SECTION XIV.

THE MALIKS OF SIJISTĀN AND NĪMROZ.

As this Ṭabaḵāt ¹ is being written in the name of the great Sultān, the king of kings [over] both Turk and 'Ajām, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Muẓaffar, Maḥmūd, son of Sultān I-yal-timīsh—May his sovereignty endure!—and, as an account of all rulers and their Ṭabaḵāt is being penned, the author, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, Jūrjānī, would state that he desires, to the extent of his capability, to commit to writing what has come to his hearing, and what he has himself seen respecting the Malikṣ of Nimroz.

They were able and just monarchs, virtuous, and cherishers of the indigent, whose country, from the Sanjarī era up to this time, when the territories of Irān have, through the cruelty and rapine of the infidels of Čhin, become ruined, was adorned by the grandeur, the justice, the munificence, and the nobility of mind of those monarchs, and, therefore, the author desires that he himself, and those Malikṣ, may continue to call forth the favourable mention of those under whose notice this [account] may come, and, that a benediction may be offered for the sovereign of the present time.

The origin and lineage of these rulers from the previous Amīrs, did not seem clearly deducible in History².

¹ The word Ṭabaḵāt being a portion of the title of the original work, it has been used here, for convenience, in the singular form, although really the plural of Ṭabaḵāt.

² As in scores of other places, author is also very incorrect here. He has already given us a Section on the Suffārāns of Sijistān or Nīmroz, and has mentioned the names of the other sons of Laṅg, the Brazier; but he does not appear to have known that the descendants of 'Umro, son of Laṅg, subsequent to his captivity, ruled over Fārs [for a time] and Sijistān, although these events took place some three centuries before our author composed his work. There is consequently an hiatus of the reigns and struggles of no less than six princes of this family, and the events of just one century are entirely passed over; and two Sections are given, and two dynasties made, of one and the same family, whatever claims Khalāf may have had to descent from the Kai-
I. TĀHIR, SON OF MUḤAMMAD.

Trustworthy persons have related, that, when the dominion and sovereignty of the Maḥmūdī dynasty passed

Our author appears here to greater disadvantage, as an historian, than even in his accounts of the Saljūqs and the Kurds, which are sufficiently incorrect.

I will here briefly supply an account of the Ṣuṭṭāfīnān, passed over by our author, in order to make the subject intelligible to the reader.

When 'Umro, son of Laīq, was defeated under the walls of Balkh by Ḫisāfī, Sāmānī, in 287 H., as related at page 25, his grandson, TĀHIR, son of Muḥammad, son of 'Umro, was set up as his successor. His career was a chequered one. He at first possessed himself of Fārs, and drove out the Khālfah's officers, but was subsequently obliged to relinquish it. Subsequently, however, the administration of the affairs of Fārs was conferred upon him by the Court of Baghadād; but, shortly after, a slave of his grandfather's rose against him, in that territory.

[In nearly every history in which this slave is referred to, his name is said to be Saikr, Sabkr, Sankr, and the like; but further research, since note 6, page 34, was written, tends to show that this could not have been intended for the name of the slave, but of his race. He was a Sigiz, one of a people often mentioned in the following pages. "Sigiz, and Sigizāf, is the name of a lofty mountain [range of hills?] in Zabulistan, and the people dwelling thereabout are called after that mountain, Sigizāls and Sigizānān. Rustam-i-Zāl is also called Sigizā on the same account. Some consider, however, that the meaning of Sigizā is Sītānān, because the 'Arabs change the r into j, and call Sītān, which is the proper name of that country, Sījistān, and Sigizā, by the same fashion, Sījizā."

The Sigizās are not Afghāns, so must not be turned into Paṣānān, but there is a small tribe of that people called Sekar.] A battle took place between Tāhir and the Sigiz slave, and Tāhir was worsted, and fell into the hands of the rebel, who sent him, together with his brother Ya'kūb, to Baghadād, through which city they were paraded on a camel [one author says on two elephants]. This happened in the year 293 H., and Tāhir died after having ruled for a period of six years. Some say he died in 296 H.

On this, in the same year, Laīs, son of 'Alī, entered Fārs [from Sījistān], and the rebel Sigiz slave fled; but, being supported by an army sent by the Khālfah under his general, Mūnis-i-Khādīm, he was enabled to march against Laīq. Although Laīq made a gallant and vigorous dash upon their forces near Ujān, he was unsuccessful, and fell a captive into their hands, and the Sigiz again acquired possession of Fārs. Soon after, however, the Khālfah had to despatch Mūnis into Fārs again, as the Sigizī withheld the revenue [the Khālfah's share], which amounted to 400,000 dirams. The Sigizī now offered to pay 1,000,000 dirams, but this offer was not accepted, and, after several encounters with Muḥammad, son of Ja'far, the Khālfah's general, the Sigizī fled to the fortress of Bamm, in Kirmān; but, as he was followed by that officer, he fled from Bamm, and retired into the wilds of Khurṣān; and Muḥammad was entrusted with the administration of the affairs of Fārs and Kirmān.
over to the family of Saljūk, the nobles who were exercising authority in the country of Sijistān acquired power, and,

In that same year, Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad, Sāmānī, took possession of Sijistān, and, as he had succeeded in making prisoner of Muḥammad, son of 'Alī, brother of Yaʿqūb, 'Ummr, and Muʿaddil, sons of Lāʾī, and the Sīdīr also, they were despatched to Baghādād, by the Khālijhah’s directions, and entered it paraded on elephants; and rich presents were sent by the Khālijhah to the Sāmānī prince, in return for this service.

In 299 H. [some say in 298 H.], Lāʾī, son of ‘Alī, died in Fārs, and his brother, Muʿaddil, assumed the sovereignty over Sijistān, and drove out the Sāmānī governor, Abū Ṣāliḥ-i-Manṣūr, Sāmānī, cousin of Amīr Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad, on which, the latter despatched a large army under some of his greatest nobles, such as Ḥusain ‘Alī, Marw-ar-Rūdī, Aḥmad, son of Sahl, Muḥammad, son of Mūṣṭafār, Sīmūr-i-Dawātī, &c. Muʿaddil, on becoming apprized of this, sent his brother Muḥammad for supplies, to enable him to stand a siege, into Zamīn-i-Dāwār; but, as he happened to fall into the hands of the Sāmānī forces, Muʿaddil, on receipt of the news of this disaster, came and surrendered on terms to those leaders, and was taken to Bukhārā, from whence he was sent to Baghādād. See page 34.

In the year 300 H., 'UMRū, son of Yaʿqūb, son of Muḥammad, son of 'Ummr, son of Lāʾī-i-Sūfār, rose in Sijistān, and assumed the sovereignty. Amīr Abū Naṣr-i-Aḥmad, Sāmānī, again despatched a force under Ḥusain 'Alī, Marw-ar-Rūdī, against him. After defending the capital for a period of nine months, 'Ummr surrendered on terms of capitulation, and the territory of Nīmroz received a Sāmānī governor.

In the year 309 H., AḤMAD, said by Guzīdah to have been the grandson of Tāhir, but by others to have been the son of Muḥammad, son of Khaḷaf, son of Abū Jaʿfar, son of Lāʾī [which Lāʾī is not mentioned, but, if the Brazier be meant, Abū Jaʿfar must have been a Bāẓan son, but no doubt he was a grandson], who was living in great distress and misery at Hīrāt, chanced to come under the notice of Amīr Abū-i-Ḥasan-i-Naṣr, son of Aḥmad, the fifth of the Sāmānī rulers, who bestowed upon Aḥmad-i-Sūfār the government of his native country, Sijistān.

Fāṣīḥ-i, among the occurrences of the year 310 H., says, that by command of the Khālijhah, Al-Muqtadhir, honorary dresses were bestowed upon Tāhir and Yaʿqūb, sons of 'Ummr, Lāʾī; but this must refer to Lāʾī, son of 'Alī, son of Lāʾī the Brazier, as Tāhir, son of 'Ummr, the second of the dynasty, died at Baghādād many years previous to this. In 311 H., according to Fāṣīḥ-i, Shāh Malik, son of Yaʿqūb-i-Lāʾī, Sūfārī, with a body of Sīgīzās, attempted to gain possession of Hīrāt, but after a time left, and proceeded to Fūghānī. He returned to the Daḵt of Mālān of Hīrāt again, and invested Hīrāt for four months, but had to abandon it, and he and his party retired discomfited. Sīmūr held Hīrāt on that occasion.

Aḥmad was succeeded as ruler of Sijistān by his son, KHAĻAF, but the date of the former’s death or the latter’s accession is not mentioned—it was probably in 331 H. — but, in 353 H., Khaḷaf set out on a pilgrimage to Makkah, leaving as his deputy, his son-in-law, Tāhir, son of Al-Ḥusain, to administer the government of Sijistān. Tāhir coveted his dominions, and, when Khaḷaf returned from the pilgrimage, he would not allow him to resume his authority. Khaḷaf proceeded to the Court of Manṣūr, son of Nūḥ, Sāmānī, the eighth of that dynasty, who sent a force with Khaḷaf, which, after ousting Tāhir and reinstating Khaḷaf, returned to Bukhārā.
having tendered their allegiance to the Sulṭāns, Alb-Arsalān and Malik Shāh, the states of Nimroz came under their sway, and they took possession of those territories.

Tahir now returned, and again dispossessed Khalaf, who, a second time, received aid from Maşür, Sāmān; but, by the time the Sāmān forces reached Sīstān, Tahir was dead, and Ḫusain, his son, had succeeded to the authority. After considerable fighting, Ḫusain retired to one of the fortresses of that territory, and was therein invested. He despatched an envoy to Amīr Maşür’s presence, who sent a mandate directing him to appear before him, and so Ḫusain was allowed to proceed to Bukhārā. This was at a period when the Sāmān power was much weakened, and in the same year that İs-hāk, son of Alb-Tiğin, the Turk, encountered Abū-İlfi-Lawīk, previously ruler of Ghaznīn.

Nothing more is mentioned about Khalaf except his rebellion against Nūḥ, Sāmān, and the seven years’ investment of his capital, until the year 390 H., in which year, Būghrājaḵ, the uncle of Maḥmūd of Ghaznīn, was slain by Khalaf’s son, Tahir, at Fūshānji. On this, Maḥmūd marched against Khalaf, who retired for shelter within the walls of the fortress of Tāḵ, and he was invested therein. In 393 H., Khalaf again withdrew from public life, and gave up the government of Sīstān to his son Tahir, but, soon after, he regretted what he had done, resumed the authority, and put his son Tahir to death. Some say he put two sons, Tahir and ’Umro, to death with his own hand. This ruined Khalaf’s affairs, and his nobles rose against him on account of this abominable conduct; and they invested him in the city which he had made his capital, and read the Khujbah, and coined money in the name of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghaznīn.

Maḥmūd, on account of this last act of Khalaf, again entered Sīstān, and Khalaf was defeated and retired once more to the fortress of Tāḵ, but it was taken by assault and Khalaf was captured. It was on this occasion that Khalaf, when brought before Maḥmūd, addressed him by the name of “Sulṭān” [see note 8, page 76], and his life was spared. The district of Jūzjān was assigned for his future residence, and, with his family and dependents, he left Sīstān for ever and proceeded thither. Sīstān was conferred by Maḥmūd upon his brother Naṣr, and that territory continued for a considerable time in the possession of the Ghaznawīs.

In 398 H. Khalaf was found to have been intrigueing against Maḥmūd with I-lak Khān, ruler of Turkistān, and was, in consequence, confined within the walls of the fortress of Juzdez. He died in the following year; and Maḥmūd directed that his property and effects should be made over to his son, Abū-İl-Hīfṣ. Khalaf was a learned and intelligent man, and, by his command, the learned men of his time compiled a commentary on the Kurān in one hundred volumes, and at the expense of 100,000 dhūnars; yet, with all this, he committed the cruel act of slaying his own sons. See also note 8, p. 76.

The sovereignty of Sīstān, or Nimroz, having been taken from Khalaf, remained in the possession of the kings of Ghaznīn for a considerable time. At length, by the support of the Sulṭāns, Alb-Arsalān, and Malik Shāh, a great grandson of Khalaf, ŠAH IR, son of Muḥammad, son of Tahir, son of Khalaf, obtained the government of his native country; and the ruler’s palace in Sīstān is called the Sarāc-I-Tābir after him. This is the first of the rulers of Nimroz by our author’s account, but the sixth of chroniclers of authority, after Ya’kūb and ’Umro, the founders of the Suffārān dynasty. A few authors
When the throne of sovereignty became adorned by the phoenix-like splendour of Sanjar, the territories of Nimroz passed to Amir Tahir; and, in the service of that monarch, he gave proofs of his loyalty and good faith. The Saræi-Tahirî, or Tahirî Palace, in Sistân, which was the seat of government, was founded by him. He instituted regulations and precepts of government, brought under his control the different districts and dependencies of the country of Nimroz, reigned for a considerable time, and died. These Maliks claimed descent from the race of Kâ'üs. May the Almighty reward them!

Trustworthy persons have related that Sijistân is called Nimroz for the reason that, in ancient times, the whole of that tract was a sea; and, when Mihtar Sulimân, reclining on the couch which the winds used to bear, had to pass over that country on his way from Fârs to the mountains of Sulimân, which are opposite Multân, he commanded that that sea should be filled with sand. The Dîws, in the space of half a day, completed the task, and the sea became dry land; and the name by which it was called was Nim-ruz, signifying mid-day, and that designation continued to be applied to that country. God alone is eternal, and His kingdom only is eternal, without intermission and without wane.

II. MALIK TAJ-UD-DÎN, ABÛ-L-FATH 4, SON OF TÀHIR.

Taj-ud-Dîn was a great and a just monarch, and, when his father departed this life, in conformity with the mandate of Sulṭân Sanjar, Saljûkî, he assumed authority over the territory of Nimroz, and brought it under his sway. He spread the carpet of justice, and the people became obedient to his authority; and, both in the city and round about Sijistân, numerous monuments of his goodness remained.

mention that some writers consider Khalaf to have been a descendant of the ancient kings of Irân.

See the short account of the descent of the Afghâns in the Introduction to my Afghân Grammar, last edition, page 7, respecting Mihtar Sulimân and the Sulmân mountains.

4 Styled Taj-ud-Dîn, Abû-l-Faśl-i-Nâşr, son of Tahir, by others. He succeeded to the sovereignty in 480 H. He was just, valiant, and beneficent; and was loyal to the utmost degree towards Sulṭân Sanjar.
He accompanied Sultān Sanjar in the campaign against Khiṭā, and took along with him the troops of Sijistān; and, when Sultān Sanjar’s army was defeated, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Fath, was taken prisoner. When they had taken him to the place where the camp of the Khiṭā-is was situated, his feet were confined in a pair of wooden stocks and secured with a heavy chain, and he was kept in imprisonment.

A number of trustworthy persons have related, that one of the ladies of the Great Khān [of Khiṭā] got a sight of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, and, secretly, used to entertain great affection for him, and to have all his wants, and even more, liberally supplied, and have great care and attention paid to him. That lady left not the least thing undone, or a moment to be lost, until, by her endeavours also, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn was suddenly set at liberty, and was enabled to fly from the camp of the Khiṭā-is; and he brought back his chain and the stocks along with him to Sistān.

The territory of Nimrooz, which, during his captivity, had been deprived of his comeliness and munificence, now began to acquire fresh grace and elegance. The stocks and chain, which he had brought away with him [when he escaped], were, by his orders, hung up in the most sacred place in the great mosque [where the Imām stands during the prayers]; and Minhāj-i-Sarāj, the writer of this Tabākāt, in the year 613 H., arrived in the city of Sistān, and, in

---

* This battle having taken place in 534 H. [some say in 536 H.], and Tāj-ud-Dīn being above a hundred when he died in 559 H., he must have been about eighty years of age when taken prisoner.

* “Trustworthy persons” are constantly mentioned by our author, but it is strange that they are nameless.

* I have constantly noticed, in several authors, that, when mentioning the country, the names Nimroz and Sijistān are applied; and that Sistān almost invariably signifies the city, the capital of the country; but I have also noticed that the latter name is sometimes, but not often, applied to the country also. There is one rather astonishing thing, however. Our author invariably says the city of Sistān was the capital; while travellers, such as Pottinger and Christie, and other European authors also, say that Dooghak, or Jalālabād, is the capital. “Who shall decide when doctors disagree?” The author of the Masālik wa Mamālik, who visited it before our author wrote, says that Zaranj is the capital, and that there is no city in the territory of Nimroz so large; and, further, describes the buildings and gates and other matters in such manner, that there can be no doubt whatever but that Zaranj was the name of the capital of Sijistān, or Nimroz; and no such city as Sistān is ever mentioned in that work.
the great mosque there, saw that chain and stocks; and whoever may have reached that great city, will also have seen them.

Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Fath, was a learned and enlightened sovereign; and they relate that, sometimes, he would himself read the Friday's Khuṭbah; and this fact is an indication of the extent of his wisdom and knowledge.

He reigned for a considerable time, and died; and his mausolēum is at Sīstān.

III. MALIK-US-SĀ'ĪS, SHAMS-UD-DĪN MUḤAMMAD, SON OF TĀJ-UD-DĪN.

When Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Fath, passed away, several sons survived him, and the eldest of them was Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad. He succeeded to the sovereignty, and brought the territory of Nimroz under his sway. He deprived one of his brothers, ʿĪzz-ul-Mulūk, of his sight, and put the rest of them to death; and he caused a great number of the Amīrs and Malik of Nimroz and Sīstān to be executed.

He was a sanguinary man, and it is related of him, that, at the outset of his reign, he killed eighteen of his brothers in one day. The royal palace, which he founded in Sīstān, is [on this account] called by the name of Sarāe-i-Slāsatī, or Palace of Slaughter; and, through his excessive murders and executions, the people's hearts became filled with terror.

At the time when the reign of Sūlṭān Sanjār came to a termination, and the territories of Khurāsān, Ghaznīn, and Kirmān fell into the hands of the tyrannical tribe of Ghuzz, Malik Shams-ud-Dīn had already established his authority over Nimroz. On several occasions the Ghuzz forces resolved to subvert his rule, but they did not succeed in their design.

The grandfather of the author of this work, Maulanā

* He died in 559 H., after having reigned over Nimroz, subordinate to the Saljūk Sūlṭāns, for just eighty years, and his age was above a hundred. It seems strange our author did not know the year of his death.

* Torturer, executioner.

1 It was with this ruler that Muʾīzz-ud-Dīn, Ghūrī, the conqueror of Hindūstān, passed one cold season, after he and his brother, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, had been released from confinement.
Minhāj-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, Jurjānī, who was on his way to Ghaznī and Lohor, on his return from the pilgrimage to Ḥijāz and the sacred Kā'bah [at Makkah], reached Sistān during the reign of Malik Shams-ud-Dīn. At that time there was residing there one of the great theologians, whom they called Imām Awhād-ud-Dīn, Bukhārī, one of the most eminent men of Khurāsân. He was also one of the incomparable ones of the world, and one of the colleagues of the Khwājah—a second Imām Nu'mān—Abūl-Faṣl, Kirmānī. There was likewise there another man of learning, who went by the name of Imām, Kawām-ud-Dīn, Zawzanī, a talkative, open-mouthed, staring-eyed fellow, who was in the constant habit of annoying Imām Awhād-ud-Dīn, and of behaving insolently towards him in public.

Imām Sharaf-ud-Dīn, 'Aṭṭār, related this anecdote, which was told to him, respecting this man: that, when Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn arrived at Sistān, it was customary with the rulers of Nīmroz to treat strange Ulamā with respect and kindness; and they used to command them to deliver a discourse, and expound some religious dogma, in their presence, at the Court. Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, accordingly, commanded that Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn should expound a dogma at the Court.

The Ulamā of that city having presented themselves there, Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn expounded the dogma of defiling emissions. When the exposition was concluded, Kawām-ud-Dīn, Zawzanī, wishing, by his insolence, to annoy and mortify Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn, and to clash with him, said:—“We had heard great report of thy eminence, of thy learning and thy reputation; but this much was incumbent on thee, that, in the presence of such a great monarch, thou shouldst not have mentioned the precept of defiling emissions.” When Maulānā Minhāj-ud-Dīn perceived that he intended insolence and rudeness, he replied, saying:—“Maulānā Kawām-ud-Dīn, it is not necessary to make a long story of it; thou art filthiness itself. I beheld thee, and that precept came to my recollection.”

At this rejoinder, Maulānā Kawām-ud-Dīn was com-

---

2 The celebrated Imām, Abū Ḥanīfah of Kūfah, was called Nu’mān.
3 Emissions in sleep, &c., requiring ablution afterwards.
pletely silenced, and Malik Shams-ud-Din was so overcome with laughing, that he rolled over and over, almost beside himself, on his couch. That day Imam Awkād-ud-Din was made himself again by this rejoinder of Maulana Minhaj-ud-Din, who also gave état to that dogma likewise; and that monarch showed abundant kindness and consideration towards Maulana Minhaj-ud-Din.

Malik Shams-ud-Din reigned for a considerable time, and was put to death, and passed away.

IV. MALIK-US-SA‘ID, TAJ-UD-DIN-I-ladesh, SON OF MUHAMMAD.

Malik Tāj-ud-Din was a great, learned, and just sovereign, and a cherisher of his subjects. He had a number of children, and, during his lifetime, two of his sons succeeded to the throne of Nimroz, as will, please God, be hereafter mentioned.

The first incidents in his career were these. When Malik Shams-ud-Din, his uncle, came to the throne, he deprived his Tāj-ud-Din’s, father of his sight, and put the rest of his brothers to death. Malik Shams-ud-Din had a sister, who was aunt to Malik Tāj-ud-Din-i-endar, who possessed great influence; and, when the tyranny and oppression of Shams-ud-Din became unbearable, the people became quite sated of his rule, and prayed the Almighty to grant them redress.

A party of the nobles and chief men of the country of Nimroz sought the aid and assistance of that Malikah, the aunt of Malik Tāj-ud-Din-i-endar; and they held counsel

---

4 A couch or sort of throne or seat spread with four cushions.
6 Our author, who has a peculiar way of his own for relating important events, says this ruler was martyred. He was such a blood-shedder and tyrant that his troops rose against him, attached themselves to his sister, and put him to death. Our author relates it among the events of the following reign instead of here.
6 Styled Tāj-ud-Din, Ḥasan, son of ʾIzz-ul-Muluk by Faqih, and Malik Tāj-ud-Din-i-endar, son of ʾIzz-ul-Muluk, by others. Why he and some others are styled Ḥarab [in the very old MS. I have previously referred to the vowel points are given], and what the real signification of the word may be, it is difficult to tell; but some of the Mughal officers—not Mughals probably—are designated by this same appellation.
7 How could they possibly “attain the throne during his lifetime,” unless they previously dethroned him?
together, and made arrangements for a change [of rulers], and fixed upon Malik Tāj-ud-Din by general consent. At that time he was sixty years of age, and none else remained of the descendants of the Malikis who was eligible for the sovereignty.

There is a place, outside the city of Sistān, where, in ancient times, there was an old city, which place they call Ḥaşhnū." At night, all the populace of Sistān and the soldiery assembled there, and, in the morning they rose against Malik Shams-ud-Din, and put him to death with eighteen of his sons; and Malik Tāj-ud-Din-i-Ḥarab was raised to the throne. His father, ʿIzz-ul-Mulūk, was still living, but deprived of the blessing of sight.

When Malik Tāj-ud-Din ascended the throne, he governed the people with equity and justice, and all submitted to his authority. He entered into communication with the Sultāns of Ghūr and Khurāsān, and became feudatory to them, and read the Khūṭbāh in the name of the Sultāns of Ghūr. He used his utmost endeavours in the support and encouragement of ecclesiastics and learned men, and in securing the rights of the weak and helpless; and it was a rule with that family to show great honour and respect to strangers and travellers. Malik Tāj-ud-Din, in this respect, greatly surpassed his ancestors. He commanded, likewise, that for every mosque of Bukhārā a prayer-carpet should be woven, according to the size of each, and despatched to that city; and for the sacred mosque at Makkah, and the holy Kaʿbah, he despatched carpets, mats, and the like, as well as vessels of different kinds, in great quantity.

During the reign of Malik Tāj-ud-Din, the father of the author of this volume, Maulānā Sarāj-ud-Din-i-Mināj

---

6 Rather doubtful, as the MSS. are all at variance here. Some have Hashū, others Khushūdī and Hushūdī, some Hašū and Ḥašhnū. I do not find either of these names in the ancient accounts of Sijistān.

9 Therefore he was precluded from the succession.

1 The coin also was stamped with the titles and name of the Sultān of Ghūr.

2 It must have been in this reign, not during that of the Blood-Shedder, that our author’s grandfather met with such a good reception at the capital of Sijistān, as blood-thirsty tyrants are not generally those who patronize priests and learned men. This seems confirmed by the author’s own remarks a little farther on.

3 Sometimes he writes Mināj-i-Sarāj, and at others Sarāj-i-Mināj.
came to Sīstān on two occasions. The first time, he went there on a mission from the august Sultān, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām; and on the second occasion, when he was proceeding from the presence of that monarch to present himself at the Court of the Khalīsfāh, Un-Nāṣir-ud-Dīn 'Ullah, by way of Mukrān, he likewise passed by way of Sīstān, and received great kindness and benevolence at the hands of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab.

During his own lifetime, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn made his eldest son, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, his heir-apparent; and, subsequently, when Nāṣir-ud-Dīn died, he nominated another son, Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, as his heir and successor.

Towards the end of his reign, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn became totally blind. He had reigned for a period of sixty years, and his age was a hundred and twenty. He died in the year 612 H.

V. MALIK NĀṢIR-UD-DĪN, 'UṢMĀN-I-ḤARAB, SON OF MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN.

Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn was a just monarch, and 'Āyishah Khātūn, the daughter of the Malik of Khurāsān, 'Umru-i-Maraqhani, was married to him. He had good and worthy sons; and, upon several occasions, he marched from Sīstān with numerous forces, and joined the Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, in Khurāsān. At the time of the success at Nishāpūr, he was present with that monarch's Court.

He was a Malik of good disposition, and the patron of learned men, and passed his life among men in (the exercise of) justice, beneficence, and humanity.

During the reign of his father, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, he acted as his representative and lieutenant, in the adminis-

---

4 See page 244. This was the occasion when the author's father, whilst proceeding by way of Mukrān to Baghdād, lost his life.
5 He died during his father's lifetime; consequently, he is not entitled to be considered as one of the sovereigns of Sījistān, and he is not accounted such by other writers. He was a regent or lieutenant only; and, on account of the extreme age of his father, at his [Nāṣir's] death, his son, Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, became regent.
6 His suzerain. See account of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn in Section XVII.
ration of the government of the territory of Nimroz; and, outside the city of Sistān, on the bank of the river Hirmand, he founded a large and noble palace.

He ruled the country for a considerable period, and likewise died during his father's lifetime.

VI. MALIK UL-GHĀZĪ, YAMĪN-UD-DĀULAH WA UD-DĪN BAHRĀM SHĀH, SON7 OF TĀJ-UD-DĪN-I-ḤARĀB.

Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, was a firm and stern ruler, very severe but strictly just; and he continued to observe the rule established by his ancestors, of treating learned men and strangers and travellers with respect and reverence.

During the lifetime of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, his father, he became greatly distinguished, and was famous for his valour, sagacity, activity, and magnanimity. He ruled over the territory of Nimroz for a considerable time during the lifetime of his father; and, when his father died, the sovereignty passed to him.

Both Bahrām himself and two other brothers were borne by a Turkish slave-girl; and, previous to his time, all the sovereigns and nobles, according to ancient custom, allowed their hair to hang loosely, and used to wear conical caps on their heads, with two or three fillets wound round them, with a black fillet over the others; but, when Malik Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, came to the throne, his mother being of the Turkish race, he assumed the cap of sable, and camlet garments, and curling ringlets like the Turks; and both his brothers, one, Malik Shīhāb-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, and the other, Malik Shāh, likewise adopted similar costume.

The author of this work, in the year 613 H., set out from the city of Bust for the purpose of proceeding to Sistān. When he arrived within a short distance of that capital, where there is a place which they call by the name of Gumbaz-i-Balūch—the Cupola of the Balūch8—on the east side [of Sistān], at this place, a deputation received him, and

7 The grandson, not the son of Tāj-ud-Dīn. Bahrām Shāh was the son of Naṣir-ud-Dīn. See note 8, preceding page.
8 One copy has Balūj, but the rest have Balūj and Balūch. The place is not mentioned in the ancient accounts of the country. Balūj means an oak.
brought him to the city; and\(^9\) there, at a place which is named the Madrasah-i-sar-i-Ḥawz— the College at the head of the Reservoir—to the south of the city, which they call Dar-i-Ṭa'ām\(^1\) and Bāzār-i-Farod, he alighted and took up his quarters\(^2\).

The author delivered a discourse in the private audience hall of that dignified sovereign, within the Sarāe-i-Sīāsat; and, upon two occasions, he was honoured with robes of distinction from that beneficent monarch, consisting, each time, of three dresses; and, as long as the author remained at Sīstān, every month, Malik Yāmn-ud-Dīn sent him a liberal allowance in money and grain, and treated him with the utmost kindness and respect. After sojourning there for a period of seven months, the author returned again to Khorāsān.

Malik Yāmn-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, ruled with great firmness and sagacity. It had been a practice of old, in the territory of Nimroz, among the tribes [therein], to be constantly quarrelling and fighting among themselves; and no person entered a city or town without being fully armed. When the sovereignty devolved upon Bahram Shāh, he made every tribe give hostages, and kept them shut up in different fortresses, so that, in whatever tribe blood might be shed unjustly, the chiefs and head men of the tribe were held responsible for the crime. Through this stringent order such acts of bloodshed decreased.

Yāmn-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, on two occasions waged holy war against the heretics of Kūhistān\(^3\), and carried on hostilities against them for a long time. Imām Sharaf-ud-Dīn, Aḥmad\(^4\) of Farāh, who was the most eloquent man of his time, composed these lines on those successes, and in praise of them:—

---

\(^9\) One or two copies omit the "and."

\(^1\) See page 20, and note 3.

\(^3\) The places noticed here were at Zaranj, and their mention proves the statements of the author of the Masālik wa Mamālik to be correct. See also note 7, p. 188.

\(^4\) The chief place of which is Khirān, formerly of considerable importance. He led troops against those heretics upon several occasions.

\(^4\) Several other authors, and among them the author of the Nusakh-i-Jahān-Ārā, say, that Abū Naṣr, Farāhī, was the composer of these lines. He was the author of the celebrated lexicographical work entitled "Niṣāb-i-Niṣābīn."
"August and suspicious unto the world's people
Is the revered countenance of the Shāh of exalted descent.
At this warfare, which thou didst in Kuhistān wage,
The globe is with justice, with equity, and requital, full.
Thou art the king of mid-day ⁶, and of thy day's reign
'Tis as yet but the propitious early dawn thereof.
Like as the warriors of Muḥammad exult in thee,
In such wise the soul of Muḥammad in thee rejoiceth.
Continue in the world whilst the world hath freshness
From water and from fire, from earth and from air.
From the remembrance of the great king will not be obliterated
The encomiums of the Farāh-ī, if aught of memory remain ⁶."

After Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, had reigned for a considerable time, the calamities attending the irruption of the infidel Mughals arose, and Khorāsān became desolated by them, and the kingdoms of Islām fell.

There is a fortress on the confines of Neh, in the territory of Nimroz, which they call the castle of Shāhanshāhī; and the nephew of Bahrām Shāh, the son of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, had sold the fortress of Shāhanshāhī to the heretics of Kuhistān, and it was in their possession. Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, at this time, despatched an agent to demand the restoration of that fortress, and further, to intimate that, in case any difficulty should arise, a force would be speedily brought against it.

On this account, disciples were nominated by the heretics of Kuhistān to remove him; and, in the year 618 H., on a Friday, when proceeding on his way to the mosque to perform his devotions, in the middle of the bāzār, four fidā'īs, or disciples, surrounded him and martyred him.

VII. MALIK NUṢRAT-UD-DĪN, SON OF MALIK YAMĪN-UD-DĪN, BAHRĀM SHĀH.

On the death of Malik Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, the great nobles and chief men of Nimroz agreed together and raised to the throne Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, the middle son of the late ruler. This caused agitation and commotion to

---

⁵ A play upon the word Nimroz, signifying mid-day. See p. 187.
⁶ Like all translated poetry, these lines, which are fine enough in the original, lose by translation, and the play upon words is generally lost. Two copies of the text contain one distich more, but the second line is precisely the same as the sixth line above, and therefore it must be an interpolation, or the first line has been lost.
arise in the country of Nîmroz, and, in every direction, disorder and confusion occurred.

The eldest son of Bahrām Shāh, named Rukn-ud-Dīn, was detained in confinement⁷ [as a state prisoner]. The orthodox people of both parties were all partisans, well-wishers, and under allegiance to Amīr Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, while the whole of the heretics of the districts of Nîmroz were friendly towards, and submissive to Rukn-ud-Dīn⁸. After some months had passed away from the accession of Amīr Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, the heretics broke out into rebellion and brought forth Rukn-ud-Dīn; and, between Amīr Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn and his brother, Rukn-ud-Dīn, an encounter ensued, in which Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn was defeated, and he retired into Khurāsān and Ghūr.

He returned a second time to Sīstān, and liberated the country from the hands of Rukn-ud-Dīn; but, at last, as a body of troops of the infidels of Chīn and Mughals⁹ advanced against Sīstān, it fell into the hands of those infidels, and Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn obtained martyrdom, and died¹⁰

VIII. MALIK RUKN-UD-DĪN, MAḤMŪD, SON OF YAMĪN-UD-DĪN, BAHRĀM SHĀH.

Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, was a prince harsh, sanguinary, and cruel. The author of this work saw him, during the lifetime of his father, in attendance upon that sovereign. Rukn-ud-Dīn was a person of middle height, ruddy, and fair; and his mother was a Rūmī slave-girl. During the lifetime of his father he had been guilty of several perverse and contumacious acts; and his father, Malik Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, on two occasions, had imprisoned him on account of his misdeeds.

Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, sent a mandate from Khwārazm to Bahrām Shāh, requesting him to despatch a force from Nîmroz to join him. In conformity

---

⁷ Rukn-ud-Dīn had been kept in confinement by his father, and was still imprisoned when his brother succeeded, for reasons afterwards explained. He soon after made his escape.

⁸ This accounts partly for his being kept imprisoned in his father's reign.

⁹ Șīk in MSS., and this difference between Mughals and infidels of Chīn often occurs in the text.

¹⁰ Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn was slain early in the Mughal troubles by those infidels.
with this command, Malik Yamin-ud-Din, Bahrám Shāh, nominated his son, Rukn-ud-Din, Maḥmūd, to proceed with this army, and despatched it towards the confines of Khurāsān along with the applicant for assistance, who had come from Khwārazm Shāh, to the presence of that Sultān [Bahrām Shāh].

When he had reached the limits of Fūshanj, and arrived near Hirāt, Malik Rukn-ud-Din, while engaged in a drinking bout, slew the applicant in question, who was a Turk of distinction, and, out of fear for what he had done, returned towards Sīstān again. Malik Yamin-ud-Din, Bahrām Shāh, on account of this misconduct, put him in durance, and despatched a numerous force under Amir Shams-ud-Din, together with presents of silks and fine linen, and numerous expressions of obligation, with many apologies, to the presence of Khwārazm Shāh.

In that same year the calamities caused by the infidel Mughals happened, and those troops of Nimrooz were ordered to the [frontier] fortress of Tirmiz. Chingiz Khān, the Accursed, advanced with his forces against it in person, and took Tirmiz; and the whole of the troops of Nimrooz were martyred therein.

When Malik Rukn-ud-Din, after overcoming his brother, assumed the sovereignty over Sīstān, he began to tyrannize, and stretched out the hand of violence and oppression; upon which, at the solicitations of the inhabitants of Sīstān, his brother, Amir Nuṣrat, returned from Khurāsān, and between the brothers contention again ensued.

At this crisis an army of Mughals unexpectedly reached Sīstān, and the whole were either slaughtered, exterminated, made captive, or martyred. The city of Sīstān became desolate, and its inhabitants obtained martyrdom.

IX. MALIK SHĪHĀB-UD-DĪN, MAḤMŪD, SON OF ḤARAB.

When the army of infidels, after having reduced it to desolation, turned their backs upon Sīstān, Malik Shīhāb-

---

8 Sometimes spelt Tarman, but incorrectly.
9 Chingiz and also Čingiz. The word is spelt both ways; the latter appears to be the most correct.
4 Killed in battle with the Mughals, or slaughtered afterwards.
4 He is said to have been the son of Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, brother
ud-Din, who had kept in concealment, came forth and took possession of Sistān; but, as it was in a very ruinous state, and no inhabitants remained, he did not acquire much strength or power.

A party of heretics gathered together in some force, and besought Shāh 'Uṣmān, the grandson of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān⁶, Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab, to come from the city of Neh, and occupy Sistān. He called in the aid of a force of Khwārazm-Shāhī troops, from the Malik of Kirmān, whom they styled Burāk, the Ḥājib [chamberlain]. When that body of troops, from Kirmān, joined Shāh 'Uṣmān and came to Sistān, Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, was martyred, and his brother, Amīr 'Alī-i-Zāhid⁷ [a recluse, a holy man], ascended the throne. Still the government did not acquire stability, and he died.

X. MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN, BINĀL-TĪGIN⁸, KHWĀRAZMĪ.

Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin, was of the same family as the Maliks [sovereigns] of Khwārazm, and was a son of one of the maternal uncles of Sultān, Khwārazm Shāh⁹; and, at the period that the Sultāns of Ghūr took Nīshāpūr¹, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin, with his cousin, Malik Fīruz-i-I-yal-timish, came into Hindūstān.

At the time of the irruption of the infidels of Ghīn, and consequent calamities, this Tāj-ud-Dīn was in the service of Bahrām Shāh. In some copies of the text he is styled son of Ḥarb, and simply Maḥmūd-i-Ḥarab in others.

⁶ See page 196.
⁷ Neither of these persons is mentioned in Jahān-Ārā as ruler in Sijistān, but Bināl-Tīgin is. Raṣūlat-ūs-Ṣafā, copying from our author, of course mentions the two first, but not the last. Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, encountered Shāh 'Uṣmān and Bināl-Tīgin, and was slain in battle; but Fāṣīh-Ī, under the events of the year 646 H., mentions a Malik 'Alī, ruler of Nīmroz, having been put to death by Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Kurt.
⁸ Nīfāl-Tīgin, in some copies and in some other works, is totally incorrect. The name, as above, is corroborated by other writers; and, in the old copy of the text, the vowel points are also given. It appears to be an error of copyists writing شل for شل.
⁹ Which is not said. Some copies have Sultāns. Raṣūlat-ūs-Ṣafā says Sultān Muḥammad. He certainly was of the same tribe as the Khwārazm Shāhī rulers.
¹ See under reign of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Ghūrī, Section XVII.
of Malik Karīm-ud-Dīn, Ḥamzah, at Nāg-awr² of Siwālikh. All at once he sought an opportunity, slew Khwājah Najīb-ud-Dīn; and an elephant, which was there, he sent on in advance³, and then set out towards Uchchah⁴, and joined Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kūbājah⁵. When Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mangabar, Khwārazm Shāh, reached the territory of Sind, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgīn, left Uchchah and went and joined Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn. He accompanied him into the territory of Kirmān; and, in that country, the district of Khūk and Lūk⁶ was entrusted to his charge.

As the rival Maliks of Nimroz were struggling against each other, the grandson of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, whom they styled by the name of Shāh, sought assistance from the Malik⁷ of Kirmān, who was the chamberlain, Burāk, Khīṭāt⁸. He despatched Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgīn, to Neh, to his aid, in the year 622 H., and, when he reached that place, he rendered him assistance, and assumed the authority himself, and took possession of the territory and city of Neh on his own account⁹.

A body of people from the city of Sistān presented themselves before him, and sought his help and assistance, saying that, as they had killed¹⁰ Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn, and

² The proper mode of spelling this word, on the authority of the Shams-ul-Lughat and others, is Nāg-awr; and Siwālikh is said to have been the name applied to the territory. Karīm-ud-Dīn was the governor of the province.

³ This sentence is the same in all the copies of the text on which dependence can be placed. He slew Karīm-ud-Dīn, and carried off a number of horses and several elephants.

⁴ Written ʿUchchah, and at times ʿUchchah, according to native authorities; but which English writers have turned into Uch and Ooch.

⁵ See Section XX., the third ruler.

⁶ In the majority of copies these words are thus written, but in some copies they are Jūk and Kūk, Jūk and Lūk, and Hūk and Kurk or Kark, and Khūk and Kūk. These places are not mentioned in Masālik wa Mamālik. The Guruk of modern maps probably.

⁷ Styled Burāk Khān in one or two copies of the text. He was the brother of Tāniko of Tarāz, the Awtir-ul-Umā of Gūr Khān, who was defeated in battle and taken prisoner by Sulṭān Muhammad, Khwārazm Shāh. See under the tenth sovereign, Section XVI.

⁸ All the copies of the text, with two exceptions, say he did render assistance to Shāh 'Uṣmān; but the only assistance he appears to have afforded was in joining Shāh 'Uṣmān to overcome his rival, Shāh Maṭmūd; and, after the latter's defeat and death, Bināl-Tīgīn showed no further regard or respect to 'Uṣmān, but took possession of the country for himself.

⁹ See note 7, p. 199.
Sistān remained without a ruler, he should take Shāh 'Uṣmān to Sistān and set him up there. Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin, accordingly moved to Sistān, took possession of the city, and brought the territory of Nimroz under his own sway.

At this juncture, Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, of Khāesār of Ghūr, despatched this, his dependent, Minhāj-i-Saraj, from Ghūr, on a mission to Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin. The author found him at the city of Farāq, in Dāwarī, and waited on him; and a firm compact was concluded.

After returning from thence, and reaching Ghūr again, between Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn and the Mulāhidah heretics hostility arose, and an engagement ensued between them, and he was defeated. After this, he returned to Sistān again, and overthrew a body of Khāriji schismatics who had revolted against him.

In the year 623 H., the author of this work was despatched a second time, and he proceeded again to his presence; and, after that, Tāj-ud-Dīn came himself into Ghūr, and took possession of the fortresses of Tūlāk and Isfīrār; and, in this same year, after his return from Nimroz, the author had occasion to undertake a journey into Hind.

In the year 625 H., an army of Mughals advanced into the territory of Nimroz a second time; and Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin, was invested within the walls of the fortress of Arg of Sistān. For a period of nineteen months he

---

1 This journey is again referred to by our author towards the end of his work, under the heading "Downfall of the Mulāhidahs," Section XXIII.; and this place is again mentioned, but is there written in two different ways—Khāesār and Khaisār.

2 This word is used in all the copies of the text, with one exception, which has  دارعي [dārū or dārū-]. This can scarcely refer to the district of Dāwar [not Dāwarī], which lies more to the east. In the Mashālik wa Mamālik the  وادي [wādī is a valley, low-lying ground, &c.] of Farāq is mentioned; but this is an Arabic term, not a proper name. The "compact" here referred to could not have been very "firm," as may be seen from a more detailed account of these journeys of the author, under the head of "Downfall of the Mulāhidahs," towards the end of the Section above mentioned.

3 The author contradicts himself, not an unusual thing, in the Section referred to in the previous note, which see.

4 The Būrān-i-Kūt-i says, one of the meanings of the word Arg is "a citadel," but that it is also the name of a fortress in the territory, not the city, of Sistān. See note 6, p. 34, and the account of the investment of Sistān [as our author calls it] by the Mughals in Section XXIII., where the situation of this fortress is mentioned.
defended the place; and the whole of his followers with him in that stronghold, consisting of Ghūris, Tūlakīs, Sigizīs†, and Turks, all perished. Tāj-ud-Dīn himself received an arrow in one of his eyes, and he straightway fell from the battlements to the ground, and became a captive to the Mughals.

The fortress was taken, and the remainder of the people within the walls were martyred; and Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīgin, was brought from Sistān to the fortress of Șafīhed Koh‡, and at the foot of the walls of that castle they martyred him. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

† See fourth paragraph to note §, pp. 183-4.
‡ Also called Sūfīed-Koh. Our author was once detained within the walls of his fortress by Bināl-Tīgin.