SECTION XV.

THE KURDIAH MALIKS OF SHÂM.

MINHĀJ-I-SARĀJ, Jūrjānī, the humblest of the servants of the threshold of the Most High, begs to mention, that, as an account of the Malikṣ of the East and West, both infidel and of the true faith, has been detailed and recorded, to the best of his ability and power, and a small portion, in a condensed form, has also been related from the annals of the Malikṣ of 'Ajam and the East, this work has been embellished [!] with a description of the Malikṣ of Shām, Miṣr, Ḥijāz, and Yaman, who were Sulṭāns in Islām, and Malikṣ and warriors of the true faith, of great renown, and who, subsequent to the Sanjarī and Saljuḳi dynasties, held sway over those countries. He has done so in order that the readers of this Ṭabaḳāt, when these pages come under their observation, may remember the author with a pious benediction, and the Sulṭān of the Musalmāns with a prayer for the stability and permanency of his sovereignty and dominion, and the increase of his conscientiousness and beneficence.

I. SULṬĀN NŪR-UD-DĪN, MAḤMŪD-I-ZANGĪ₁.

Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Zangī, was one of the Atā-baks of Mauṣil; and the Atā-baks of Mauṣil were

₁ Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn was not the first of this dynasty, neither was he a Kurīd, nor one of the Atā-baks of Mauṣil, but, by our author's own account, "the descendant of a Turk of Ḫiṭā;" and yet he places him at the head of the dynasty which he calls the Kurdiš Malikṣ of Shām! In this Section, above all the others in his work, and that is saying a good deal, he has greatly exposed his ignorance; and appears to have concocted, out of his own fertile imagination, the greater part of what he has here adduced, beyond what he heard of the rulers of Mauṣil and Shām from a fugitive at Lakhnautī, in Bengal, who called himself one of their descendants.

The first of this dynasty was ABŪ SAĪD-I-ĀḴ-SANḴUR [turned into ASCANSAR by Gibbon], son of 'Abd-ullāh, styled the Ḥājīb, and Ibn-i-
descendants of slaves of Sultan Sanjar; and this bondman of Sanjar, who was the first Malik of Mauzil, was a Turk of Khita.

This relation the author heard, in the city of Lakhnauti, from one of the descendants of that family, and the son of one of the Lords of Mauzil himself. In the country of Hindustan, and at the capital, Dhihi, he was known as the Khudawand-Zadah of Mauzil. He was of the same progenitors as the august Sultan, Shams-ud-Dunyā wā ud-Din [Iyal-timish].

Hājib, according to some. In 478 H., the year before Sanjar was born, Tāj-ud-Daulah, Abū Sa'ūd, surnamed Tutiṭ, son of Alb-Arsala[n, the Saljuḳ, gained possession of Halab and its dependencies. Aḳ-Sanḳur, who was one of his brother's slaves, in whom he placed great dependence, he made his Deputy there. Tāj-ud-Daulah-i-Tutiṭ at this time resided at Damashq. Aḳ-Sanḳur became disaffected, and Tutiṭ marched against him; and, in a battle which took place between them, near Halab, in 487 H., Aḳ-Sanḳur was slain.

He was succeeded by his son, 'IMĀD-UD-DIN, ZANGI, who had previously held the government of Bagdad under Sultan Maḥmūd, son of Muḥammad, son of Malik Shāh, Saljuḳ; but, in 521 H. [some say 522 H.], through the efforts of the Khalfah of Bagdad, Mustarshīd, 'Imād-ud-Dīn, Zangī, was appointed to the government of 'Irāḳ-i-'Arab, the capital of which was Mauzil—so called from being situated between 'Irāḳ and the Jazīrah [Mesopotamia], and derived from the 'Arabic جزيرة—and Sultan Maḥmūd sent two of his sons, Alb-Arsalān and Fārūkh Shāh, to Zangī to be brought up; hence he was styled Atā-bak or Preceptor. In the same year he took Halab, and, in 523 H., the fortress of Himār, in Kūrdistan, which he razed, and erected a fortress in place of it, which he named after himself, and it is still known as 'Imādīsh. He acquired sway over the greater part of Shām, Dīyar-i-Bakr, the Jazīrīr, and Mauzil. Zangī was slain while besieging the fortress of Jābar. He was killed, some say, by his own slaves, in Mūharram [Yaḥī' says in Rabi'-ul-Ṭahir], 541 H. We now come to Nūr-ud-Dīn, whom our author places as first of the Kurdish sovereigns of Shām.

On the death of Zangī, his two sons, Sa'd-ud-Dīn-i-Ghāzī, and .ABU-I- KASIM, NŪR-UD-DĪN, MAḤMŪD, styled AL-MALIK-UL-'ĀDIL [the Just Malik], divided their father's dominions among them. The former took Mauzil and its dependencies, and the latter Shām and its dependencies. Nūr-ud-Dīn proceeded to Halab, and began to extend his authority. In 549 H. he gained possession of Damashq, and his power and dominions were greatly extended. He also gained possession of Himār, Hāmah, Manbij, Ba'albāḳ, and other fortresses in the territory of Rūm, and numerous strongholds in the country of the Farangs [the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem], more than fifty in number in all. He sent the Amir, Asad-ud-Dīn, Shek-i-Koh, on three different occasions into Mīṣr; and, on the third occasion, Šalāh-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf, became the Deputy of Nūr-ud-Dīn in that country. See under Šalāh-ud-Dīn, p. 214.

The word used is سال م another signification of which, but not applicable here I think, is the affinity between two men who have married two sisters.

And so the first—the Turk of Khita—is here made "a Kurd," while his
This Khudāwand-Zādah stated to the author, that the whole of his ancestors were descendants of a slave of Sanjar Shāh; and, that he himself was the eighth in descent from that Turk of Khiṭā previously mentioned.

In short, Sūltān Nūr-ud-Dīn, who was Malik of Shām, was a just and conscientious monarch, and did a great deal of good. He undertook many expeditions against the infidels, and engaged in many conflicts with them. A number of Maliks [chieftains], Kurds, Turks, 'Ajamīs, and 'Arabs were in his service.

Sūltān Nūr-ud-Dīn left numerous marks of his goodness behind him in the territory of Shām⁴, and reigned for very many years⁵.

At the time of his death he left one son, named 'Alī, who succeeded him.

II. MALIK-UṢ-ṢĀLIḤ, 'ALĪ⁶, SON OF MAḤMŪD-I-ZANGĪ.

Malik-uṣ-Ṣāliḥ, 'Alī, ascended the throne of Shām at the city of Damashḵ; and the great nobles and chieftains paid brother Turk—the slave king of Dihlī—is turned into "a Paṭān," i.e. an Afghān, by Dow and his copyists.

⁴ Nūr-ud-Dīn reigned for a considerable time in great grandeur and glory, and the laudable course of his life, and his conduct towards his people, were such that he was accounted, by them, as one of the saints; and it is said, that prayers, offered up before his tomb, are effectual. He founded a great hospital at Damashḵ, and a university or college, and died in the month of Shawwāl, 569 H., but some say in 568 H., when leading an army towards Miṣr against Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, who had become disaffected. Ibn-i Khalkān says he died in the citadel of Damashḵ.

⁵ His descendant, apparently, did not know how long his ancestor reigned.

⁶ Nūr-ud-Dīn does not appear to have had any son called 'Alī; but certain it is that he was not succeeded by one of that name, as our author states, but by his son ISMĀ'ĪL, entitled MALIK-UṢ-ṢĀLIḤ, then a mere child, being only in his eleventh year. Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, at first, read the Khutbah for him, and coined the money in his name, as he had done for his father previously; but in 570 H., the year after his accession, when in his twelfth year, Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, taking advantage of his extreme youth, brought an army before Damashḵ, and seized upon it and the greater part of Shām, leaving nothing to his benefactor's son but the city of Ḥalab and its environs, to which place Malik-uṣ-Ṣāliḥ retired. He dwelt there till 577 H., when he died in his nineteenth year, much regretted by the people for his virtues; and, with him, this branch terminated.

If this account be compared with our author's, the absurdity and incorrectness of his statements will be sufficiently apparent, more particularly those contained in the last paragraph of his account of them. Of the Atā-baks of Muṣīl and several other dynasties, he gives no account.
allegiance and submission to him; and the districts around Shām, and Ḥalab, and Diyār-i-Bakr, came under his sway.

When intimation of the decease of Sultān Nūr-ud-Dīn reached Miṣr—and at this time the sovereignty of Miṣr had passed to Sultān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, Yusuf—as he owed a heavy debt of gratitude for favours conferred, Sultān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn determined to proceed from Miṣr to the presence of Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ, pay his obeisance to him, and perform the forms of condolence, and congratulate Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ on his succession to the dominion of Shām, and then return again.

He set out from Miṣr [accordingly] with a body of troops and conducted it to Shām⁷; and, as soon as he reached the frontier of that territory, information of his arrival was brought to Damāshq. The heart of Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ was filled with affright and consternation, and he asked advice of everybody as to what he ought to do. There was a servant of Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ, who had also been an old follower of his father, Sultān Nūr-ud-Dīn, who was named Aymin, and he said to Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ:—"It is advisable, when Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn comes, to turn your face towards Ḥalab and proceed thither, and relinquish Damāshq and Shām to him, since fear of him has taken root in people's hearts.

---

⁷ A novel mode of expressing his gratitude. A traitor in Damāshq, who had been gained over by Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, gave out that Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn was coming merely to adjust the affairs of the child. Our author either forgets to allude to, or did not know of, the hostilities that took place between Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn and Saif-ud-Dīn-i-Ghāzi, the latter of whom sent his troops to aid his brother Ḥizz-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd [they were sons of Maudūd, sons of Zangī, cousins of Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ], who advanced to Ḥalab, and, taking his cousin Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ and the latter's troops with him, marched to give battle to Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn. The latter offered peace, which Ḥizz-ud-Dīn refused; and, in Ramadān of 570 H., a battle took place near Ḥamah, in which Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn was victorious. After this, Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ entered into terms with him for Ḥalab and some other places. Further hostilities took place between Saif-ud-Dīn-i-Ghāzi, supported by his brother, and—but I might fill a volume by merely naming our author's misstatements, and other important matters which he has left out, without giving any details of the facts. He omits nothing that is childish and ridiculous; the ball, for example, overshadowing the sun [p. 215], the rings for the Christian captives [p. 321], and such like nonsense: it is the important events only that he eschews. Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn subsequently endeavoured further to "express his gratitude," by attempting, in 571 H., to gain possession of Ḥalab. He remained a long time before it, without being able to take it. At last, a daughter of the late Sultān Nūr-ud-Dīn was made over to him, and, for her sake, he left Malik-uş-Ṣāliḥ unmolested.
He has great resources and a large army, and he is able to reduce the territories under his sway. He is likewise legitimately born, and has a well-disposed mind, and will respect your rights and the gratitude he owes to your father. If you should enter into hostilities with him, you have neither the means nor the power to oppose nor to resist him." The opinion of Malik-uş-Şâlih was in accord with this fact; and he left Damashk, and retired to Ḥalab, and consigned the territory of Shām into the hands of Šalâh-ud-Dîn.

Malik-uş-Şâlih passed the remainder of his lifetime at Ḥalab; and Šalâh-ud-Dîn served him in all honour and reverence, guarded his rights, and, in the observance of the laws of good faith, and the fulfilment of his engagements, he failed neither to observe nor to neglect the most minute thing.

III. MALIK AIYÜB, SON OF SHĀDI*.

This Malik Aiyüb, son of Shādi, and his brother, Malik Asad-ud-Dîn, were two brothers, and sons of one of the

* The correct titles and name of Šalâh-ud-Dîn's father were Malik-ul-Afsal, Najm-ud-Dîn, Abū-Laşhkar-i-Aiyüb.

Shādi, their father, son of Mardān, was born in a village of Āzarbâjân, and belonged to a Kurdish tribe, which he left and proceeded to Baghâdâd, with his two sons, Asad-ud-Dîn, Sher-i-Koh, and Najm-ud-Dîn, Aiyüb. The sons entered the service of Bahrûz, the prefect of Baghâdâd, and were entrusted by him with the charge of the fortress of Takrît, and there Shādi died. His tomb was still to be seen there when Yâfa'i wrote; and within the walls of that stronghold Šalâh-ud-Dîn was born. The brothers continued there for a considerable period; and, at the time when Īmâd-ud-Dîn, Žangî, in 526 H., came to the aid of Sulṭân Mas'ûd, Saljûq, and his brother Saljûq Shâh, and his Atâ-bak, Karâjah, the cup-bearer, were routed, Žangî passed the Tigris near the fort of Takrit, by means of boats provided by the brothers. Subsequently, Asad-ud-Dîn having slain a person, they had to leave the fortress of Takrit, and they proceeded to Mausil, and presented themselves at the Court of Žangî. He received them with great favour, and bestowed feis upon each of them.

Subsequently, when Žangî was assassinated, and his son, Saif-ud-Dîn-i-Ghâṣf, succeeded him as ruler over Mausil, Najm-ud-Dîn-i-Aiyüb, who had been assigned the territory of Ba'âlbaḳ by Žangî, finding Saif-ud-Dîn-i-Ghâṣf unable to protect him, had to give it up, and went and entered the service of the then ruler of Damashk, named Majf-ud-Dîn, Artûk [Artûk], who gave him a feis. Asad-ud-Dîn, Sher-i-Koh, Aiyüb's brother, went to Ḥalab and took service under Nûr-ud-Dîn, Maḥmûd, Saif-ud-Dîn's brother, who had seen the honour with which he had been treated in his father's time, and he raised Asad-ud-Dîn to the highest position among his nobles; and, at the
Kurdish chieftains in the territory of Shām; and they passed a number of years in the service of Sultan Nūr-ud-Dīn. They performed great deeds, and on the confines of Maghrab and of Shām, with numerous forces, they waged holy war, and fought engagements against unbelievers.

When Malik Aiyūb, son of Shādī, departed this life, he left four sons behind him: first, Malik Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf; second, Malik 'Adil-i-Abū-Bikr; third, Shāhanshāh; and fourth, Saiīf-ul-Islām⁹: and Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, son of Shādī, as before stated, was the brother of Malik Aiyūb¹.

When the latter died, his sons were in the service of their uncle, Malik Asad-ud-Dīn; and the first person among them [sic in MSS.] who became sovereign of Mīṣr was this same Asad-ud-Dīn; and the first one who acquired sovereignty in Shām was Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf, son of Aiyūb, as will, please God, be hereafter recorded ².

IV. MALIK ASAD-UD-DĪN ³, SON OF SHĀDĪ, IN MĪṢR.

Trustworthy persons have related after this manner: that a body of Maghrabī 'Alawīs laid claim to the Khilāfah⁴, taking of Damāshq, Asad-ud-Dīn, Sher-i-Koh, and Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, were in Nūr-ud-Dīn's service; and the former held the government of Ḥimṣ.

⁹ Abū Lašḫar-i-Aiyūb had six renowned sons, the titles and names of whom, according to the years of their birth, are as follow:—1. Amīr-Nūr-ud-Daulah, Šāhān-Šāhāh. 2. Malik-ul-Muẓamm, Šāhama-ud-Daulah, Türān Shāh. 3. Malik-ul-Nāṣir, Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf. 4. Malik-ul-’Ādil, Saiīf-ud-Dīn [Daulah], Abū Bikr, Muṣammad. 5. Malik-ul-’Azīz, Zāhīr-ud-Dīn, Abū Farās-i-Tuḡa-Tīgīn, Saiīf-ul-Islām. 6. Tāj-ul-Mulk, Majd-ud-Dīn— the least in years, the greatest in learning and accomplishments.

¹ Any one reading this would imagine that Aiyūb had been an independent ruler in Shām, and one of the dynasty, and that he had died before Asad-ud-Dīn, and before Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn rose to power; but neither of these is the fact. Aiyūb merely held Ba’albak of Zangī and another fief under his son. See note ⁸, page 215.

² Here is another specimen of an author who "narrates his facts in a plain, straightforward manner, which induces a confidence in the sincerity of his statements, and the accuracy of his knowledge." He begins this Section with an account of the Kurdish rulers of Shām and Mīṣr, the two first of whom were Turks, and the third never reigned at all; while he himself states, subsequently, that the fourth was the first Kurd that ruled in Mīṣr, and the fifth, the first Kurdish ruler of Shām ¹.

³ His correct name and titles are Abū-l-Ḥārīṣ, Sher-i-Koh [the Lion of the Mountains], Asad-ud-Dīn, surnamed Al-Malik-ul-Maṇṣūr.

⁴ Nearly three hundred years before Nūr-ud-Dīn despatched Asad-ud-
and brought an army from Maghrib into Misr, and wrested it out of the hands of the governors and nobles of the 'Abbāsi Khalifahs.

The chief of them was named Al-Muntaṣir⁸; and some theologians regard them as Karāmiṭahs. The territory of Misr had continued in the possession of his descendants up to the period that an army of Afranj set out towards Misr, and plundered and sacked the country. The 'Alawīs of Misr had not the power to resist them, nor to drive out that host of infidels; so they solicited aid from Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn of Shām. He nominated Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, son of Shādi, to proceed into Misr, and expel the Afranj infidels from that country⁹.

Dīn into Misr, viz. in 296 H.: In 351 H. they removed from the territory styled Maghrib, and took up their abode in the former country.

⁸ Abū-Ṭamīm-i Sa'd, Al-Mustanṣir B'illah, was the eighth of the Ismā'īlīs or Fāṣimītes. They had been in Egypt, and had founded Kāhirah upwards of sixty years before Al-Mustanṣir succeeded to the Khilāfat. All the copies of the text have "Muntaṣir."

⁹ Our author's statements here are totally incorrect. Asad-ud-Dīn, Sher-i-Koh, was despatched into Misr—or more correctly Diyar-i-Misraḥ, for Misr is the name of the ancient capital of Egypt, and Yāfa'I and others make this distinction—upon three different occasions. The first occasion was in this wise: Shā'ūr, the Wazīr of Misr, who held the chief power, for the Ismā'īlīs Khalifahs appear to have possessed little authority, had been ousted from office by a powerful rival, Zir-ghām by name, who obtained the chief authority, and put Shā'ūr's son, Ta'e, to death. On this, Shā'ūr came to the presence of Nūr-ud-Dīn to solicit his aid in restoring him to power; and, in Ramāzān, 558 H. [according to some in 559 H.], Nūr-ud-Dīn despatched a numerous army into Misraḥ for the purpose, under Asad-ud-Dīn, Sher-i-Koh, and Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, his nephew, accompanied him.

The objects of Nūr-ud-Dīn, in sending this expedition, were twofold. One was to aid Shā'ūr, and the second was his desire to know the exact state of the affairs of that country, as he had been informed that there was really no ruler in it, and that it might be easily annexed. Asad was therefore selected to command, as Nūr-ud-Dīn had implicit confidence in him. He accordingly entered the Misraḥi territory in Jamād-ul-Āakhir, 559 H. [some say in 558 H.], and Zir-ghām was put to death, his head placed on a spear, and his body left to the dogs and jackals; but his remains were subsequently buried. Shā'ūr again assumed the Wazīr-ship, but, finding the presence of Asad and his army irksome, and fearing treachery on Asad's part, he sought an alliance with the Farangs [Latin Christians of Jerusalem] to counteract it. Asad in consequence was unable to hold his own in the Misraḥi territory, and he accordingly retired into Shām again and returned to Damascus, and entered it in Ṣa-Hijjah, 559 H. [some say in 558 H.] Asad-ud-Dīn's thoughts, however, were concentrated on Misraḥ, and he was constantly pondering the subject. Shā'ūr, becoming aware of his ambition and covetous designs, entered into a treaty with the Farungs to aid him, in case of need, against the ruler of Shām.

On the news of these negotiations reaching the ears of Nūr-ud-Dīn and
Malik Asad-ud-Din preferred a request to the Sultan that he would appoint Salah-ud-Din, Yusuf, his nephew, to accompany him on the expedition. This was granted; and Malik Asad-ud-Din, along with Salah-ud-Din, set out from Sham towards Misr.

When they reached the frontier of that country, the infidel Asranj, having gained information of the arrival of the troops of Sham, reined in the bridle of their audacity, and they halted in that part of the country which they had then reached.

The troops of Sham entered the territory of Misr, and acquired predominance over it; and, as they possessed great power and magnificence, the 'Alawis of Misr became timid of them, and repented of ever having sought their assistance, as they were not sufficiently strong to hinder them [the Shamsis] from the usurpation of power and authority over the country.

The Sayyid, who filled the masnad of the Khilafat in Misr, had a Wazir, who bore the name of Shaur, and he summoned him privily, and commanded that he should write a letter, secretly, to the infidel Farangs, and tell them "neither we nor our troops will render any help to the Shamsis, and we will not send them sufficient succour. It behoveth you to advance upon them: put forth your strength, and drive them out of this country, and all the

Asad, they consulted together, and the former, fearing lest the Farangs might gain a footing in Misrah, and thereby acquire dominion over the whole of the parts adjacent, determined to despatch Asad with a large army against Shaur, which commenced its march in Rabul-Awwal, 562 H., and Salah-ud-Din attended him, being in his service.

Shaur, on this movement, called in the Farangs; and, with those allies, encountered Asad and his forces in several engagements, but without decisive advantage on either side. Nur-ud-Din now created a diversion by sending a force against the Farangi territory, and succeeded in taking Montreal [Mamrut]. The news of this having reached Almeric [Emir], king of Jerusalem, an accommodation was entered into by the contending parties, under the agreement that not a man of either the Shamsis or Farangs should remain in the Misrah territory, and that both armies should retire into their respective countries.

Asad-ud-Din, Sher-i-Kolt, in 564 H., again advanced into the Misrah territory, accompanied by his nephew, Salah-ud-Din, and a large army, and sought to subdue it. Salah-ud-Din succeeded in getting possession of Iskandarh, but Shaur invested him therein with the forces of Misr, and Asad had to evacuate Salid and march to his succour. At last a peace was come to, and Asad and Salah-ud-Din returned to Sham again. For an account of the third expedition see note 1, page 312.
spoil taken from them shall be yours." In short, the Miṣris sought, by such like treachery, to betray the army of Shām into the hands of the troops of the infidels of Rūm and the Farangs.

In accordance with the solicitation contained in the letter referred to, the Farang infidels advanced upon the forces of Shām to give them battle, and drive them out of Miṣr. The army of the infidel Farangs amounted to 80,000 men, and that of Shām numbered 700 horse.

When the two armies came into contact with each other and the conflict and struggle began, the troops of Shām, on account of the smallness of their numbers, were unable to withstand their opponents; and, as a matter of necessity, they were discomfited, and fled, fighting, from the gate of Miṣr until they reached a place which is called Talbīs. This place had a fortified wall all round it, and a citadel; and, in it, they sought shelter, and they shut themselves up within the walls. The troops of the infidel Farangs completely surrounded it, pitched their camp, and commenced their preparations for taking the place.

When the Shāmī forces perceived the extreme danger they were in, and that they were completely invested, besides the treachery of the 'Alawīs of Miṣr, they all, of one accord, deliberated together, and discussed a plan of escape. Malik Asad-ud-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn told them, saying: "The plan of saving yourselves consists in staking your lives; in victory or death." They all, accordingly, agreed together; and, placing their hands within the open grasp of confidence, and with full trust in the Most High and Holy God, they, having quite resigned themselves to sacrifice sweet life if necessary, suddenly and unawares, issued from the place and commenced fighting the infidels, as by orthodox law prescribed: and heavenly succour came to their aid; and, according to the promise of Him who promised victory to

7 No troops whatever of the Greek empire were employed on the occasion; but, the fact is, our author was not acquainted with his subject at all, and has concocted much nonsense.
8 The words Afranj and Farang are often used here indiscriminately.
9 On the preceding page he says Asad-ud-Dīn's troops "acquired pre-eminence over the territory of Miṣr," and Shā'ūr had to call in the Christians to expel them, and immediately after tells this impudent falsehood. A very trustworthy writer certainly!
the true believers, He sent succour, and the army of the infidels was put to the rout, and the defenders of the truth gained the victory; and from that place to the gate of Miṣr, and in the vicinity, and in the parts round about,

1 The cause of the third expedition was that, in 564 H., the Farangs [King Almeric and the Hospitallers, A.D. 1168] invaded the Miṣrāfah territory, intending to seize it for themselves. They marched to Balbīs [the ancient Pelusium], took it, and put the inhabitants to the sword. Again Shā‘ūr sought aid from Nūr-ud-Dīn, who, fearing the Farangs and their designs, and possessing vast resources, sent a countless army [not 700 horse probably] thither under Asad-ud-Dīn, who, on this occasion, took with him his brethren [sic in MS.] and kinsmen, including Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn. The account of the advance of this host having been conveyed to the Farangs, they desisted from further operations, evacuated Balbīs, and retired from the country, pressed hard in their retreat by Nūr-ud-Dīn’s Turkmāns. The author, from whom I have been taking these extracts chiefly, says, “Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn told me himself that he [Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn] did not accompany his uncle of his own choice; and further, that Shā‘ūr used to promise to defray all the expenses of this expedition, undertaken on his account; but he did not fulfil his promises, and sometimes he would be with the Farangs, and at times he would be with the Amīr [Asad-ud-Dīn]. Fearing the perfidy and double-dealing of Shā‘ūr, Amīr Asad resolved to seize him; and, one day, when Shā‘ūr, attended with drums and trumpets and banners, as is the custom with the Wazirs of Miṣr, mounted and set out with a cavalcade to visit Asad-ud-Dīn, the latter also mounted and rode forth to receive him; but, when they met, he seized Shā‘ūr by the collar, and gave a sign to his own followers to secure him. This was done, and Shā‘ūr was detained as a prisoner in a tent. Shortly after, a body-servant arrived from the sovereign of Miṣrāfah [Abū Muḥammad-i-‘Abd-ullah, entitled ’Āṣid, the last of the Ismā‘īlīs of Egypt] signifying his desire that the head of Shā‘ūr should be sent to him. This was in accordance with the custom of the country, that any one who, by force, seized the Wazir’s person, and cut off his head and sent it to the ruler, should have the robe of Wazirship fortnightly brought to him; and, according to that custom, Asad cut off the head of Shā‘ūr [had it cut off] and sent it, and on the same day he assumed the robe of Wazirship, and the supreme direction of the affairs of the country.” This occurred 17th of Rabī‘-ul-Ākhir, 564 H.

Another account of the events ending in the death of Shā‘ūr, quoted in Yāfā‘ī, is not unworthy of a brief record here, and, in all probability, is the most correct. When Asad-ud-Dīn reached the Miṣrāfah territory, and entered Kāhirah on the 17th of Rabī‘-ul-Ākhir, 564 H., ’Āṣid-i-‘Abd-ullah, the last of the Ismā‘īlī Khalfāns, on the Friday following, came forth and held an interview with Asad, and had him arrayed in a dress of honour, and treated him with great distinction. Asad now requested Shā‘ūr to disburse the expenses incurred on his account, which he had agreed to defray; but Shā‘ūr delayed. Asad sent a person to him with a message, saying, “My troops, through want of their pay, are much incensed against you; therefore be careful.” Shā‘ūr evinced no fear, and resolved to invite Asad to an entertainment in order to seize his person. This design having come to Asad’s knowledge, Amīr ’Īṣa-ud-Dīn, one of Nūr-ud-Dīn’s nobles, and Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, agreed together to kill Shā‘ūr, and communicated the design to Asad, who forbade them to do so. Shā‘ūr, subsequently, in order to visit Asad, without any
they made heaps of the slain. Praise be unto God! May victory ever be theirs!

The troops of Islam having gained such a victory, at once appeared before the gate of Misr. The Wazir of Misr, who was named Shā-ur, performed the ceremonies of going to receive them; but, as soon as the sight of that victorious Sulṭān, Ṣalāh-ud-Dīn, fell upon him, he, in the presence of Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, with his own august hand, struck off with his sword the wretched head from that accursed one's body.

The whole of the people of Misr and the forces of Shām agreed together, with one accord, to raise Malik Asad-ud-Dīn to the sovereignty; and he became sovereign of Misr accordingly, and obtained the throne of that country.

The 'Alawīs of Misr, without molestation or impediment, were placed in seclusion, and the Khuṭbah was read for them in the same manner as before.

The news of this success was despatched to Shām; and the territory of Misr, together with its coasts and confines, was taken possession of by Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, who resided there for a considerable time; and he died.

Suspicion, came to the bank of the Nīl, where his [Asad's] tents were pitched to enable his followers to visit conveniently the tomb of Imām Shāfi'i. Amīr 'Izz-ud-Dīn and Ṣalāh-ud-Dīn, after they had received Shā-ur, as the usual salutation of "Peace be unto thee," &c., had passed—Asad was not present at the time—dragged him from his horse, upon which his followers fled. They then handcuffed him, and kept him a prisoner in one of the tents, but did not dare to put him to death without the permission of Nūr-ud-Dīn [Asad?]. In the meantime, 'Aṣīd, the Ismā'īlī, sent an order to put Shā-ur to death. [According to the custom before mentioned], on which his head was cut off [by two slaves of Nūr-ud-Dīn] and sent to 'Aṣīd on a spear. After this, 'Aṣīd summoned Asad-ud-Dīn to his presence, who went; and the Wazīr's robe was conferred upon him, with the title of Al-Malik-ul-Manṣūr, Amīr-ul-Juyūgh.

At this time this "victorious Sulṭān" was serving under his uncle, who was himself serving Nūr-ud-Dīn.

Asad-ud-Dīn was not raised to the sovereignty, and never occupied the throne of Misr. For the refutation of this absurd and untrue statement, see preceding note.

Asad did not enjoy his Wazīr-ship very long; for on the 22nd [some say 26th] of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir of the same year, two months and five days after he obtained it—a "considerable time" truly—he died suddenly at Kāhirah. He was first buried there, but subsequently, according to his last wishes, his remains were removed to Madīnah. The "Lion of the Mountains" left a son, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sher-i-Koh, entitled Al-Malik-ul-Kāhirah. When his father died, Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn of Shām, deprived him of the sief of
V. SULTÂN ŞALÂH-UD-DİN, YÛSUF, SON OF AİYÜB-AL-KURDİ.

Sultân Şalâh-ud-Din was a great and illustrious monarch, and he waged holy wars and undertook many religious expeditions; and the Kâisâr of Rûm and the infidel Farangs, he encountered in many conflicts. It was most probable, that in all his doings, and throughout the whole of his career, the sword of heavenly success and divine victory attended him. The territories of Shâm, Kudst [the Holy Land], Mîsîr, Hijâz, and Yaman, all came under his rule.

As the Most High God willed that, at this, the end of time, His true religion should be manifested, and that the empire of Islâm should be victorious, from every illustrious family He made choice of one sovereign, His servant, and, by means of the key of holy war waged by him, caused the gates of conquest of the countries of the infidels to be thrown open. In the same manner as in the countries of the East He distinguished Sultân Mu‘izz-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-Sâm, Shansabî [Shansabâni], Ghûrî, by great victories in the country of Hindûstân, as far as the boundaries of Chîn; in the territories of the West, and in the country of Shâm, He made Sultân Şalâh-ud-Dîn, Yûsuf, the Kurd, exalted by the conquests of the territories of Maghrib, and of the Afranj, so that great victories were achieved by him.

He brought back again the realm of Mîsîr from the hands

Hîmîş; but, when Şalâh-ud-Dîn, his cousin, gained possession of Shâm, he restored Hîmîş to him, and there he died in 581 H.

6 Şalâh-ud-Dîn had an elder brother named Malik-ul-Muṣṣam, Shams-ud-Daulah, Tûrân Shâh, and greatly esteemed by that Sultân. He employed him in an expedition into Yaman, and subsequently sent him into Nûbah [Nubia of Europeans], and he was afterwards placed in charge of Damašt. He died in Safar, 576 H., and was buried in the Madrasah in sight of Damašt, which he had himself founded.

7 Our author has been as unsuccessful in foretelling the end of the world, as some others, his successors, who pretend to know the secrets of futurity and the will of Providence.

6 It is somewhat new to find that Şalâh-ud-Dîn made conquests in Europe. He does not mean conquests in Palestine or the Greek empire, for he mentions them a little farther on. This is merely another of his audacious falsehoods. The words he uses are.
of the Miṣri 'Alawis, who were the chiefs and heads of the Bāṭīnah and Karāmiṭah heretics, under the sway of the Khalīfahs of the house of 'Abbās; and Kuds [the Holy City], 'Akkah [Acre], and a great portion of the territories of Rūm, and Filistīn, he liberated from the hands of the infidel Farangs.

The beginning of his career was this. When his father, Malik Aiyūb, son of Shādl, departed this life⁹, he was in the service of his uncle, Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, as has been already stated in what has been previously recorded, and used to be constant in his attendance at the Court of Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn. He had acquired great fame for his manhood, his activity, and his sagacity. He had also become an associate with Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn in the game of Chaugān, and playing at ball on the course¹.

One of the trustworthy has related after the following manner:—One day Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn was engaged with Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn in the game at ball, and the ball fell between him and the Sulṭān. By his strength and agility, Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, with one blow, bore away the ball from the Sulṭān in such a way, that, from the immense force with which his Chaugān struck it, the ball flew into the air so far that it became immersed in the light of the sun, and the shadow of it fell upon Nūr-ud-Dīn². When the Sulṭān noticed this circumstance, his heart became so overpowered with wrath, that he threw down his Chaugān in a rage and left the course. This circumstance filled Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn with fear and apprehension, and he began to conceal himself from

---

⁹ Here is another specimen of the false statements of our author, so "trustworthy." Asad died in 564 H., and Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn's father, Abū-Lashkar-i-Aiyūb, joined his son in Egypt in the following year, when Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn had succeeded to the Wazir-ship held previously by his uncle. Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn wished his father to accept the office, but Aiyūb refused, saying, "The Almighty hath chosen thee, my son, for this office, and consequently no one else is worthy of it." Aiyūb was killed from injuries sustained by a fall from his horse, which threw him when he was viewing Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn's troops file past before the Bāb-un-Naṣr [the Naṣr Gate] of Kāhirah, on an expedition against Karak, in Zi-Ḥijjah, 567 H., about three years after Asad's death. Aiyūb entered Kāhirah in Rajab, 565 H., and 'Aṣīd, the Ismā'īlī Khalīfah, in order to gratify Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, came forth to receive his father, whom he treated with great reverence and distinction.

¹ Sic in MSS.

² Our author must have been a very simple-minded man indeed if he believed this; but many of his statements are equally childish and absurd.
the Sultān's sight, and seldom used to present himself to the Sultān's observation.

The author heard from Khwājah Muzhir, a merchant, that, at the period in question, one night Sultān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn saw, in a dream, that he was in Miṣr, and that, at night, some people seized him, and took him away to the palace of the sovereign, and, having placed a tent-rope around his neck, they hung him up from the battlements of the palace. The terror which this produced awoke him from his sleep, and his apprehension became still greater than before, and he was constantly overwhelmed with anxiety. Unexpectedly, the envoy from the 'Alawīs of Miṣr arrived to solicit aid from Sultān Nūr-ud-Dīn, as has been related previously. The Sultān appointed Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn's uncle, Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, to proceed thither, and he solicited that his nephew, Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, should be allowed to accompany him.

The latter was so overcome with fear, caused by this dream, that he went to an interpreter of dreams, and related the dream to him. The interpreter said: —"May the sovereignty of Miṣr be propitious! Allow no anxiety to find a way into thy mind, for the Almighty God will make thee a great king." On the strength of that interpretation, with a buoyant heart and with expanded hope, he reached Miṣr, where all those circumstances happened to him and to his uncle, as already stated.

When his uncle died, the people of Miṣr and the troops of Shām were agreeable to his assuming the sovereignty, but he would not in any way assent to it. When the

3 These are the exact words of our author; but the story is related somewhat differently. "One night, before he had gone to Miṣr, he saw in a dream that a party of people, having put a tent-rope about his neck, drew him up to the battlements of the metropolis of Miṣr by the neck. When Asad-ud-Dīn was about to proceed into that country, he used to endeavour to persuade Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn to accompany him; but the latter, on account of this dream, which he kept secret, used to manifest great disinclination to accede. At length, having communicated the dream to an interpreter of dreams, he was told that it signified he should become ruler of that country, and after this he was quite willing to go."

4 Another of our author's absurdities or wilful perversions of facts. After the death of Asad-ud-Dīn, his nephew, Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn, was chosen Wazīr, from among several candidates, by the Ismā'īlī Khālfah, 'Āṣīd, as he considered Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn rather weak in intellect, and less to be feared than the others, in which he greatly deceived himself. Instead of seizing people's
importunity of people, however, exceeded all bounds, Sultan Salah-ud-Din commanded, saying:—"I will comply
property and effects, Salah-ud-Din began to appropriate their hearts, by
making them his own; and he likewise resolved to lead a new life, and
renounced wine and women, riotous living and amusements, and other vicious
practices. Having obtained the direction of the affairs of the country, Salah-
ud-Din issued commands to read the Khutbah for Nur-ud-Din; and the latter
addressed him in all his communications as the Amr-i-Sipah-salar [Asid
having previously given him the title of Malik-un-Nasir]. As Salah-ud-Din
acquired the attachment of the people, 'Asid lost it; and he now sent for his
brothers, who were in the service of Nur-ud-Din, who would not allow them to
go, mentioning, as his reason, his fear lest either of them should become hostile to
his brother Salah-ud-Din, but the truth was Nur-ud-Din suspected his motives.
However, when Nur-ud-Din subsequently despatched his troops to operate
against the Farangs, who had invaded the Mughal territory, he entrusted
Salah-ud-Din's elder brother, Shams-ud-Daulah, Turan Shiah, with a com-
mand in that army, but with orders that he was not to consider Yusuf [Salah-
ud-Din] as his younger brother, but as the lord of Misr, and his [Nur-ud-
Din's] lieutenant and representative; and this order Turan Shiah agreed to
obey.

Ibn Asir says, that, when Salah-ud-Din had become firmly established, Nur-
ud-Din sent to command him to give up reading the Khutbah, for 'Asid, and
to read it for the 'Abbasi Khalifs. Salah-ud-Din excused himself by saying
that the people were well-inclined towards the present family, and he feared,
if he obeyed, that an insurrection would take place. Nur-ud-Din, however,
worst the second and the third time to order him to do so, and Salah-ud-Din, not
daring to disobey the reiterated commands of his suzerain, was in a dilemma,
but it so happened that 'Asid was about this time taken ill. Salah-ud-Din
now consulted with the chiefs and nobles as to what should be done; but
some said one thing and some another, and the difficulty was as great as
before. At this juncture, a person of some note, named Amr-i-Alim [Guz-
dah calls him Najm-ud-Din], an 'Ami, who had come to Misr, offered to
take the initiative, if permitted; and, on the first Friday in the month of
Muhammad, before the Khutbah [the preacher who pronounces the Khutbah]
entered the pulpit, this 'Ami entered the pulpit, this 'Ami went into it, and prayed for the 'Abbasi Khalif,
Imam Mustaf B'nur-Ullah. The Mughals who were present made no
objection, and the next Friday Salah-ud-Din directed that the Khutbah for
'Asid should be discontinued at Khairah and at Misr [the old capital], and that
for Mustaf B'nur-Ullah adopted, and also in other parts of the Dlyar-i-Misr.
The disorder of 'Asid had increased, and this matter was, in consequence, not
communicated to him, because, in case he ever arose from his bed again, he
would soon hear of it, and if not, of what use was it to afflict him? Salah-ud-
Din took care, however, to separate the family, slaves, and dependents of 'Asid
from each other, and to provide for the security of the dying man's wealth and
effects. Before his death, 'Asid sent for him; but, fearing treachery, as he pre-
tended, Salah-ud-Din did not go, and regretted it afterwards. 'Asid died roth
of Muhammad, 567 H. [Faist-I says 565 H.], and the 'Ubaiz Islah's dynasty
terminated. [According to Vertot vol. ii. p. 209, Salah-ud-Din had the
Khalfah murdered in or out of his bath, and says it was narrated freely by
the Christians, but that the Moslems were silent on the matter.] When the
Abbasi Khalifah, Al-Mustaf B'nur-Ullah, received information that the
Khutbah had been read for him in Mughal, he despatched 'Imad-ud-Din, a
with your solicitations. on the stipulation that you attend to a request of mine." To this demand of his they signified their assent. Sultan Salah-ud-Din commanded that they should assemble, on the morrow, in the great mosque, at which time he would make his request known to them, and accept the sovereignty of Misr. To this all pledged their faith; and the next day they all assembled in the great mosque of Misr, and solicited that he would mention his request.

Salah-ud-Din demanded that they should give their allegiance to the Khalifahs of the house of 'Abbâs as the successors of the Prophet and chief patriarchs. The people all agreed to pledge their fealty to the house of 'Abbâs; and, at that time, the Lord of the Faithful, Al-Mustazî B'amr-Ullah, filled the office of Khalifah, and the Khuṭbah was pronounced in the name of the 'Abbâsi family. A despatch announcing this triumph was forwarded to Bagh-dâd, the capital of the Khalifahs, together with the standard of the Farangs, inverted, and the flags of the Karâmithah heretics, to the presence of the Khalifah, Al-Mustazî B'amr-Ullah.

From the capital of Islâm, Salah-ud-Din received the title of Malik-un-Nâşir, and he became sovereign of Misr; venerable and illustrious dependent of the 'Abbâsi dynasty, to Sham, with rich dresses of honour for Nur-ud-Din—to the sovereign, not to his lieutenant, Salah-ud-Din—but robes of honour were also despatched to Salah-ud-Din, together with black hangings for the pulpits of Misrîfah, as the Ismâ'îlî colour was green.

In 569 H. Nur-ud-Din directed Salah-ud-Din to assemble the forces of Misrîfah, and march against the Christian territory, and invest Karak, and promised to come himself likewise. Salah-ud-Din reported his departure 20th of Muḥarram, from Kâhirah; and Nur-ud-Din, on receipt of his despatch at Damascus, marched towards Karak, and, having reached it, fully expected the arrival of Salah-ud-Din and his forces. He was, however, too cunning to trust himself in the power of his master, and wrote excusing himself on account of pretended disaffection in Misrîfah. Nur-ud-Din repeated his commands without avail, and had serious intentions of marching into the country and removing his disobedient lieutenant. Ibn-i-Shadâd gives a different account of this circumstance, which is too long for insertion here, and says it happened in 568 H. Nur-ud-Din died in 569 H.

Faṣîḥ-i says that, the first time the Khuṭbah was read in the Diyâr-i-Misrîfah, it was read for Al-Mustanjîd, who died in the beginning of the month of Rabî'-ul-Awwal, 566 H., but, subsequently, the news of his death, and the accession of his son Al-Mustazî B'nîr-Ullah [not B'amr-Ullah] was received.

This statement is totally incorrect: the title was conferred upon him by 'Āṣid, the Ismâ'îlî Khalifah, when Salah-ud-Din became his Wazîr.
and, at this time also, Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn died. Sulṭān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn marched into Shām, and assumed the throne of sovereignty, as has been previously stated. He conferred the [government of the] territory of Miṣr upon one of his sons, Malik-ul-ʿAzīz, and another son, Malik-ul-ʿAfżal, he nominated to be his heir; and upon his brother, Malik-ul-ʿĀdīl, he conferred the province of Diyār-i-Bakr.

One of the most distinguished [persons] of the trust-worthy has related, that, when the news of the accession of Sulṭān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn reached the territories of Rūm and the Ḫāṣārs* of the Farangs, a countless army came from the country of the infidels, and advanced into Shām, and fought a battle with Sulṭān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn before the gate of Damashḵ. The army of Islām was defeated and overthrown, and the Sulṭān, flying before them, retired within the walls of the city of Damashḵ. The infidels pitched their camp before the gates of the place, and the Musal-māns sustained great calamity and misery.

Sulṭān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn assembled the inhabitants of Damashḵ in a certain place, in order to induce them to pledge themselves to make holy war upon the infidels, and to attack them and drive them away. He deputed one of the godly ʿUlamāʾ to ascend the pulpit, to speak a few words in order to incite the people to holy warfare, and urge them

---

7 Nūr-ud-Dīn did not die until 569 H., and the Khūṭbāh was read for the ʿAbbāsīs in 567 H.

8 The plural form is used in all the copies of the text collated.

9 This assertion is totally false: during the whole of the reign of Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, and the numerous battles that took place therein, no battle was ever fought before Damashḵ between him and the Farangs. The rest of our author’s statement may be depended upon accordingly. It is something like 700 horse routing 80,000 Crusaders, and their dead lying in heaps for miles. Our worthy author probably considered, when he wrote this, that, as Hindūstān was such a far-off country, he might make any statement for the glorification of the Musal-mān faith with impunity. The great battles that took place during the reign of Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, of course, are not mentioned, and were probably unknown to Minhāj-i-Sarīj, who was “so industrious in collecting information from trustworthy persons,” and who often [very!] mentions his authority for the facts he records”—of which, probably, the matter of the rings for the ears of the Crusaders farther on is one. Our author has evidently been confused about the investment of Damashḵ in the year 543 H., some years before Sulṭān Nūr-ud-Dīn obtained possession of it, when Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn was in his eleventh year, and in the defence of which city his eldest brother, Amīr Nūr-ud-Daulah Shāhān Shāh, so greatly distinguished himself, and died of the wounds he received on that occasion.
to enter into conflict with the infidels\textsuperscript{1}. The godly ecclesiastic, with all sincerity of heart, turned his face towards Şalâh-ud-Dîn, and said:—"Oh, Şalâh-ud-Dîn, from thy mouth, thy tongue, and thy person, emanateth the effluvium of Satan's urine! How canst thou expect that the Most High God will ratify thy vow? how can it be regarded as real and sincere?"

This reproof, by the grace of God, took effect upon the august heart of Şalâh-ud-Dîn. He got up, and on the hand of that godly ecclesiastic he expressed contrition, and renounced wine and all other sins\textsuperscript{2}. The people, with sincere eagerness and willingness, renewed to him their vows to undertake holy war; and from that very spot they turned their faces in the direction of the scene of holy warfare. The whole of the people issued from the city, and they fell upon the army of the infidels. The Most High God sent them heavenly assistance, and the enemies of the faith were defeated and overthrown, and such a vast number of them were sent to Hell by the stroke of the sword of the defenders of the true faith, as cannot be numbered or computed\textsuperscript{3}. The whole of the Maliks\textsuperscript{4} [princes], and

\textsuperscript{1} Şalâh-ud-Dîn was too wise to trust to "the people" to make holy war and defend his cities. He depended more upon his hardy troops, well knowing that rabble cannot be turned into soldiers at a nod of the head.

\textsuperscript{2} See beginning of note \textsuperscript{4}, p. 216. Our author confounds both times as well as events.

\textsuperscript{3} Şalâh-ud-Dîn's total overthrow, near ‘Askalân, at the head of an immense force by the sick king Baldwin IV.—at the time that Şalâh-ud-Dîn marched against Jerusalem in Nov. 1179 A.D. = 575 H., when Odo de St. Amand, the Master of the Temple, at the head of eighty of his knights rode through Şalâh-ud-Dîn's Mamlûk body-guard of a thousand picked men, in coats of mail and saffron coloured mantles, and penetrated to Şalâh-ud-Dîn's own tent, from which he with difficulty escaped almost naked, and had scarcely time to scramble up the back of a fleet dromedary and make for the desert—is an event which our author would scorn to chronicle. On this occasion, pigeons spread over Egypt the triumphant news of a victory, in order, as the Arab chroniclers say, "to quiet the minds of the people," although scarcely one of the Egyptian army ever got back to Egypt again. Neither would our author condescend to chronicle the crushing defeat, inflicted upon Şalâh-ud-Dîn and his immense host, by Richard Coeur-de-Lion, and his French and Burgundian allies, near Arsûf, in 1191 A.D. = 587 H., nor the alacrity with which, soon after, he agreed to enter into a treaty with Richard [who had rebellion at home to crush], when his forces were in such a woeful plight, but the real state of his affairs unknown to the Christians.

\textsuperscript{4} The word Malik may mean king here; and our author might have desired his readers to believe that all the kings of the Franks were made captive.
nobles, and chief personages among the Farangs were made captives.

The Islamis having become victorious and triumphant, Sultan Salah-ud-Din directed every one to devise [means] for the disposal of the Farang captives. At last the Sultan determined to set the whole of them at liberty, and they were set free accordingly; and he made them signify their repentance, and conferred gifts upon them. After they had departed to the distance of a day's journey, they sent a representation to the Sultan, saying:—"We are all your servants, set at liberty by you: send to each of us a ring that we may insert it in our ears," and then we will depart." The Sultan commanded that a sufficient number of rings should be prepared, of pure gold, sufficient to supply every one of them with one of the weight of one miskahl; and they were sent to them, and the whole of the liberated captives inserted the rings in their ears, and they went away; and of that host not one person ever again came to fight against the Sultan's troops.

Sultan Salah-ud-Din became firmly established, and his illustrious deeds in Islam will endure. He reigned for a very long period, and died. He had six sons, whose titles were as follows:—Malik-uz-Zahir, Malik-ul-Afzal.

Probably he heard something about Salah-ud-Din's encounters with the Latin Christians and the battle of Tiberias, just before the capitulation of Jerusalem in 583 H., and has confounded them with the investment of Damascus by the Emperor Conrad and Louis VII. in 541 H., some years before the death of Zangi, Nur-ud-Din's father, when Salah-ud-Din was about nine years old. He has made a precious hash of the account of the Kurdish rulers, and of Salah-ud-Din's reign in particular.

8 Rings in the ears are emblems of slavery. Bigoted Mullahs, like our author, stick at no falsehoods in their endeavours to enhance the deeds of their co-religionists; but the 'Arab chroniclers of the Crusades are very different, and their writings, generally, bear the stamp of truth. I need scarcely say that their accounts are very different to our author's, and that such an absurd statement will not be found in any of their writings.

8 He knows all about the rings and their weight, but he does not know how long Salah-ud-Din ruled, or when he died. All his sovereigns reign "for a long period, and die;" and the same stereotyped expression answers for Asad-ud-Din, Salah-ud-Din's uncle, who never reigned at all, but was the Vazir of Egypt for sixty-five days, and for Salah-ud-Din, who reigned [after Nur-ud-Din's death] from 569 to 589 H.

9 Salah-ud-Din had a number of sons, but the names of six only have been recorded; the others may have died very young. The correct titles and names of the six referred to are as follows:—

1. Abü-l-Hasan-i-'Ali, Malik-ul-Afzal, Nur-ud-Din, who was the eldest
VI. MALIK-UL-‘AFZAL, 'ALI, SON OF ŠALĀH-UD-DĪN, YŪSUF, SON OF AİYŪB, AN-KURDI.

Malik-ul-‘Afzal, 'Ali, was the heir of Sultān Šalāh-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf; and on the death of the Sultān he ascended the throne of the territories of Damāshq and Šām.

All presented themselves before him, and paid him homage, and submitted to him, with the exception of Malik-ul-‘Aziz, his brother, who was ruler of Miṣr. He led an army into Šām in order to claim the sovereignty from 'Aziz; and Malik-ul-‘Ādil, Abū-Bikr, son of Aiyūb, the brother of [the late] Šalāh-ud-Dīn, and who held the territory of Diyār-i-Bakr, took part with [his nephew] Malik-ul-‘Aziz. They invested Malik-ul-‘Afzal within the walls of Damāshq, and for a considerable time contention continued between them. At length it was agreed that Damāshq should be given up to Malik-ul-‘Aziz, and peace was effected. The territory of Sar-ḥadd, which is a tract of country in Šām, was assigned to Malik-ul-‘Afzal.


For his correct name and titles see note 7 above. He was the eldest son of Sultān Šalāh-ud-Dīn, and his father's heir-apparent. On the death of his father, at Damāshq, where Afzal then was, and which he held the government of, he assumed the sovereignty over that territory, whilst his brother, 'Aziz, assumed sovereignty over the Diyār-i-Miṣrāh, of which he held charge. Another brother, Malik-ul-Zāhīr, held Ḥalab. Contention went on between the brothers, Afzal and 'Aziz, the latter supported by his uncle 'Ādil, for a considerable time, the details of which are too long for insertion here. At last, Afzal was invested in Damāshq and made prisoner, and a portion of territory on the frontier was assigned to him.

Other writers place Malik-ul-‘Aziz next after his father, as he assumed the sovereignty over the territory of Miṣrāh, and overcame his brother, Malik-ul-Afzal, who held Šām.

The word here used is unintelligible. It is written in different ways in nearly every copy and also Yāsāf says, ʿAṣfar, which means "a place on the frontier." There is a place called "Ṣar-khad."
He was a learned and very enlightened man, and composed beautiful poetry. The situation in which he was placed, together with the condition of his brother, who was named 'Uṣmān [Malik-ul-'Azīz], and their uncle, Abū-Bikr [Malik-ul-'Ādil], he depicted in the two following couplets, and sent them to the Court of Baghdād, to the Khalfah, Un-Nāšir-ud-Dīn-Ulā; for the office of Khalfah had fallen to Imām, Un-Nāšir. The two couplets are as follows:—

"My lord! Abū-Bikr and his companion, 'Uṣmān, 
Have, by the sword, deprived 'Alī of his right. 
Remark the fatality of the name; how it suffers, from the last, 
The same wrong as from the first [generation] it endured."

Atter some time expired, Malik-ul-'Azīz died, and Malik ul-Afzal was entreated to come into Miṣr. He proceeded thither, and from thence he brought an army into Shām. Malik-ul-'Azīz had made over Shām to his uncle, Malik-ul-'Ādil, and he and Malik-ul-Afzal came to a battle, and the latter was defeated. At length, however, Malik-ul-Afzal chanced to have a meeting with his uncle, who gave him Samīṣāt. He remained there for a long time, and he died.

VII. MALIK-UL-'AZĪZ, 'UṢMĀN, SON OF ŠALĀH-UD-DĪN,
YŪSUF, SON OF AĪVŪB, AL-KURDI.

The name of Malik-ul-'Azīz was 'Uṣmān; and, when Sulṭān Šalāh-ud-Dīn came to the throne of Shām, and the other writers say Afzal was a state prisoner when his brother died, and that he was invited to Miṣr to act as Atā-bak to 'Azīz's son, Malik-ul-Manṣūr.

The celebrated historian, the learned Abū-l-Faṭḥ-i-Nāṣr-ulāh, son of Šīyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Shībānī, surnamed Ibn Āṣr, was Malik-ul-Afzal's Wazīr.

Yafā'ī has four lines more. The reference of course is to the Khalfah 'Alī and the two first Khalfahs.

All the copies of the text are alike here; but, as 'Azīz died in Miṣr, Afzal was invited to come to Miṣr. See last paragraph of the next reign, page 224.

After assuming the throne of Miṣr after 'Azīz's death, Afzal invested his uncle, 'Ādil, within the walls of Damašk, and reduced him to great straits; but his son, Kāmil, having advanced from the eastern parts with an army, raised the investment, and the father and son overcame Afzal, and deprived him of Miṣr, and he was fain to content himself with Šamīṣāt.

Some write this name Šamīṣāt, others, Šamīṣāt, and some, Šamīṣāt. The last, however, seems most correct.

In 622 H.
dominions of Shām and the territories of Mīr, Diyār-i-Bakr, Filisṭīn, and Sikandarīlah came under his sway, he conferred the throne of Mīr upon his eldest son⁸, who bore the title of Malik-ul-'Azīz. He brought that country under subjection, and was a man of tact and capacity, and in the guardianship of that country, he showed many laudable dispositions.

When his father, Sultān Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, died, Malik-ul-'Azīz led an army from Mīr and appeared before Damāshk; and his uncle, Malik-ul-'Ādīl, joined him. He wrested the territories of Diyār-i-Bakr and Damāshk⁹ out of the hands of his brother, Malik-ul-Afẓal, and gave up to his uncle, Malik-ul-'Ādīl, Shām and Damāshk and the whole of that region, and returned again to Mīr.

A short time afterwards the decree of destiny overtook him, and he sustained a fall from his horse, and broke his neck, and he died. After this occurrence, Malik-ul-Afẓal came into Mīr, and took possession of that country¹.

VIII. MALIK-UL-‘ĀDĪL, ABŪ-BIKR⁶, SON OF AĪYŪB, SON OF SHĀDĪ, AL-KUṚDİ.

Some time subsequent to Malik-ul-‘Ādīl’s having ascended the throne of the kingdom of Shām, and after he had defeated Malik-ul-Afẓal, who had brought an army from the side of Mīr, and he [‘Ādīl] had reduced the various provinces of the territory [entrusted to him] under his sway, the daughter of a Ḋaiṣar of the Farangs⁸ entered

---

⁸ 'Azīz was the second, not the eldest son. Afẓal was the eldest of Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn’s sons, according to Yāfṣa‘ī and other chroniclers. See note ⁷ p. 221. ‘Azīz was merely his father’s lieutenant in Mīr.
⁹ The first attempt on the part of 'Azīz to deprive his brother of Damāshk did not succeed; but on the second occasion he succeeded.
¹ See page 223, and note ⁴.
⁵ His correct titles and name are, Malik-ul-‘Ādīl, Saīf-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr-i-Muḥammad.
⁶ Our author has neglected—for a very good reason, doubtless—to name his ‘trustworthy’ authority for this statement, of a piece with the ‘rings,’ and the like. There is nothing whatever contained in any of the authorities I have consulted to warrant such an assertion, not even that a Christian female had had the misfortune to be his captive, and was immured in his ḫaram, much less a Christian princess. Such a circumstance, if true, was not likely to have been passed over in silence.
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his hāram, and he married her, and that daughter bore him several children.

This Malik-ul-‘Ādil was a sagacious, discerning, competent, experienced, and crafty man, and he ruled for a great number of years. He held possession of the different parts [of his territory], to the best of his judgment and ability; and his adversaries kept quietly and peaceably each within his own dominions, and hence he had but seldom to carry on hostilities.

He had several distinguished sons, who acquired great

4 Malik-ul-‘Ādil accompanied his uncle, Asad-ud-Dīn, when the latter was despatched into Mīṣr by Nūr-ud-Dīn, at which time Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn also went, as previously related. When Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn acquired power in that country, he sent his brother, ‘Ādil, as his representative into Shām; and, when Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn marched against Karak, in Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 579 H., ‘Ādil was left in Mīṣr, but he was summoned from thence, with all the available troops, to join Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, as the Christians had assembled in strong force with hostile intent against the Musalmāns. ‘Ādil joined him there accordingly, with an immense army, in Sha‘bān of the same year. When Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn gained possession of Ḥalab, in the same year, he bestowed it upon ‘Ādil, having taken it from his own son Malik-ud-Tāhir, to whom he had just before entrusted it. Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn was in the habit of placing his strongholds in charge of his brothers and nephews and other kinsmen, and not of entrusting them to his sons. At last, Sullāmān, one of the Amirs [nobles] of Ḥalab, an old friend of Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, expostulated with him on the subject and it took effect, and he at once gave back Ḥalab to Ṭāhir. When Sultan Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn went against Maqṣūl, in Sha‘bān, 581 H., and was taken ill, and a peace was concluded between him and 'Īzz-ud-Dīn Mas‘ūd, of Maqṣūl, he was joined at Ḥarrān, by his brother 'Ādil, on whom he had conferred the seifs of Ḥarrān, Ruḥā [Edessa], and Mfa‘ārḵīn [Martyropolis], after which the Sultan returned to Damāšq.

After the Crusaders, under Richard Cœur-de-Lion and Philip Augustus, took 'Akkā [Acre], in Jamā‘ī-ul-Ākhrīr, 587 H., when “the Musalmāns sustained such a great calamity,” and the Christians were preparing to march against 'Āṣkalān [Ascalon], Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, in consultation with the chiefs of his forces, determined to entrust his brother 'Ādil with a portion of his army, to hold the Christians in check, whilst he himself, with the remainder, proceeded to 'Āṣkalān to raze it, in order to deter the enemy from marching thither. Whilst engaged in this operation, during the same night, a messenger arrived from Malik-ul-‘Ādil, saying that the Christians were willing to make peace, if the coast towns were ceded to them. Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn, finding his troops so disorganized and dispirited, was under the necessity of agreement, and he wrote to 'Ādil to make an accommodation on the best terms he could. The authorities, from which these details are taken, agree generally with European chroniclers of the Crusades at this period, and their writings are free from such nonsense as our author writes.

'Ādil did not succeed to the sovereignty of Egypt and Damāšq until after the death of his nephew 'Azzā, and ousting the latter’s son, Malik-ul-Maṃṣūr, under pretence of serving whom he came into Mīṣr, from the former country. The Khūṭbāh was read for him there in Shawwāl, 596 H., and at Ḥalab, in 598 H., when he obtained sway over it and other parts of Shām and the eastern provinces.
renown, such as Malik-ul-Kāmil, Malik-ul-Muazzam-i-'Īsā, Malik-ul-Ashraf, Malik-ul-Fā'īz, Malik-ul-Ghāzī, Malik-ul-Awḥad, Malik-ul-Mamdūd, Malik-ul-Amjad, and Malik-us-Ṣāliḥ-i-Ismā'īl. Each one of them was a sovereign over a different tract of territory comprised within his dominions; and the annals of the good works, and the circumstances of the sovereignty of his sons, will remain inscribed on the pages of time, in the countries of Ḥijāz, Shām, and Yaman, until the resurrection at the last day.

Each of the different portions of his dominions Malik-ul-Ādil conferred upon one of his sons, whilst he himself continually moved about from one part to another with his forces, and, with equity and sagacity, guarded and watched over them.

He always had a bow at his side, and such was his great strength, that no one in that part, or at that time, could bend his bow on account of its great tallness. He was noted, both by friend and foe, for his truthfulness of word. The whole of the enemies of his country, who were the infidels of Rūm and the Farangs, placed implicit trust in his word; for the dust of falsehood had never soiled the skirts of the robe of his word and his promise. Throughout his dominions no human being suffered from tyranny or oppression.

He reigned in tranquillity and affluence for a period of thirty odd years, and died.

---

6 Ghānī, in two copies.
7 The word used by our author is “Bādāghāhs,” but his sons were only his lieutenants charged with the administration, subject to his control. When he became firmly established in his dominions, he divided them among his sons, giving each of them charge of one or more provinces. To Malik-ul-Kāmil he assigned the Diyar-i-Miṣrīfah, to Malik-ul-Muazzam the territory of Shām, to Malik-ul-Ashraf the Sharkīfah (the eastern parts), and to Malik-ul-Awḥad the territory of Miṣfārkhīn; and, in 610 H., after he had established his authority over Yaman, and Awḥad had been sent to Miṣfārkhīn, another son, Malik-ul-Masūd, was sent to Yaman.
8 Malik-ul-Ādil died in Jamādi-ul-Ākhir, 615 H., near the village of 'Ālīfīn, in sight of Damṣāk, when moving against the Christians, who had entered the coasts of Shām. Hearing of his death, they gave up their designs on Shām, and turned their thoughts towards Egypt, and appeared before Dimyāṭ [Damietta]. He was a man of great wisdom and intellect, of considerable judgment and conception, of good disposition and temperament, constant to his religious duties and attendance at public worship, a follower of the orthodox, inclined to learned men, and, altogether, a fortunate and august personage. He was alike abstemious in his food, and moderate in his passions.
IX. MALIK-UL-MUAZZAM, 'ISĀ, SON OF ABŪ-BIKR, SON OF AİYÛB, SON OF ŞÂDI, AL-KURDI.

Malik-ul-Muazzam was a learned monarch, and endowed with great accomplishments, and Almighty God had dignified him with great attainments.

Among the sons of Malik-ul-'Ādil, who observed the ordinances of the followers of the traditions of the sect of Shāfi'i, Malik-ul-Muazzam was the only one who was of the sect of the great Imām, Abū Ḥanīfah-i-Nu'mān, son of Šābit, Al-Kūff.

During the troubles in the territories of 'Ajam, when the Ulamā of Khurāsān, and Māwar-un-Nahr, became dispersed at the period of the inroad of the infidels of Čhin, Imām Sharaf-ud-Dīn, Adīmī, who was a prodigy in the science of theology and religious jurisprudence, and Imām Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Hašīrī, who was a master in the science of physiognomy, came and presented themselves at his Court. Malik-ul-Muazzam became the disciple of these two great Imāms, and other eminent 'Ulamā,—the mercy of the Almighty be upon the whole of them!—and assigned them emoluments and rewards, and fixed places for their abode. He, however, sought mostly to secure the presence of Muḥam-mad Husaīn, Shibāni.

The brother of Malik-ul-Muazzam, Malik-ul-'Ādil, was by the same mother as himself, and for a long time was

9 Most other writers place Malik-ul-Kāmil, the other son of 'Ādil, next after his father as ruler of Miṣr; but our author has reversed them. Malik-ul-Muazzam's proper titles and name are, Al-Malik-ul-Muazzam, Sharaf-ud-Dīn, 'Isā. To read our author's account of him, one would imagine that he reigned over the whole of his father's territories, but such was not the case. He held a large portion of Shām, but never reigned in Miṣr at all; and, at his death, at Damascus, in 624 H., his son, Malik-un-Nāṣir, Šalāḥ-ud-Dīn-i-Dā'ūd, succeeded him as ruler of that territory. The latter died in 650 H.

1 One author says of him:—“He was a man of great firmness and resolution, bold and intrepid, of great stateliness and gravity, high-minded and endowed with many virtues and excellencies, the friend and patron of ecclesiastics and learned men, strongly attached to the doctrines of the Ḥanīfah sect, in fact, the only one of the race of Aïyûb who was a follower of Abū Ḥanīfah. He had performed the pilgrimage to Makkah and Madīnah, and was, altogether, one of the best and the most inestimable of men.”

2 Also written, Hašīrī.

3 In two copies, Hasan.
his brother's associate and lieutenant in the territory of Damāshḵ [?].

Malik-ul-Muazzam reigned for a considerable period, and died.

X. MALIK-UL-KĀMIL ⁴, SON OF ABŪ-BIKR, SON OF AIYŪB, SON OF SHĀDI, AL-KURDI.

Malik-ul-Kāmil was his father's heir, and ascended the throne of Miṣr after his father's death. On the decease of his brother, Malik-ul-Muazzam, he brought the territories of Shām under his jurisdiction. He conferred the sovereignty of the territory of Yaman upon his son, who was named Malik Mas'ūd, and also brought Hijāz under his sway.

⁴ His names are Abū-l-Maʿālīf, Muḥammad, entitled Al-Malik-ul-Kāmil, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn. He was about the greatest of his family, and, of course, our author has said the least about him. He held the government of the territory of Miṣr during his father's lifetime, and at his death assumed the sovereignty over it. It will be remembered that his father, Malik-ul-ʾĀdil, died when on his way to oppose the Christians, who, on hearing of his death, turned their arms against Miṣr. They had now reached Dimyāt. Malik-ul-Kāmil assembled a large force to repel them, and was joined by his brother, Malik-ul-Muazzam, Lord of Damāshḵ, who by his tact prevented Kāmil's being dethroned by his own nobles, and his brother Malik-ul-Fāʾiz, Sābiḵ-ud-Dīn, Ibrāhīm. After the Christians had taken Dimyāt, they determined to advance to Kūhirah and Miṣr; but the Almighty gave Kāmil success, and the Christians abandoned the strong position they had taken up in the prosecution of their design, and an accommodation was come to 10th of Rajab, 628 H., and the Christians returned to their own territories, after they had remained between Shām and Miṣr for forty months [four?] and seventeen days.

Malik-ul-Kāmil raised a dome over the tomb of Imām Shāfiʿ, on the banks of the Nil; and, when his brother, Malik-ul-Muazzam of Shām, died, and the latter's son, Malik-un-Nāṣir, succeeded him, Kāmil marched from Miṣr to deprive him of his territory. He was joined by another brother, Malik-ul-ʿAṣḥraf, Muṣaffar-ud-Dīn, Mūsā; and, having subdued Shām in 625 H., he bestowed it upon ʿAṣḥraf instead of the eastern provinces, which he resumed, and set out for those parts. It was at this time that Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh, invested Khalīfa [also called Akhīsi]. Kāmil subsequently made his son, Najm-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Muṣaffar, Aiyūb, his lieutenant over the eastern parts, and his youngest son, Saif-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, lieutenant in the Miṣrīfah territory, and another son, Masʿūd, he sent into Yaman. The latter annexed Makkah, and the Hijāz territory; and the empire of Kāmil became of vast extent. When the Ḥaṭīb of Makkah, on Fridays, prayed for him, he styled him, "Lord of Makkah, 'U바dīlian, Yaman, Baidān, Miṣr, Saʿdān, Shām, Šanadīn, the Jazīrān, and Waḥdatān, Sultān-ul-Kabīlātān wa Rabb-ul-'Alāmatain-ul-Sharīf, Abū-l-Maʿālīf, Muḥammad, Al-Malik-ul-Kāmil, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Khalīfa-ul-Imām-ul-Maʿūnī." I have not space to say more. He died at Damāshḵ in Rajab, 635 H.
In the direction of Rūm and 'Arab, he undertook numerous expeditions against infidels, and waged holy war as by orthodox law required; and, after having ruled over the kingdom for some time, he died.

XI. MALIK-UŞ-ŞALİH, SON OF AL-KĀMİL, SON OF ABŪ-BIKR, SON OF AİYŪB, SON OF ŞHĀDI, AL-KURDİ.

Malik-uş-Şāliḥ was his father's heir, and, when Malik-ul-Kāmil departed this life, Malik-uş-Şāliḥ ascended the

The nearer he approaches his own time, the more our author blunders, and the shorter and more confused his accounts become. Here, the ruler of Miṣr is said to be ruler of Şām, and vice versā. After the death of Malik-ul-Kāmil, his empire soon fell into utter disorder and confusion. His son, Malik-ul-ʿĀdil, Abū-Bikr, who was quite a youth, succeeded; and his cousin, Malik-ul-Jawād, Muṣaffar-ud-Dīn, Yūnas, son of Şams-ud-Dīn, Maudūd, son of ʿĀdil [Ṣalah-ud-Dīn's brother, and father of Malik-ul-Kāmil], became his deputy with the accord of the nobles of Kāmil. Malik-ul-ʿĀdil exercised the sovereignty, or held the name of sovereign rather, for about two years, when his nobles assembled together at Balbīs, seized him, and sent for his brother, MALIK-UŞ-ŞALİH, NAJM-UD-DİN, AİYŪB, who was at Damāshq, which he had promised to give up to Malik-ul-Jawād for other territory. On this, Şāliḥ's uncle, also called Malik-uş-Şāliḥ, 'Imād-ud-Dīn, Lord of Ba'albaḵ, being supported by Mujāhid-ud-Dīn, Asad-i Şer-i Koh, Lord of Ḥimṣ, when Şāliḥ [son of Kāmil] set out towards Miṣrīfah, and remained encamped at Balbīs for some time, made a dash upon Damāshq and gained possession of it. Malik-uş-Şāliḥ's [son of Kāmil] adherents, fearing for the safety of their-families and homes at Damāshq, deserted him, and left him nearly alone in his camp at Balbīs, and went over to Şāliḥ, the uncle. The younger Şāliḥ, before he could fly to some place of safety, was pounced upon by Malik-un-Nāṣir, son of Malik-ul-Muẓammāl [son of the first ʿĀdil], Lord of Karak, who carried him off to that stronghold; but he set him at liberty again the same year, 637 H., and at the request of ʿĀdil's nobles, and attended by the same Nāṣir and his forces, Malik-uş-Şāliḥ [son of Kāmil] entered Ẓāhirah in Ḫaṣa'dah of the same year. The author from whose work most of these extracts have been taken, says, "I was present there at the time, and Malik-ul-ʿĀdil was brought forth seated in a covered litter, and under an scort, and immured in the fortress of Sūltānāfāh."

Malik-uş-Şāliḥ regained possession of Damāshq in 643 H., and proceeded thither, and, when on his way back to Miṣrīfah, was taken dangerously ill, and had to remain at Shamūm. The Christians had resolved to attack his territory, and they reached Dimyāt on Friday, 20th of Ṣafar, 647 H. The city was totally abandoned by its inhabitants, who fled. They gained possession of the place on the following Sunday. Malik-uş-Şāliḥ was removed from Shamūm to Maṣfūrah, and had to be kept there, so ill was he, until the night of 14th of Ṣaḥbān, when he died. His remains were deposited in the Ḫadj̲ah Maṣjīd, and for near three months his death was concealed, until his son, Malik-ul-Muẓammāl, Tūrān Shāh, arrived there from his seat of Kaifa [or Kayif] when the Khubbah was read for him, and the father's death was made known.
thrones of Miṣr, and took possession of the dominions of his father and his grandfather.

According to the best of his capability, he provided for and advanced the sons of his uncles, and his own brothers, and took measures for the safety of his dominions; but his life was a brief one, and, after a short time, he died, leaving young children behind him.

Trustworthy persons have related, that, during the calamities and troubles which happened in Irān, when the irruption of Chingiz Khān took place, a body of Turks of Khwārazm, and [several] nobles of the Khwārazm-Shāhī dynasty, retiring before the infidels of Chīn, after the defeat of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mang-bārī, son of Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, reached the territories of Shām and Miṣr, and possessed themselves of the dominions of the 'Ādilī dynasty. Some they slew, some passed away, and some remained. May the Almighty have mercy upon the whole of them!

Tūrān Shāh did not get on with his father's slaves [nobles and chiefs], and, after he had put some of them to death for their rebellious conduct, the remainder combined against him, and put him to death in Muḥarram, 648 H. Malik-ul-'Ādil died in confinement in 646 H., and left a young son named Mughlīs-ud-Dīn, 'Umūr. He subsequently had possession of Karak and its dependencies, but was invested therein by the rebel slaves, and capitulated on terms in 662 H., but was put to death by the usurper of the Miṣrīah throne. Most authors consider the Aiyūb dynasty to have ended with Malik-ul-Muḥgam, Tūrān Shāh. There were other branches of the same family, who ruled in different parts until the irruption of the Mughals, but I have not space to mention them here.