Sankur, who was the ancestor of the Atā-baks of Fārs; and the Atā-bak, Zangi, the Atā-bak, Duklah, and the Atā-bak, Sa'd, and his sons, are all his [Sankur's] descendants. The country of Khwārazm he conferred upon the son of Khwārazm Shāh, who was one of his [the Sulṭān's] servants, who was the father of I- yal-Arsalān, who was the father of Takish, Khwārazm Shāh, father of Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh.

The Sulṭān of Ghaznīn, Mas'ūd-i-Karīm [the Beneficent], son of Sulṭān Raẓzī-ud-Dīn, Ibrāhīm,—May the light of the Almighty illumine their resting place!—took the sister of Sulṭān Sanjar to wife. During the reign of the last, through the death of Sulṭān Mas'ūd-i-Karīm, it is said that dissension arose between the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn. Malik Arsalañ, son of Sulṭān Mas'ūd, ascended the throne at Ghaznīn, and Bahrām Shāh, another son of Mas'ūd, was with his father, in the district of Tigīn-ābād of Garmsīr, at the time of his father's decease; and, from that place, Bahrām Shāh proceeded to the presence of Sulṭān Sanjar [his maternal uncle], and for a considerable period continued in attendance at his Court.

After some time had elapsed, Sulṭān Sanjar came to Ghaznīn to the aid of Bahrām Shāh, and set Bahrām upon the throne of Ghaznīn; and in that territory, and in Hindustān likewise, the Khuṭbah was read and the coin stamped, in Sulṭān Sanjar's name.

This dominion and power which Sanjar possessed was more extensive than had been possessed by any of his ancestors. He conferred the territory of Mauṣil upon one

written Ilāt-giz. This person's name has been incorrectly written "Atlakīn," and "Ileku," in many translations. See page 170, and note 8.
2 No Atā-bak of this name occurs elsewhere.
3 See note 9, p. 107.
4 At this period Sanjar was merely ruler of Khurāsān, subordinate to his brother, although he succeeded to the whole empire shortly after.
5 Sanjar imposed a tribute of one thousand dinārs per day upon Bahrām Shāh; and, in 530 H., had to march to Ghaznīn to enforce payment, and reduce him to submission.
6 It is beyond a doubt that the Saljūk empire was of the greatest extent in Malik Shāh's reign. See latter part of note 8, page 140.
of his slaves, and the Atā-baks of Mauṣil, who have been up to nearly this present time, are the descendants of this slave of his, who was a Turk of Khiṭā-t, and the whole of the territories of Shām were held by his slaves. Sūltān Nūr-ud-Dīn, of Shām, likewise, was one of the descendants of the Atā-baks of Mauṣil, as will, please God, be hereafter mentioned. The Malik of Ghūr, and the Sultāns of the Jībāl, were all subject to Sultān Sanjar.

During his reign hostility arose between the Sultāns of Ghaznīn and the Malik of Ghūr, and the latter were overcome. When, however, the territory of Ghūr came under the rule of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Husain, he refused to pay submission to the Sultān; and an engagement took place between him and Sultān Sanjar in the neighbourhood of the mountain tracts of Hirāt, at a place named Sīh Gōshah-nāb, and the forces of Ghūr were routed, and Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn was taken prisoner. After some time he obtained his release, and became one of the especial confidants and intimate companions of Sultān Sanjar.

About the time of the troubles consequent on the outbreak of the Ghuzz tribe, when 'Alā-ud-Dīn was in company one day with Sultān Sanjar, and engaged in a carousel, Sanjar, who was seated upon the throne, thrust out one of his august legs, and let the foot, on the sole of which there was a black mole, dangle over the throne. On 'Alā-ud-

---

7 See note 4, page 168.
8 Jībāl here signifies the northern parts of Ghūr, Bāmīān, &c., not of 'Irāk.
9 Petty chieftains at this time, and holding but a very small tract of country. See note 8, page 166.
1 This encounter took place before the gate of Alobah.
2 Our author, being such a warm partisan of the Ghūrīs and their Turk successors, would not probably mention, if he knew of it, the circumstance of Bahrām of Ghaznīn sending the head of Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, son of Husain, son of Sām, to his uncle. Sultān Sanjar encountered the Ghūrīs upon two occasions. The first time, in 501 H., in which affair Husain, son of Sām, was made captive, and Sanjar gave orders to put him to death, but he was saved at the intercession of Shaikh Ahmad, Ghazzālī; and, it is stated, that for two years Husain used to light the fires for the cooks of the Sultān's army, to such misery was he reduced. For further details see Section XVIII. The second occasion, when, according to our author, "'Alā-ud-Dīn Husain, refused to pay submission to the Sultān," was in 547 H., just before Sanjar moved against the Ghuzz tribe, in which affair he was taken prisoner, and at the time when the Sultān's power was almost at the lowest ebb. See note 8, page 155.
3 This statement is much more probable than that of the Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣaṣī,
Din's noticing this mole, he stood up and solicited that he might be allowed the honour of kissing it; and repeated these lines suitable to the occasion:—

"Verily the dust at the gate of thy palace is [my] diadem,
[And] this, the collar of thy service, is my adornment.
In the same manner as I kiss the mole on the sole of thy foot,
Even so good fortune [likewise] salutes my head."

Sultan Sanjar acceded to his request; and, when 'Ala-ud-Din knelt down and kissed the mole, the Sultan contrived to twist his toes in the hair about the face of 'Ala-ud-Din, and to keep him on the floor. 'Ala-ud-Din desired to raise his head from the ground, but was held down by his hair. Those present laughed, and 'Ala-ud-Din became disturbed, and his countenance changed. Sultan Sanjar, noticing his mortification, out of his princely beneficence and sympathy, said:—"'Ala-ud-Din, this jesting hath hurt thy feelings; let the dominion of Ghūr be [my] amends to thee. I congratulate thee! Return again to thy capital and throne: thou art my brother! Now that the troubles with the Ghuzz tribe have arisen, take along with thee all the flocks of sheep and herds of horses and camels belonging to me, my own private property. If victory aid my efforts against them, and the outbreak of this tribe should be quelled, send them back to me again; but, if not, let them be. It is far better that they should remain with thee, than that they should fall into the hands of such ingrate rebels."

Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din returned to Ghūr, and through the magnanimity and generosity of Sultan Sanjar regained his throne. This was a tradition of Sanjar's beneficence and kindliness; but the author of this Tabakat will here relate that which sets forth his sovereignty. I, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in the year 611 H., when at Firūz-koh, which was the capital and seat of government of the Sulṭāns of Ghūr, heard [the following] from Amir 'Ali, the Chā-ūsh [pursuivant], who said that his grandfather was the Marshal of the retinue of Sultan Sanjar: and that his grandfather stated, that, when Sulṭān Mas'ūd of 'Irāk, who was one of Sulṭān Sanjar's

and far more cleanly. The throne of state is not meant, but a chair or raised seat used on ordinary occasions. See Dorn's "Afghans," part ii, p. 85.

1 The point of the original, of course, is partially lost in translation.

4 This seems to be about the only meaning applicable to the term ٍیمٍ. ٍیمٍ
brothers' sons, broke out into rebellion, and Karajah, the Sakli [cup-bearer], who was one of Sanjar's slaves, became his supporter in that revolt, the Sultan marched an army from Marw, with the object of falling upon the rebels unawares.

He reached the summit of the Sawah Pass, at the foot of which, on the 'Irak side, the rebels were encamped, and issued from it with a few followers; but, when his eye caught sight of the forces of the enemy, he reined in his horse, and came to a halt. A party of nobles, who had reached the spot where he was, he summoned to his side, and said to them:—"We have come upon this gathering,

---

Some discrepancy exists among historians respecting the sons of Muhammad, son of Malik Shah, the nephews of Sultan Sanjar. Guzjäh and others mention an encounter between Sanjar and his nephew, Mahmud, in 513 H., in 'Irak, who was defeated and fled to Sawah, but mention no revolt on the part of Mas'ud, who only succeeded to the subordinate sovereignty over 'Irak-i-Ajam, on the death of his brother Tughril, in 529 H., who succeeded Mahmud, the other brother. In the enumeration of the different victories obtained by Sultan Sanjar during his reign, the Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh mentions one gained over his nephew, Mahmud, in the neighbourhood of Sawah, in 513 H., and a second gained over another nephew [7], Mas'ud, near Dinawr, in 526 H.; but Mas'ud only succeeded his brother in 529 H. He may have been, however, rebellious before he succeeded. The cause for such discrepancy appears to have arisen from there having been two Mas'uds and three Tughrils, who held 'Irak-i-Ajam under Sanjar, on the authority of Faish-i, who gives the events of each year in chronological order. That work states, that "Mahmud, son of Muhammad, Sanjar's brother, at his father's death in 510 H. [some say it took place in 511 H.], notwithstanding he had opposed his uncle in battle, was allowed to retain the government of 'Irak[i-'Ajam]," but that he died in that same year. Tughril, his brother, succeeded him, but in that same year Tughril likewise died. On this, Mas'ud, the third brother, succeeded, and he became disaffected towards his uncle, who marched against him, and defeated him in 513 H. in sight of Hamadan [a long way from Sawah]. Mas'ud fled to Jurjan; but he was permitted, shortly after, to resume his government, but under supervision. There is no mention of his having been taken prisoner, yet this is the account which agrees best with the statement of our author. This Mas'ud died in 525 H. The Jahân-Ârâ, and Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh state, that Mahmud died in that year [Ibn-i-Khalkan says in 524 H.], and was succeeded by his brother, Tughril, who died in 529 H., and was succeeded by Mas'ud; but, if Mas'ud only succeeded in 529 H., how could he, according to the same authors, have been defeated by his uncle in 526 H.? According to Faish-i, Mas'ud was succeeded by Tughril, his brother, but probably his son, as the same author states that his brother Tughril died in the same year as Mahmud, who died in 525 H. [this date agrees with Jahân-Ârâ and the Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh above quoted], when Mas'ud, son of Mahmud [son of Muhammad], Sanjar's nephew, succeeded. He died in 547 H., and is said to have always been loyal to Sanjar. He was succeeded by his brother, Mughis-ud-Din, Malik Shah.
but we have but a weak following, while the enemy are very numerous: what is it advisable to do?” Some among the nobles replied, that whatsoever, in accordance with his Majesty’s opinion, he might be pleased to command would be most advisable; but, if his Majesty would defer any movement until such time as the whole of the force should come up, and then dash upon them, it would be still more advisable. Others of the nobles said:—“These people too are his Majesty’s servants: it is necessary that he should be pleased to show clemency towards, and have compassion on them, and give them intimation of the arrival of the imperial standards, so that the whole of them may be able to come and tender their services, and rest in safety under the shadow of the imperial protection and pardon.” In short, each one of the great lords and nobles made representation of such opinions as entered their minds.

Sultān Sanjar [then] turned his face towards the Amir-i-Chā-ūsh, who was also Marshal of his retinue, and said:—“Chā-ūsh, what is it advisable to do?” The Chā-ūsh dismounted from his horse, and, bowing his head to the ground, repeated the following lines:—

“Great monarch! we ought to give battle:
We should close with the foe.
All the fierce lions of the forest
Must be brought into the field,
All the huge elephants of war
Should doubtless be brought into the fray.
It is the day of battle: it is meet to engage.
It is the hour for action: it is well to be doing.
If thou wouldst render the kingdom stable,
It is essential that the sword should be plied.”

The Sultān replied:—“It is necessary to act as the Chā-ūsh advises;” and at once, without any further delay, with as many cavalry as had come up, Sultān Sanjar dashed upon the rebel forces. Karājah, the cup-bearer, and Mas‘ūd of ‘Irāk were both taken prisoners, and the forces of this gathering were defeated and put to the rout, and the countries of ‘Irāk and ‘Azarbāijān were recovered anew.

The Sultān returned to Khorāsān; and it was a constant practice with him to pass the hot season at Bukhārā, and the winter at Marw of Shāh-i-Jahān. It so happened, one year, that he remained longer than was his wont at Marw.
The temperature began to rise, and not one of his Court had the courage to represent that it would be well to return to the land of Bukhārā. The climate of Bukhārā agreed with a number of the nobles and great men. They urged Amir-i-Mu'azzī that he should, by means of verse, bring the charms and beauties of the villas and gardens of the city of Bukhārā to the imperial hearing, so that Kamāl-uz-Zamān might, at an opportune time, sing it, accompanied with lutes.

Amir Mu'azzī, who was the Chief of Poets, or Poet-Laureate, and who, along with forty other adepts [in the art], was in the habit, on days of entertainment and at banquets, of recounting the deeds of the Sultan, and [of whom] it is related, that the whole of these [poets] were of his clan and followers, accordingly composed the following strophe⁷: and the Minstrel, Kamāl-uz-Zamān, early one morning, when the Sultan had taken his morning draught of wine, played⁸ it with such feeling and touching effect, that the Sultan, half-dressed as he was and in his slippers, came forth, mounted on horseback, and took neither

⁷ Our author is unfortunate with regard to his quotations very often. These lines were neither composed by the poet Mu'azzī, nor were they composed to influence Sultan Sanjar to return to Bukhārā. It was neither his capital, nor did he "use" to pass the hot seasons there. The lines were composed more than a hundred years before Sanjar was born, with the title "Mir" instead of "Shah," by Farīd-ud-Dīn, Abū 'Abd-ullah, Muḥammad, born at Rūdak of Ṣamarkand, and hence known as Rūdakī, a famous poet, blind from his birth, but endowed with a very melodious voice, and he played enchantingly on the barbat, a kind of lute. He was also the first native of 'Ajam who composed a Divān. The lines in question were composed to try and influence the Amir, Abū-l-Ḥasan-i-Naṣr, son of Ahmad, Sāmānī, to return to his capital, which was Bukhārā. One author states that he went to Hirāt, and was so delighted with the place that he remained a long time, and even thought of taking up his residence there. His ministers, nobles, and troops, who longed to return to Bukhārā, were much put out at this, so much so that they, finding all remonstrance useless, even contemplated rebelling. Another writer, who gives a biography of Rūdakī, states that the place was Marw with which Naṣr was so much taken up. But, be this as it may, the poet, Rūdakī, was induced to use his efforts upon the Amir. He accordingly composed these lines, and in the Sarā FEATURES or villa, in which Naṣr had taken his morning collation, the poet sang them accompanied by his lute. Naṣr became so enchanted on hearing some of the lines, that he did not stay to hear all; but, without either turban or shoes, he at once mounted and rode off the first stage on the way to Bukhārā.

⁸ "Lutes" are mentioned above in all the copies; whilst here, it appears, the minstrel sang it, accompanying it with his lute.
rest nor repose until he reached the appointed destination:

"The breeze from Mullān’s rivulet reacheth me the same,
Even as cometh the fragrance of a loving friend.
The gravel of the Amū, and the roughness thereof,
Appeareth like as the softest silk beneath my feet.
The river Jīḻūn, with its wide-spread surface,
Reacheth, even now, to my white steed’s very girlish.
O Buhārā! rejoice, and be thou glad once more,
For the Shāh even now cometh a guest unto thee.
The Shāh is a moon, and Buhārā a firmament;
The moon likewise riseth the celestial vault within.
The Shāh is a cypress, and Buhārā a garden;
The cypress also cometh unto the garden now."

After a great part of his reign had elapsed, a body of people from Karā-Khaṭā’-l, from Tamghāj, and the dependencies of Chin, entered the confines of Karā Kuram of Turkistan, and solicited Sūltān Sanjar to assign them grazing-lands; and, with the Sūltān’s permission, they took up their quarters on those confines, in Bilāsāghūn, Kabālik, and Almālik, and made those parts their grazing-grounds.

When their progeny became very numerous, during the Sūltān’s reign, they rebelled against his authority, and fought a battle against him. Tānīko of Tarāz, at the nomination of Sunkam and I-māḥ, was at the head of the Khaṭā’īs. The Sūltān’s forces, from a long period of inaction, and enervated by protracted ease and luxury, were unable to cope with or stand before the enemy, and were overthrown; and they took Turkān Khāṭūn, who was the Malikah-i-Jahān [Queen of the Universe], and consort of Sūltān Sanjar, captive.

8 The only other signification the word used will admit of is a boat, which does seem more appropriate, for I do not think the Jīḻūn can be forded on horseback. I have doubts whether the word is correct in the original.
1 Sic in MSS.
2 In 534 H. Sanjar marched to Samrākand, and fought a battle with Aṭ Khān; but he was defeated, and had to retreat to the fortress of Tirmiz, or Tirmid, as it is also called. Turkān Khāṭūn, and the Malik of Nīmroz, and many other great men, were left in the hands of the enemy. These infidels of Khaṭā’-l, and Mughals likewise, overran Māwar-un-Nahr, slaying, devastating, and making the people captives; and, included in the numbers put to the sword by the invaders, were many great and learned men. The Khaṭā’-l’s and Mughals remained in Māwar-un-Nahr until driven out by Sūltān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh. Guţfah and Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīḵah state that this reverse took place in 535 H.

As soon as this disaster befell Sanjar, his vassal, Utsus [it is written “Itis”
This was the first reverse the Sultan had ever sustained; and, subsequently, he concluded a peace with them, and the pasture-lands of Turki斯坦 and Bilasaghun, along with the cities and towns included in those frontier tracts, were left in the hands of the Khata-i invaders. After the peace was concluded they sent back Turk斯坦 Khatun to the Sultan again. The Hakim [philosopher] Koshaqi has written much satire upon this unfortunate event, which is contained in Diwans and [other] books.

When this reverse became public, the affairs of the empire began to decline, and to grow weak; and, of the reign of Sanjar, sixty years had passed away. A body of the Ghuzz tribe, from Khandan, now rose in revolt against the Sultan's authority, and withheld the yearly tribute which had been previously fixed. The Sultan marched an army against them, and the Ghuzz were willing to pay a kalâh [ingot] of silver for each family, but the Sultan would not

in Burhan-i-Kata', and in the Tarikh-i-Ibrahim, "Utsiz," and by our author, "Utsuz"), son of Keshb-Din, Muhammad, son of Nush-Tigin, upon whom Sanjar's father conferred the rule over Khwaramz, threw off his allegiance. Sanjar invested him in Hazar-as in 535 H., which was taken; but he treated the rebel leniently, and still allowed him to retain that territory. In 537 H. [Guzdah says in 535 H., while the Muntakhab ut-Tawarikh says it happened in 536 H.] Gur Khan, who, in concert with At Khan, defeated Sanjar in the Dasht, or Desert of Katran, on the frontier of Samarkand, died; and, after this happened, Muhammad Khwaramz Shah expelled the infidels from Mawar-un-Nahr.

It was, according to Guzdah and others, after Sanjar's defeat by the Khatahs and Mughals that 'Ala-ud-Din, chief of Ghur, ventured to show hostility towards him. Sanjar defeated him before Aoba in 547 H., and 'Ala-ud-Din was taken prisoner, but was subsequently released. Our author has mentioned this as about the first event of Sanjar's reign.

A tract of territory on the frontier of Chin. A few MSS. have Khutlan.

Fanakatf says that, when the Ghuzz tribe crossed the Jihun, Badr-ul-Mulk, 'Ajami, the Sultan's Wazir, advised Sultan Sanjar to attack them. This he did, and was overthrown and taken prisoner, and Khurasan, Kirmân, and Fars were seized by them.1

The Sultan marched against the Ghuzz in 548 H. The details are far too long for insertion here. Upwards of a hundred thousand persons, not including women and children, were afterwards massacred by the Ghuzz, and the territory of Khurasan was devastated. In the following year was born Tamuchin, afterwards known by the name of Chingiz Khan.

Guzdah says "a maun [which signifies two pounds of twelve ounces each] of silver." Price, quoting the Khulassat-ul-Akhbar, says "a quarter of a hundredweight of gold, besides 100,000 dinars," which is ridiculous. Our author's account is the most probable one.

L. 2
agree to it, and, on this account, gave battle to them, and was defeated and taken prisoner.

On the Sulṭān falling into their hands, the whole of the Ghuzz dismounted before his stirrup, and saluted him, and tendered their services. The Ghuzz chieftains, such as Ṭūṭi, Kurgharat, Malik Dinār, Ibrāhīm, and Khutalī, besides others, girded up their loins before the Sulṭān's throne [to serve him], and began themselves to issue mandates [in his name]; and they divided Khurāsān among themselves. Whatever it was requisite to do they did, and they used to state, "The Sulṭān commands this and that." The slaves and servants of the Sanjarī dynasty became dispersed and separated; and the affairs of the country became disorganized, and the thread of sovereignty snapped asunder.

After some time had passed—about a year, more or less*—one of the slaves, who was one of the Sulṭān's nobles, proceeded to the Sulṭān Sanjar's presence, and presented himself, and, as if going out on a hunting excursion, mounted the Sulṭān on horseback, and brought him away [out of the hands of the Ghuzz], and restored him to liberty once more. He conducted the Sulṭān to Marw⁹, and placed him on the throne again, and some of the still remaining adherents of the dynasty collected around him; but the Sulṭān's days had now drawn towards their close, and the sovereignty had grown antiquated and gone to decay. On Monday, the 24th of the month Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, in the year 552 Ḥ., Sulṭān Sanjar died at Marw, and was there buried. His age was seventy-three years.

* Our author generally eschews dates. Here again we have a specimen of his mode of writing history, when he asserts that Sanjar remained in captivity "about a year, more or less." Sanjar remained nearly four years in the hands of the Ghuzz, and, during this period, no efforts were made to effect his escape, lest his consort, Turkān Khāṭūn, who appears to have again fallen into captivity, might remain in their hands. She having died, however, in 551 Ḥ., Sulṭān Sanjar succeeded in gaining over the Ghuzz chief who had charge of him, so far as to get him to take him out on a hunting excursion to the banks of the Jīḥūn. Arrangements had been made for the occasion, and Amīr Aḥmad-i-Ḵamāj, governor of Tirmiz, was awaiting him on the bank, where he had got boats in readiness. The Sulṭān succeeded in throwing himself into one, and his people got into others, and then made their escape. In Ramaḍān of that year, the Sulṭān succeeded in assembling a force at Tirmiz, and he then set out, under its escort, to Marw.

⁹ See latter part of preceding note.
and a little over, and his reign lasted sixty-two. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

ACCOUNT OF THE SULTANS OF RUM, OF THE SALJUK DYNASTY.

The Sultans of Rûm were of the race of Saljûk, and were great and powerful monarchs; and, in the territories of Rûm and the country of Afranj, numerous signs and marks of their goodness and benevolence, their expeditions and holy wars, their conflicts with unbelievers, buildings of public utility and charity, in the shape of colleges, mosques, monasteries for darweshis, karwansaræs, bridges, and charitable and pious foundations, remain to this day; and the accounts of their descendants, their Maliks, and their Amirs, and of their heroic achievements in that country, are recorded in trustworthy books.

When the Sultân of Sultans, Sanjar, on whom be the mercy of the Almighty, ascended the throne of his father, and became established in the sovereignty of the world, and, when the territories of Islâm, both east and west, were taken possession of by his servants, and the Khutbah was read for him from all the pulpits of Islâm, and the money of the world became adorned with his name and titles, he conferred the kingdom of Rûm upon his brother, Maḥmûd, son of Malik Shâh. The whole of the Sultans [of that country]

1 Guzîdah says Sanjar died of grief on the 16th of Rabî‘-ul-Awwal 552 H., aged seventy-two years. The length of his reign must be calculated from the death of his brother Muḥammad in 510 H., at which period he was thirty-one years old. Previous to this he was but subordinate ruler of Khurasa; and historians calculate his reign from the date above mentioned. Other authors state that he reigned forty-one years.

2 Our author completed his work in 658 H., and Sanjar died in 552 H.; and, although the Saljuk dynasty existed for thirty-two years after Sanjar’s death, and had terminated ninety-eight years before our author closed his history, he says nothing about Sanjar’s successors.

3 Europe, the countries of the Christians, and the Roman empire of the east.

4 All the copies of the text are alike here. Our author has made a precious hash of this Section of the Rûmi dynasty of the Saljûks. Sanjar did not, as he states, first establish that dynasty, neither was Sanjar’s brother, Maḥmûd, the first subordinate sovereign of Rûm, nor was his son, Maṣûd, the second, nor were they ever its rulers. He has confounded the Sultans of ‘Irâk and those of Rûm together. Sanjar’s brother, Maḥmûd, moreover, died when in
are his [Maḥmūd’s] descendants, an account of every one of whom is recorded in this Ṭabaḵāt, in order that its readers may call to remembrance, with a blessing, those who have passed away, and acquire some information respecting that dynasty*.

* I will now demonstrate what I have referred to by giving a brief account of the rulers of Rūm, of the Saljuḵ dynasty.

Kīl-timīṣ—it was written likewise Kīl-timīṣ and Kāl-timīṣ—but the last syllable is evidently the same as occurs in the name of the Turkish slave-sovereign of Dīlīf, “I-yal-timīṣ,”] son of Isrā’il, son of Saljuḵ, Alb-Arsālān’s great uncle’s son, according to the Muntakḥab-ut-Tawārikh, rebelled against him [Alb-Arsālān]; but, in an action near Dāmghān in Muḥarram, 456 H., Kīl-timīṣ was defeated, and was found dead on the field. Alb-Arsālān desired to put Kīl-timīṣ’s sons to death, but was dissuaded from doing so by his Wazīr, and was induced to make Sulīmān, son of Kīl-timīṣ, viceroy of certain territories of Shām, and he was the founder of the Saljuḵ Sulṭāns of Rūm. Guzīdah states that Kīl-timīṣ received the investiture of the government of Damāshḵ, from Malik Shāh, at the time when he conferred so many territories upon others. See note 9, page 168. Sulīmān, who was employed against the Christians in 467 H. [A.D. 1074-5]—but Faṣīḥ-ī and a few others say in 469 H.—succeeded by stratagem in wresting Anṭāḵšār out of the hands of Firdaus [Philaretus], Rūm, after it had been in the hands of the Christians in his tenth year, in 489 H., only twenty-one years before Sanjar succeeded to the throne, and when Sanjar was about the same age. The first two sovereigns here mentioned as rulers of Rūm, who undertook expeditions against “the infidel Afrang,” were the first two rulers of ‘Irāḵ, subordinate to Sanjar, as will be seen on reference to the second Rūmī sovereign, so called, and Sanjar’s reign where Karādah, the cup-bearer, is referred to, page 151. From the third to the ninth, the rulers mentioned in this Section are correctly given as far as their names and a very meagre account of their reigns go; but the tenth ruler, again, was the last ruler of ‘Irāḵ, not of Rūm. I noticed, when reading the work, that, at the latter part of the reign of Mas’ūd, all the copies of the original contained matter totally unintelligible with regard to that sovereign. It is strange too that all the copies of the work should be the same, for some of the MSS. I have collated, one in particular, are certainly five or six hundred years old. Still more strange is it, however, that, not only should the author in his preliminary notice of the Sulṭāns of Rūm mention Maḥmūd, brother of Sanjar, as the first, but, that he should subsequently mention his undertaking expeditions against the Christians; and, with reference to the second ruler, Mas’ūd, Maḥmūd’s son, he says that Sanjar, at first, conferred the throne of ‘Irāḵ upon him [Mas’ūd], thus inferring that, subsequently, that of Rūm was given to him. The heading of a chapter or paragraph might be put in incorrectly by a copyist, but the sense of the matter cannot be, nor could Rūm have been inserted for ‘Irāḵ. It is therefore evident that our author himself made a muddle of his work, and confounded the rulers of ‘Irāḵ with those of Rūm, which, from other errors he has made, is not improbable. It will also be noticed that he makes no mention whatever of the Saljuḵs of Kirmān, consisting of eleven sovereigns, whose dynasty outlasted all the others—but he has also left out all the other ‘Irāḵi rulers, except the two first and the last, who do duty for the Rūmīs—neither has he given any account whatever of Sanjar’s successors, nor does he notice at all other less powerful dynasties.
I. MAḤMŪD, SON OF MALIK SHĀH.

On the throne of the territory of Rūm having been conferred upon him by Sultān Sanjar, his brother, he undertook many holy wars in that region, and on the frontiers of Islām. He marched armies against the infidel Afranj, and carried on holy war according to the canons and ordinances of the sacred law. He captured fortresses and cities, and ruled over the servants of Almighty God with justice and beneficence. After he had reigned for a considerable time he died.

II. MASŪD, SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

Sultān Masūd was the son of Maḥmūd, son of Malik Shāh. At first, Sultān Sanjar conferred the throne of Irāk upon him; and, on one occasion, through the power and authority which he had acquired in that territory, he combined with Karajah, the Sāḵī [cup-bearer], and they rebelled against the Sultān.

The Sultān came upon them suddenly, and attacked them⁴, and took both Masūd and Karajah, the cup-bearer, prisoners. After that occurrence the affairs of Masūd went to ruin, and he never ascended the throne again; but, in the person of his son, Kāzil-Arsalān by name, he acquired considerable power, and became sovereign, and carried on the government⁶.

* * * * * * * * *

[Twelve copies of the original are all hopelessly defective here, and no two copies are alike. No break occurs in either MS. to indicate that any portion whatever has been lost or misplaced, or that any omission has been made in copying⁷.

since 358 H. This was effected during the reign of the Greek emperor, Alexius Comnenus. I. SULĪMĀN [the Solyman of Tasso] acquired great renown by this, and, in 480 H., Malik Shāh [not Sanjar, as our author states, for he was then only an infant in his first year], conferred the sovereignty on him. He reigned twenty years, and was succeeded by his son, II. DAʿŪD, who

⁴ See the particulars, at page 151.
⁵ This is the only sense that is to be gathered from the original, and the statement is incorrect. See note ⁴, page 157.
⁶ Not even in the precious Paris copy, which M. Tascherau so fondly imagines to be in our author's own handwriting.
The context, in fact, proves that Minhāj-i-Sarāj considered Қазил-Арсалān to be the son and successor of Mas'ūd; and, such being the case, the extent of our author's knowledge of history is impressively indicated.]

* * * * * * * *

III. ҚАЗИЛ-АРСАЛĀN⁶, SON OF MAS'ŪD, SON OF MAḤMŪD, SON OF MALIK ShāH.

After the decease of his father, Қазил-Арсалān acquired some little power, and possessed himself of some of the frontier districts of the territory of Rūm. He ruled for a short period and died.

IV. KULĪJ-АРСАЛĀN, SON OF ҚАЗИЛ-АРСАЛĀN.

Kulīj-Арсалān was the son of Қазил-Арсалān, who was the son of Mas'ūd, son of Maḥmūd, son of Malik Shāh. He assumed the sovereignty of Rūm after the death of his father, and became a very great and powerful monarch. He possessed himself of the territories upon the confines of Rūm, captured many fortresses and strongholds, performed many heroic exploits, and acquired a great name on account of the infidel Afranj having been often worsted and overthrown by him.

All the Sulṭāns of Rūm glory in their connexion with him; and he obtained the felicity of martyrdom. He was interred at Kūnīlah⁷, which is a large city in Rūm.

ascended the throne at Kūnīlah. He gained some successes over the Christians, and, after a reign of eighteen years, died in 518 H. His brother, III. KULĪJ-АРСАЛĀN, succeeded, who is said by one author to have fought a naval battle with the Christians, and, after an arduous struggle, to have been victorious; but there is some discrepancy with respect to the date, and the story may refer to the previous reign. He reigned until 539 H., but some say until 537 H.; but, having been defeated in a battle with the 'Īrākī Saltūks, he was drowned whilst crossing a river, when retreating before them. His son, IV. SULTĀN MAS'ŪD, succeeded, who, after a reign of nineteen years, died in

---

⁶ Mas'ūd, brother of Maḥmūd, son of Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sanjar's brother, had no son so named. The lines which follow are meaningless, but are alike in all the copies.

⁷ Called Koniah by Europeans.
V. 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, KAI-KĀ-ŪS, SON OF KULĪJ-ARSALĀN.

Sultān 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kā-Kā-ūs, ascended the throne after his father’s death, and brought the country under his rule. He carried on holy war against the infidels of Afranj, and fought several battles with them in that country. He founded colleges and masjids, and left many monuments of his goodness and bounty behind. He was interred by the side of his father in the city of Kūnlah.

VI. KAI-KUBĀD, SON OF KAI-KĀ-ŪS.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kā-Kubād, ascended the throne on the decease of his father, Kā-Kā-ūs, and brought under his sway the territories of Rūm, and parts adjacent.

558 H. He was succeeded by his son, V. 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, KULĪJ-ARSALĀN, who ascended the throne at Kūnlah. He annexed some of the territories of the Christians, and, after a reign of twenty years, died in 578 H. After him came his son, VI. RUKN-UD-DĪN, SULĪMĀN SHĀH, the eldest, and, between him and his brother Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Kā-Khusrāw, who had been nominated successor by his father, hostilities arose, which went on till 588 H. Kā-Khusrāw fled to the Christians. Sulīmān annexed Arp-i-Rūm and Kār (Kars), with their dependencies. He reigned twenty-four years, and died in 602 H. His son, VII. 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, KULĪJ-ARSALĀN II., son of Sulīmān, succeeded. He was an infant, and his uncle, Kā-Khusrāw, having been recalled from the Farang, in 603 H., succeeded, after a year, in depriving him of the sovereignty, and Kulīj-Arsalan was shut up in a fortress, where he died in 609 H. VIII. GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN, KAI-KHUSRĀU, after dethroning his young nephew in 603 H., assumed the sovereignty. He took Anṭākli from the Christians, into whose hands it had again fallen, in 603 H., and was himself killed in a battle with the ruler of Istanbūl [Constantinople], after a reign of six years, in 609 H., but some authors say in the preceding year, and some, 610 H. This probably is the fifth monarch referred to by our author, under the name of Kulīj-Arsalan, as he is the only one mentioned who attained the felicity of martyrdom in having been slain by the Christians. His brother, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kā-Kubād, rose against him, but had to submit, and was confined in a fortress.

Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Kā-Khusrāw, having been slain in battle with the Christians, was succeeded by his son, IX. 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, KAI-KĀ-ŪS, but he died after a short reign of about a year. Most authors do not mention this prince at all. He was succeeded by his uncle, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kā-Kubād, who is about the first of the sovereigns of this dynasty that can be traced by his correct name and title, from our author’s account of them. X. 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, KAI-KUBĀD, who had been immersed in a fortress, succeeded his nephew, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kā-Kā-ūs, in 610 H., and is accounted one of the greatest sovereigns of the dynasty. Hostilities arose between him and the
He fought battles with the infidels of Afranj; and many indications of his goodness exist to this day.

He had sons, who acquired great renown, and became great men. He died on the 5th of the month Shawwāl, in the year 633 H., and he, likewise, was buried at Kūnīlah.

VII. KAI-KHUSRAU, SON OF KAI-KUBĀD.

Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, was a great monarch of noble disposition and excellent qualities, just and impartial. Having ascended the throne after the death of his father, he took possession of the territories of Rūm, and assumed the government of them.

In this reign, the disturbance and disorder consequent upon the irruption of the army of infidel Mughals had reached the frontiers of Rūm. The Sultān, in such manner as he was able, entered into friendly relations with the Farang. He was assembling an army upon the frontiers bordering upon the territory of Islām, when, suddenly, unfortunate but gallant Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the last of the Khwārazm Shāhīs. They fought a battle, in Ramağān, 627 H., in which Kai-Kubād was victorious. The Mughal, Uktām Ḳā’ān, sent him a Yarīfgh [diploma] congratulating him, and the Khalīfah [for overthrowing a good Musalmān perhaps] conferred upon him the title of Sultān-i-Aʿẓām, wa Ḳasīm-i-Muʿāṣgam. He reigned twenty-six years, and died in 634 H., having been poisoned, by mistake some authors say, by his son, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, who assumed the throne.

---

1 Our author is correct here as to the name and title. GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN, KAI-KHUSRAU, the eleventh of the dynasty, is the man who poisoned his own father, of whom our author gives such a glowing account.

2 An army of Mughals marched against him, under Tājū, Nūyān, and the Mughals obtained sway over the territory of Rūm, after an engagement at Koshah-dāgh, in 641 H. Kai-Khusrau died in 642 H., but Gūzdah says in 644 H., and Jahān-Ārā and Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh say in 643 H., but Raṣūfat-ṇa-Safā says in 640 H., which is certainly incorrect. His son Sulṭān succeeded.

3 The word “Farang” is used here in all the copies; but Afranj is the word previously used. This, doubtless, is what Gibbon refers to in grandiloquent style, which often covers great errors:—“Flying from the arms of the Moguls, those shepherds of the Caspian [whom he styles the strange and savage hordes of Caria-mies], thus indicating the extent of his knowledge of the matter] rolled headlong on Syria; and the union of the Franks with the Sultans of Aleppo, Hems, and Damascus, was insufficient to stem the violence of the torrent.” The “torrent” of course signifies the fugitive Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn flying from the Mughals, who was defeated by Alā-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kubād, as related in a previous note.
he was deserted and left alone by his troops. The Mughal forces made an inroad into that territory; and, after they again retired, Kai-Khusrau died in the beginning of Muḥarram, 643 H. 4

He reigned for a period of eleven years, and named his son, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kā-ūs, his heir and successor.

VIII. 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, KAI-KĀ-ŪS, SON OF KAI-KHUŞRAU.

According to his father's nomination as successor to the sovereignty, Sultān 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kā-ūs, ascended the throne of Rūm in the beginning of the year 643 H., and the Malikhs and other great nobles submitted to his authority 5.

As he was celebrated for his energy, his warlike accomplishments, and his nobility of mind, he strengthened his frontiers on the side of Afranj; and, as a matter of necessity,

4 Died in 644 H. according to Guzīdān and Faṣīḥ-ī, and in 642 H. according to the Muntakhab-ut-Tawāfirī.  
5 As is often the case towards the termination of a dynasty, authors here are at variance one with another respecting the succession. Some say that Ghīyā-y-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, was succeeded by his son, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kā-ūs, and that he, as our authority states, despatched his brother Rukn-ud-Dīn, Kūlīj-Arsalān [called by others Rukn-ud-Dīn, Sulmān], to the camp of the Mughal Kā'an. The facts, however, appear to be as follow. On the death of Ghīyā-y-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, in 642 H., his son, XII. RUKN-UD-DĪN, SULİMĀN, succeeded. It was he who despatched his brother, 'Ala'-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kubād, to the Court of Ab-gā [called also Ab-kā] Khān, where he continued for a considerable time in distress and trouble. Having at length succeeded in his mission, he set out on his return, but Rukn-ud-Dīn, Sulmān, suspecting he was coming with designs against him, had him put to death as soon as he entered his territory; and another brother, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kā-ūs, fled to the camp of Barkā Khān. After a reign, so called, of twenty years, Sulmān was himself put to death, by order of Ab-gā Khān, in 664 H.

Others, on the contrary, say that Rukn-ud-Dīn, having succeeded in obtaining from the Mughal Kā'an, a grant of investiture for himself, on his return into Rūm, was the cause of great disorders; and that 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, fled to Istanbūl, and was proceeding to the Dašht-i-Khūchak to lay his case before the Kā'an, but died on the way, Rukn-ud-Dīn having in the meantime, with Mughal aid, assumed the sovereignty; but, after a short time had elapsed, Rukn-ud-Dīn [called Kūlīj-Arsalān by some and Sulmān by others] was found to have been intriguing with the ruler of Miṣr, and was put to death in 664 H.

As our author finished his history in 658 H. I have no occasion to say more than that he records events respecting the Mughals which, evidently, belong to the reign of Ghīyā-y-ud-Dīn, Kai-Khusrau, the seventh ruler, by his account, and has confused the events of the following ones.
consequent upon the power and predominance of the infidel Mughals over the dominions of Islam, he, in order to ward off [the inroads of] that race, despatched his younger brother into Turkistan to the Court of Mangü Khan, the Mughal, so that he might, under terms of peace, be left in possession of his dominions.

On Rukn-ud-Din, Kulij-Arsalan, the envoy and brother of Sultan Kai-Kaüs, reaching the presence of Mangü Khan, the Mughal, he preferred requests, and made solicitations contrary to the mandate of his brother. He sought from Mangü Khan the territory of Rum for himself, and likewise assistance from him to enable him to liberate that country from the hands of his brother. Mangü Khan gave him the daughter of the Nū-in [a Prince, or a great noble,] Aljaktā, the Mughal, and despatched Aljaktā, with his troops, to aid Rukn-ud-Din, Kulij-Arsalan [against his brother].

When they reached the Rūmī territory, 'Izz-ud-Din, Kai-Kaüs, retired before them; and Kulij-Arsalan and the Mughals became dominant over Rūm. Kai-Kaüs went to Aor Khan of Rūm, and, having obtained aid from him, came and suddenly attacked the Mughals, and overthrew them'. He captured his brother, and immured him in a fortress.

After some time, he, Kulij-Arsalan, succeeded in escaping, and went to the Mughals; and, as what has happened since has not become known to the author, this [notice of him] has been thus much abridged.

IX. KUTB-UD-DIN, KULIJ-ARSLAN.

Trustworthy persons call him Rukn-ud-Din, Kulij-Arsalan, and say that he is among the Mughals, along with Hulāū, the Accursed, in the direction of the territory of Āzarbāijān. What the upshot of his affairs may be no one can say; but, please God, may they end well.

6 Also written Nūyān.
7 Who Aor [in one copy Ūz] Khan of Rūm might have been, it would require our author to explain. No overthrow of the Mughals by the Saljuks of Rūm is mentioned by other writers.
8 One copy has Rukn-ud-Din.
9 This short account varies, and is somewhat less in some of the copies of the work. Hulāū is also styled Hulākū.
[The author now returns to the last of the Saljuks of 'Irāk. All the MSS. are alike here.]

X. TUGHRIL, SON OF TUGHRIL.

Respecting the descent of this Prince two different accounts have been given. Some relate that he is Tughril, the son of Tughril, son of Kazil Arsalān.

Sultān Tughril was a sovereign, and the son of a sovereign, and a person of great magnificence; and his reign was contemporary with that of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Takish, Khwārazm Shāh.

His strength was so very great, that not a warrior of his day could lift his mace from the ground, and he was a man of great stature and of awe-striking presence. Persons of credit relate, that the hair on his upper lip was so long, that he used to draw his moustaches back, and put them behind his ears.

He was one of the brother's sons of Sultān Sanjar, and was [left] very young in years on the decease of his father. The sons of the Atā-bak Iladd-giz—who was one of Sanjar's slaves, and had, previously, been ruler of that territory, and had espoused Tughril's mother [grandmother of Tughril, widow of Arsalān, Tughril's father], after his father's death—had acquired power over 'Irāk; and, when their father died, they immured Sultān Tughril in one of the fortresses of 'Irāk, and took the country into their own possession.

---

1 All the copies are alike in this respect, and no hiatus whatever occurs in the different MSS. to show it. I merely discovered it from the names and events mentioned.
2 Not so: Tughril, the last of the dynasty, was son of Arsalān Shāh, and his title was Rākhn-ud-Dīn. There are no contrary accounts that I know of. One copy has Tughril, son of Arsalān, son of Kulī-Arsalān.
3 In some copies this paragraph is placed at the end of his reign.
4 See note 9, page 91.
5 He was Sanjar's brother's great-grandson, if not one generation farther removed.
6 I have been obliged to take a little liberty with the text of this paragraph, which, in all twelve copies, is in a hopeless state of muddle. No two copies are alike; and, as the text now stands, it is a mere jumble of words without any observance of grammatical rules. The literal translation of this passage, as it now stands, is as follows:—"He was one of the brother's sons of Sultān
When Sultān Tughrīl reached man's estate, and became famous for his vast strength, his great bodily vigour, his nobility of mind, and his warlike accomplishments, a party [of adherents] rendered him aid, and set him at liberty from imprisonment. He came forth, and great numbers of the servants of his father and grandfather flocked around him. He assumed the Chatr [canopy of royalty], and became Sultān. The following are two lines from a poem composed on his escape from confinement, and his rise to dominion and power:

"The tidings reach'd Rai—'The Sultān is come!'
And that august canopy of his is to Hamadān come."

After Sultān Tughrīl had acquired supremacy over the territory of 'Irāk, and had reigned for a considerable period, a number of his servants despatched letters to Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Takīsh, Khwārazm Shāh, and invited him to come into that country. In accordance with that request, Sultān Takīsh invaded 'Irāk with a large army. When the two armies came into proximity with each other, one or two ingrate slaves acted treacherously towards Sultān Tughrīl, and came up behind his august back and martyred him.

At this period his other followers were engaged in front, at the head of a pass, fighting bravely, and did not become aware of this piece of treachery, until those treacherous ingrates brought the august head of their sovereign to Sultān Takīsh, Khwārazm Shāh, who despatched it to that staunch and steadfast band of Tughrīl's followers.

Sanjar, and had been left, after his father's death, very young [in years]. The sons of the Atā-bak Iladd-giz, who was a slave of Sanjar's, having acquired power over 'Irāk, because his [sic] father was ruler of 'Irāk; [and], when he died, they imprisoned Sultān Tughrīl in one of the fortresses of 'Irāk, took his mother to wife [sic], and possessed themselves of the country." For a correct account of these matters see the following note, and note 7, page 169.

7 Jahān-Pahlawān, the Atā-bak, on the death of his half-brother [see under Atā-baks of Aṣarbājān and 'Irāk, page 171, and note 8] Arsalān Shāh, set up the latter's son, Tughrīl, as sovereign of 'Irāk, who was then seven years old. While his maternal uncle, Jahān-Pahlawān, lived, Tughrīl's affairs prospered; and he reigned in some splendour. Jahān-Pahlawān, however, died in 582 H., and Ḵazīl-Arsalān, his full brother, desired to take his place as Atā-bak to Tughrīl. The latter, being impatient of restraint, would not brook it, and, accordingly enmity arose between them. For further particulars respecting Tughrīl and Ḵazīl-Arsalān, see note 8, page 171, and note 8 page 172.
When they found what had happened, they declared that they would not cease fighting and using the sword, until he, Sultān Takhish, should deliver up to them the murderers of their sovereign, whereupon they would yield to him. Sultān Takhish complied, and delivered up the murderers, whom they sent to the infernal regions. Then, taking along with them the head of Sultān Tughrīl, they proceeded to the presence of Sultān Takish, and submitted to him. He took the head in his arms, and, along with them, performed the customary mourning [for the deceased]; and Sultān Takish, Khwārazm Shāh, took possession of 'Irāk.

Tughrīl's death occurred in the following manner:—Takhish of Khwārazm, having invaded 'Irāk at the instigation of Kutlagh Īnānaj, encountered Tughrīl's forces within three farsakhhs of Rai, where Tughrīl had pitched his camp. According to several authors Tughrīl and Kutlagh Īnānaj were engaged hand to hand, when Tughrīl struck his own horse a blow with his mace, which was intended for his opponent, and the horse fell with him, and Tughrīl was slain by Kutlagh Īnānaj. I prefer, however, the circumstantial account of Yāfā', who says that whilst Tughrīl was leading his troops in a charge, his horse stumbled, and Tughrīl was thrown to the ground. At this moment Kutlagh Īnānaj reached the spot, and desired to give Tughrīl a finishing blow, and slay him before he was recognized. This he accomplished, and the body was then placed upon a camel and taken to the presence of Takish, "who, on seeing his enemy in this condition, knelt down and gave thanks to the Almighty for the mercy vouchsafed to him." His head was sent, as an insult, to the Khalīfah at Baghdād, and his body was exposed upon a gibbet in the bāzār of Rai, on Thursday, the 29th of Rabi' ul-Awwal, 590 h. Thus ended the first dynasty of the Saljūks, who ruled over Khurāsān and 'Irāk for a period of 161 years. This account of Tughrīl and his death is widely different from our author's. The Khalīfah was hostile to Takish. See under his reign, Section XVI.

Our author does not give any account of the Saljūk dynasty of Shām, or of that which ruled so long in Kirmān.