PREFACE.

In 1865 I was led to read the printed text of the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Nāṣirī, published at Calcutta in 1864, in search of materials towards a history of the Afghāns and their country, which is very much mixed up with that of India.

Having gone through a great portion of it, and finding it defective in many places, and full of errors, I thought it advisable to examine the India Office Library M.S., No. 1952, from which the printed text was said to have been taken, went through the whole of that work, and found that it also was defective, and contained numerous errors. I found nothing, however, respecting the Afghāns, except in one place, and there they were briefly mentioned in a few lines, but very characteristically.

I had already discovered, when in search of other materials, what lamentable errors the available Histories of India, so called, in the English language contained, and I now found how they had arisen. With a view of correcting them, I made a translation of those portions of the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Nāṣirī which related to India, and the History of the Ghaznawī and Ghūrī dynasties: and, when I offered a translation to the Bengal Asiatic Society some twelve years ago, my intention was, as stated in my letter on the subject, merely to have made a fair copy of the translation of those identical portions.

Soon after, I obtained a very old copy of the work; and, on comparing it with the I. O. L. M.S. No. 1952, I found such considerable and important differences to exist, that I determined to begin anew, and translate the whole work.

The Society having accepted my offer, and the defective
state of the printed text being well known, Mr. Arthur Grote, to whom I am very greatly indebted for assistance in many ways, advised that, in making this translation, I should avail myself of any other copies of the text that might be procurable in Europe. On instituting inquiry the following were found, and have been already referred to in my report to the Society, published in the “Proceedings” for February, 1873, and have been used by me in my task. I must here give a brief description of them, and notice and number them according to their apparent age and value, which arrangement, however, will be somewhat different from that in the notes to pages 68 and 77 of the translated text.

1. A M.S. belonging to the St Petersburg Imperial Public Library.

This, probably, is the most ancient of the copies collated. It is not written in an elegant hand, by any means, although plainly and correctly, but in the style in which Mulläšs usually write. The dâls are marked with diacritical points, and other letters are written in a peculiar manner, denoting considerable antiquity. It is, however, imperfect, and does not comprise much more than half the work.

2. The British Museum M.S. No. Add. 26, 189.

This copy is considered by Doctor Rieu, whose experience is sufficiently great, and authority undoubted, to be a M.S. of the fourteenth century. It is clearly written and correct, and has been of the utmost use to me. It wants a few pages at the end, hence the date on which it was completed, and by whom written, which generally are inserted at the end, cannot be discovered.

3. The old M.S. in my possession.

To judge from the writing and paper, I should suppose it to be about the same age as No. 2. It is clearly written, but wants several pages at the end, consequently, the date of its completion likewise cannot be discovered. One pretty good proof of its age, however, is that the whole, from beginning to end, has been cut close to the illuminated borders of each leaf, and inlaid on other paper, which also appears to be of considerable age. Whoever did this turned a number of leaves the wrong way, and misplaced
several pages, which took me some time to put in their places again.

I imagine that there is very little difference, in point of antiquity, between these three copies.

4. A MS. belonging to the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg.

This is a well and correctly written MS., which has also been of the greatest use to me in my work. It wants about two leaves at the end, and, consequently, the date on which it was copied does not appear. I should say, comparing it with the others above described, that it is a MS. of the sixteenth century, possibly, still earlier. It has an unreadable name on the last leaf, with 1218 H. [1803 A.D.] upon it.

5. The India Office Library MS., No. 1952.

This is also a plainly written copy, and, apparently, of considerable age, nearly as old, possibly, as the three copies first named, but it is incorrect in scores of places: one place in particular, where three complete pages of the history of Sultan Mas'ud of Ghazin occur in the middle of the account of the Saljuks. This is important, although an error, because it shows us how many other copies have been taken from it, or that it, and the other copies hereafter to be named, were all copied from another, still earlier, MS. imperfect in that identical place.

This MS. is, in all probability, that referred to by Stewart, as belonging to Tipu's library, and said to have been "copied by the author himself." The reason why this, too, has been erroneously considered "an autograph of the author's," is simply this—whoever copied it, as in the case of other copies, neither recorded his own name, nor the place where, or date when, it was completed, and so it terminates in the author's own words, hence some people have run away with the idea—and it only shows upon what a shadow they often found their theories—that the author himself must have written it. It ends thus:—"The book of Al-Minhaj bin Saraj, the 5th of Rabil-ul-Awwal—the third month—in the year fifty and six hundred." The eight, which should have preceded the fifty, has been left out. On the first leaf the following is written: "The Tabakat-i-Nasiri, in the city of Haidar-abad, in the month of Rabil-
ul-Awwal, 1157 H. [1744 A.D.], was bought of the booksellers in that place."

6 and 7. Two M.S.S. in the Paris National Library.

These may be classed, at least the best of the two, with the preceding M.S., No. 5, in point of date, and want of correctness; and I believe that they are either copies of No. 5, or, like it and two others—the Bodleian M.S., and the Ro. Asiatic Soc. M.S.—copies of the same identical M.S. They all agree as to errors,¹ and they all end in the same way, without the name of the scribe, the date, or place where copied, with the single exception of the Bodleian copy, which has the word "eight" written over the words "fifty and six hundred." For the reasons above-mentioned, both Paris M.S.S.—not one only, I find—were fondly considered "autographs of the author's;" but M. H. Zotenberg, whose opinion I asked, very justly says, "this is impossible, because the two M.S. are not in the same handwriting." He, however, adds, "but to judge from the paper and the writing, I should suppose that they are both M.S.S. of the fifteenth century. They were, both brought from India." They came from the Dakhan, in all probability.

8 and 9. The other copy of the text in the British Museum, No. Add. 25,785, which Doctor Rieu considers may be of the sixteenth century, and another belonging to the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg. These are, comparatively, modern copies, of the first half of the seventeenth century in all likelihood. They are plainly written, but are neither of them very correct. The former is defective to the extent of seven or eight 8vo. pages at the end, and the other also wants a few leaves. They are neither of them of much value.

10. A M.S. formerly in the Library of Haileybury College.

This is the most complete M.S. of the text that I have met with, although it is of comparatively recent date. It is written in a plain, but not elegant hand. It is generally correct, and closely agrees with Nos. 2, 3, and 4; and I have found it exceedingly useful. Indeed without it, and

¹ See Notes ⁹, page 308; ², page 376; ³, page 400; ⁴, page 426; ⁵, page 573; ⁶, page 577; and particularly page 665, note ⁷; page 684, note ⁸; note page 693; and ⁹, page 703; in which some of these are pointed out.
Nos. 2, 3, and 4, I never could have completed my task satisfactorily. In a few places it supplied what was defective in two of the others. The date of copying is not given, but, from its appearance, I should say it was a MS. of the last half of the seventeenth century. After the author's concluding words the following is written:—

"The owner of this MS., in the port [Bandar] of Sūrat, [is] the Ḥājī, Muḥammad Sharif, son of Mullā Muḥammad Sharif, son of Mullā Muḥammad Ṭāhir;" after which follow some words not quite intelligible, "on the 8th of Sha'bān—the eighth month—1113 H. [1701-1702, A.D.], was recorded." The two last words appear to refer rather to the date the owner wrote his name, than to the date the MS. was completed. It subsequently belonged to some Grandee of the Mughal empire, from the titles given under the above record, namely, "The Mumtāz-ud-Daulah, Mu[fakhkar ul-Mulk, Ḥusām-i-Jang." Who he was I am unable to say.

11. The copy of the text formerly belonging to the late Colonel G. W. Hamilton, C.B., in the collection of the late Earl of Crawfurd and Balcarres. This is, upon the whole, the worst copy I have collated, and contains very numerous errors, although, in point of age, it may be older than Nos. 8, 9, and 10. It terminates abruptly at page 462 of the Printed Text, and is thus defective to the extent of about twenty-six pages, but it has the closing page, and when and where written. Before I saw it, I was informed that it was a very valuable copy, and that it had belonged to "the Emperor Shah Jahan, because his seal was stamped on the margin of one of the pages." On examination, I found that the MS. was completed "on Thursday, the 6th of Rajab—the seventh month—of the year 1059 H. [July, 1649], in the reign of the Second Šāhib-i-Ḵirān, Abū-l-Muẓaffar, Shihāb-ud-Din, Muḥammad, Shāh-i-Jahān, Bādšāh-i-Ghāzī, in the city of Buhān-pūr [in Kāndes], at the time when hostilities broke out between that monarch and Shāh 'Abbās the Second [the Safawi ruler of I-rān], respecting Ḵandaḵār [the Ḵīzīl-bāšhis were then actually investing that stronghold]," and that the copyist was the Khānah-zād-i-Dargāh [the born slave of the Court or Household], Mu[in-ud-Din, Khwājah-i-Jahān, the Jahan-ḵiri," [of the Household of Jahāṅgīr Bādšāh], Shāh-i-Jahān Bādšāh's father.
Beneath this again is the name of a Maulawī, the son of some "Khān," partly obliterated, with the date 1255 H. [1839 A.D.]. A seal underneath bears the date 1233 H. [1818 A.D.]. The largest seal, supposed to be that of Shāh-i-Jahān Bādshāh, bears the following inscription:—
"Mu'in-ud-Din, Muḥammad [the same person as referred to above], ghulām-i-Shāh-i-Jahān," with the figures 24, referring to the year of that monarch's reign, and the year 1061 H. [it began Dec. 14th, 1650, A.D.]. A smaller seal, with an inscription—"Ya Mu'in"—"O Helper!"—bears date 1058 H. [1648 A.D.]. I could discover nothing to show that the MS. had ever belonged to Shāh-i-Jahān Bādshāh.

12. The MS. belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society. This, as previously mentioned, is a modern copy, of the latter part of the seventeenth century possibly, and is either a copy of No. 5, or copied from the same MS. that was copied from. It is pretty plainly but carelessly written, in, by no means, a good hand; but, like the others referred to, is very defective, and the proper names of persons and places are often without any points.

I have already noticed how incorrect the Printed Text is. In the Preface to it, Colonel W. N. Lees, LL.D., says: "When I commenced the work, we had three copies, one belonging to the Ro. Asiatic Soc., one in the India House Library, and one belonging to the High Priest of the Pārsis at Bombay. A little while afterwards, Colonel Hamilton, in reply to a circular of the Society, forwarded a copy from Dehli. These MSS. are all apparently good old copies, and are written in very different hands. It was supposed, then, that we had four distinct copies to collate; but, before long, it became apparent that the four had been copied from two MSS., so, in reality, we had only two. . . . The Society had issued hundreds of circulars to all parts of India, and had failed to draw out more than two copies; and the fact, that the four old copies I had had been copied.

3 In this case, if the Ro. As. Soc's MS. is a copy of the India Office MS., the Hamilton MS., and the High Priest's, must be copies one of the other, or copies from another MS.

Sir Henry Elliot mentions that he found one in the Royal Library at Lakhnāo, but most of the MSS. in that collection were, I believe, destroyed during the rebellion of 1857.
from two MSS., seemed to indicate so clearly the great scarcity of MSS. of this work, that I decided to go on.”

From these remarks its defectiveness is not to be wondered at, but, at the same time, as I have shown in my notes, there are numerous errors in it which are not to be found in these MSS., and a little historical and geographical discrimination on the part of the editors might have corrected many of them.

The time and labour required for simply translating a book, especially if but one or two copies be used for collation, is not very great; and this translation could have been accomplished in a tithe of the time I have devoted to it. But, as this History is one of the four most important works with respect to the early rulers of India, and that part of Central Asia upon which all eyes have been lately turned, and are likely to be turned in the future, I thought it advisable not to spare any pains on it, although it has occupied some years longer than I anticipated. I have collated nine copies of the text word for word; and all doubtful passages have been collated for me from the other three. Although this has occupied a great deal of time, and entailed much labour, a still greater amount of both has been expended on the notes, which I deemed necessary to illustrate our author’s often brief, sometimes erroneous, but generally valuable, statements, to point out the errors which he has sometimes fallen into, and to point out some of the legion of lamentable mistakes, and misleading statements, contained in compilations purporting to be “Histories of India,” “Histories of Afghánistán from the Earliest Times,” and similar Histories of other Eastern states and peoples; and to show the exact value of the compilations, turned out by the yard by raw hands, for the Public of the newspapers and reviews, and the general reader.

These errors in Indian History are solely attributable to the miscalled translations of the comparatively modern chronicle, known as the Tārīkh-i-Firīštah by Dow and Briggs, the first of whom could not possibly have understood the words of the writer in scores of places, and in such cases appears to have recorded his own ideas instead of the author’s statements. Firīštah’s work, too, is not difficult, and the style is simple; and it is one of a few books
well adapted for the Lower Standard of Examination in the Persian language. Firishtah's materials were chiefly taken from the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī, also known as the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbar Shāhī, of the Khwājah, Nizām-ud-Dīn, Aḥmad, who obtained his materials, up to the reign of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balban, from the work of our author; and not a single event is recorded in Firishtah that is not recorded in the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī. This will be quite clear to any one who will take the trouble to compare them. Firishtah, indeed, follows it so closely that, not only are the poetical quotations appropriated, but the errors also, as I have pointed out in my notes, have been faithfully copied by the Dakhānī author: where the one err the other is sure to follow.3

The English version of Briggs, "the admirable version," as a writer, who did not know the contents of Firishtah, calls it, is clearly based upon Dow's, with very slight alterations, and they are chiefly of a verbal kind. I should be sorry to be unjust to any author, but I submit that, where great, misleading, and glaring, historical errors, are as clear as the light of day, it is a duty towards the public, and in the interests of science, that they should be pointed out, even at the risk of "hurting the susceptibilities" of the authors of them or their friends, especially when such pernicious compilations as I have referred to, under the name of history, continue to be used in our colleges and schools, without the nature of them being known in its true light. The writers of them have much to answer for, but those who have adopted them in our public institutions a vast deal more. See, for example, note 4, page 312, and note, page 323.

One of the most glaring of the misstatements I refer to is that wherein the Turk sovereigns of Ghazānī, as well as the Tājzik rulers of Ghūr, are turned into "Pathāns" or "Afghāns," which words are synonymous, and "Pathāns" or "Afghāns" into Turks and Tājzik Ghūrīs. Dow, in the first place, is to blame for this, but Briggs blindly followed him 4 I say this advisedly. The proof is

3 A few examples of which may be seen in Note 9, page 441; and 4, page 653; last para. of Note 9, page 665; 4, page 697; and 4, page 711.
4 Examples of this will be found in Notes 3, page 204; 4, page 312; 4,
easy from any MS. of Firıštah's work, but with MSS. alone we need not rest content. We have only to compare Briggs's version with that lithographed edition printed at Bombay, to which Briggs put his name as editor and reviser, to prove my words.

Let us, for example, take any passage in Briggs' account of the Ghūris, or the history of the Turkish slave Sulṭāns of Dihlí—those, say, referred to at page 508 of this work—and in the Persian text which, according to the title-page, had the benefit of his editing and revision, not one word will be found respecting their being Afghāns, as contained in his "admirable translation:" all comes from Dow.

If this Translation of the Ṭabakāt-i-Nāṣiri, the original of which was published just six hundred and twenty-one years ago, and the notes accompanying it, disperse to the winds this error-bubble alone, I shall deem my time not lost, and the labour of years not thrown away, because, even since the publication of Sir H. Elliot's extracts from various Histories, which also showed how incorrect this "Pathán" theory was, Turks, Tajzik Ghūris, Turkish Slaves, Jāṭṣ, Sayyids, and others, continue to figure under the ridiculous name of "Pathán dynasties," up to this present day.6

I have already remarked that our author has mentioned the Afghāns but once in his History, and that very briefly, but, at the same time, most graphically [page 852], a body of them being in the pay of the Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzām. The Afghāns were by no means unfamiliar to our author, and he certainly knew the Ghūris better than any other author known to us, and he shows on that very page that they were a totally different race. In his account of the Shansabānis of Ghūr, and their dynasties, he simply stands unrivalled, and also in his accounts of the first Mughal invasions of the territories between Hirāt and Multān. The Afghāns appear at this time to have begun to take service under the Muḥammadan feudatories of the western border provinces of the Dihlí kingdom. They may have been in the

page 320; note 7, para. 4, page 321; note 8, page 404; 7, page 431; note 9, page 441; note 4, page 514; and 1, para. 5, page 794.
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habit of taking such service previously, but to no great extent I imagine, but, about this period, there was a particular reason for it—the confusion and convulsions caused throughout the vast tracts of country which formed the kingdom of the Ghaznavis and their subverters the Ghūrīs, styled Afghanistān by Europeans chiefly, through the irruptions, devastations, massacres, and final subversion of the Musalīmān rule by the hordes of infidel Mughals, by whom the country of the Afghāns was completely surrounded on the north, south, and west, while the only territory still held by a Musalīmān sovereign lay on the east—the Panj-āb—the western part of which also subsequently fell under the Mughal yoke. The limits of the true Afghanistān were prescribed by the mountains bounding the Kūraḵh valley and the territory of Kābul on the north, the Koh-i-Surḵh on the south, the territories of Ghaznīn and Kandahār on the west, and the Sulīmānī mountains or Koh-i-Siyāh on the east.

It will be observed that I have really commenced the Translation from Section VII.; and from that point it embraces the whole work. The first six, with the exception of the History of the early kings of I-rān, are not of much importance by reason of their brevity. The account of the I-rānī dynasties, which would require a volume to illustrate them, I have treated as a separate work, which, ere long, may see the light. To make the Translation in effect complete, however, I have given an abstract of the first six Sections.

The adulations addressed to, and constant prayers offered up for, the Sultān to whom the author dedicated, and after whom he named, his History, have been omitted or greatly reduced, and some of the introductions to the Sections also, which are of a similar style, have been cut short, but, in all other cases, I have not "compressed" the Translation in the least degree; and I may say that I have weighed every word and sentence, and have omitted nothing, not even the poetical quotations, having only rejected some of the longer portions when they have been of no interest, not necessary to the text, or of no particular merit. I have endeavoured to render the translation as nearly as possible in the author's own words, without being slavishly literal. It is however sufficiently
literal to assist a student, and yet readable by the English reader, though keeping much of a foreign complexion for various reasons. It is possible that in so long a work, published at intervals as completed, and not in a complete form at once, slight inconsistencies in punctuation and English (though not Persian, save through printers' errors) orthography may be here and there observable. Most English punctuation is haphazard, and left to the compositors, who, apparently, sometimes use it to denote breathing pauses; sometimes to help out the grammar. One may point sentences very much or very little, but whatever is done should be upon one system. Accordingly here, for the most part, the minute plan of what may seem to some over-much stopping is adopted, though not always, but no such absurdity is allowed to appear as a divorce of the verb from its subject by a single comma, and other errors of that sort, which come of printers attending entirely to pause and forgetting grammar.

Scholars will understand that there may be much to be said for more ways than one of spelling the same word in such a language as English.

This book, the text and notes together, will be found to be a very thesaurus of the most varied and often recondite historical material for the periods of which it treats, and many time-honoured historical errors have been pointed out and rectified. It wants but one thing to make it still more acceptable to the Student, and that is an Index. The Reviewers are tolerably sure to point this out for fear nobody else should see it. So the Translator begs to say, once for all, that he is too weary, and his time too valuable, to take up any such work. Meanwhile, The Index Society will have here a capital tough subject for their charitable exertions.

Besides the standard Histories mentioned in note 3, page 869, the following, among which are many rare, celebrated, and excellent, works, have been also used; and some of them have been extensively drawn upon. The majority, but not all, have been mentioned in the notes taken from them. From "the labours of" these authors "my predecessors" I have derived the utmost "assistance," and acknowledge it accordingly.
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The following Puṣhto or Afghan Chronicles have also been used:—The History of the Khashī sept of the Afghan nation, and their conquests beyond the river of Kābul, by Khwājū, the Matīzī; the Tārikh-i-Nisbat-i-Afgānīnah, by the Shaikh, 'Abd-ur-Razzāk, Matīzī; and the Tārikh-i-Murassā by Muḥammad Afzal Khān, Khaṭak.

I cannot close these remarks without tendering my sincere thanks to Doctor C. Rieu, Keeper of the Oriental
Manuscripts of the British Museum, for his kind and efficient assistance at all times, also to Professor Alois Sprenger of Wabern near Bern, and to Monsieur H. Zotenberg of the French National Library, who very kindly collated numerous passages for me.

The system of transliteration, adopted in the following pages, is that known as the system of Sir William Jones, which, after some thirty years' experience, the Translator conceives to be the easiest, as well as the most natural, and as easy of pronunciation [except, perhaps, the purely 'Arabic gutturals] as the original letters of the 'Arabic alphabet.

The vowels are three short — a, i, u, equivalent to — and — ; and three long—ā, ĩ, ū, equivalent to ی — ی — ی

All consonants, except the following, are pronounced precisely the same as in English: — th as th in thing, or lisped s; چ — ch, as ch in church; چ — h, strongly aspirated, which occurs only in purely 'Arabic words; گ — gh, as ch in loch, and as German ch; ۳ — d, pronounced by applying the tip of the tongue inverted to the palate; ژ — z, as th in thine, by 'Arabs, dth; ژ — r, as r uttered by striking the point of the tongue on the palate; ژ — jz, as s in pleasure, or soft French j; گ — sh, as sh in shell; گ — s, as ss in dissolve; گ — ژ, as dwd; ژ — t, as t with a slight aspiration; ژ — z, as English s with a slight aspiration; ژ — ', a deep guttural without any audible aspiration, and, when initial to a word, the ' is placed before its vowel, as in 'Ali, and, when not initial, after its preceding vowel, as in Ja'far and Râfî'; گ gh, a guttural sound like that produced in gargling, or Northumbrian r, and something similar to gh in ghost; ژ — k, another peculiar 'Arabic sound, produced by pressing back the root of the tongue to the throat, and partaking of the sound of k and q; ژ — h, slightly aspirated; at the end of a word it is often unaspirated. When ژ occurs at the end of a word preceded by ژ, the former is almost quiescent. The only diphthongs are ai and au.

From the above system the scholar can at once tell the original letters in the names of persons and places. Unless the peculiar letters are marked there is no knowing what they are meant for. For example; if the equivalent of گ
is not marked, we cannot tell whether the original was خ or the two letters س and س ٢; and if the Roman equivalents of س، and م، are all rendered by simple "s," how are we to know which is the letter meant?

As the work is rather more bulky than was anticipated at the outset, and may be perhaps more convenient in two volumes than in one, I have provided for binding it up into two volumes by giving two separate title-pages, as it can be conveniently divided at the commencement of Section XXII., page 719.

Rock House,
Milverton, Somerset,
12th January, 1881 A.D. 12th Safar, 1298 H.
MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR.

FEW materials exist for a notice of our author, and these are chiefly furnished by himself.

The first mention he makes of his family is to the effect that "the Imám, 'Abd-ul-Khālik, the Jūrjānī, having, in his early manhood, dreamt a dream on three successive occasions, urging him to proceed to Ghaznīn and seek a wife, set out thither; and, subsequently, obtained, in marriage, one of the forty daughters of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm of Ghaznīn," who was in the habit of bestowing his daughters, in marriage, upon reverend and pious Sayyids and 'Ulamā, like other Musalmān rulers have continued to do, down to recent times.

By this wife, 'Abd-ul-Khālik had a son, whom he named Ibrāhīm, after his maternal grandfather, the Sulṭān; and he was our author's great-grandfather. He was the father of the Maulānā, Minhāj-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān, who was the father of the Maulānā, Sarāj-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad—who is called Ibrāhīm by some—who was known by the title of 'Ujūbat-uz-Zamān—The Wonder of the Age. He was the father of the Maulānā, Minhāj-ud-Dīn,1 Abū-ʻUmar-i-'Uṣmān, the author of the following History, who thence often brings in his father's and grandfather's name, styling himself Minhāj-i-Sarāj-i-Minhāj, the two ḫāfats being used to signify son of in place of the Arabic bin.

Our author's ancestors, on both sides, for several generations, appear to have been ecclesiastics of repute, and men

---

distinguished for learning. He states that he possessed, among the mişāl or diplomas granted to his maternal ancestors by the Khalifahs, one from the Khalifah, Mustażī B‘illah, conferring the Kāzi-ship of the fortress, or rather, fortified town, of Tūlak, described in the following pages, together with that over the Kuhistān, and the Jibāl—Highlands—of Hirāt, upon his maternal grandfather, in conformity with the diploma previously held by the latter's father before him. His paternal grandfather also received an honorary dress from the same Pontiff; and our author says that he himself possessed the diploma which was sent along with it.

In the oldest copies of the text, and in several of the more recent, our author almost invariably styles himself 'the Jūrjānī'—จรจับฝ— as I have from the outset rendered it; but those M.S.S. previously referred to, which appear to have been copied from the same source as that from which the I.O.L. M.S. was taken, or from that copy itself, generally have جرjisاني—and sometimes Jūrjānī as above. If the point of ج—ز—be left out, as is very liable to be the case, like the points of other letters, by copyists, it is but simple ج—ر. Words containing long ُ—ُ—are often written with the short vowel ُسماح or ُبيح—instead of ج— and hence, in some few copies, it is جرjisاني—Jurjānī, while sometimes it is written both ways in the same M.S.

Since writing note 7, at page 321, giving an account of the Amīr, Mas‘ūd’s inroad into the northern parts of Ghūr, when on his way from Ghaznīn to Hirāt, I have considered that the word given by our author referred to the tract of country described in that note as the Gūzgānān, or the Gūzgāns, by Tājžiks, but which 'Arabs, and people of 'Arab descent, who use ج—ج— for the Tājžik گ—گ— turn into Jūzjānān, and that the word he uses in connexion with his own name refers to one of the Gūzgāns, and that he should be styled 'the Gūzgānī' or 'Jūzjānī.' As the most trustworthy copies of the text, the best and most correctly written, had Jūrjānī, I considered it necessary to follow them as I had begun, and to mention the matter more in detail here in the Memoir of the Author's life.

Gūzgān, as the native inhabitants styled it, or Jūzjān, is not the name of a single town, village, or fortress,
but one of the small districts or tracts of country among the mountains, on the north-west frontier of the country of Ghūr, and north of Hirāt, beyond the Murgh-Āb—the Jibāl of Hirāt, as he himself styles it—but its exact position, and the localities of most of the great fortresses mentioned by our author in the last Section of his work, are at present unknown to us. The Gū zgānān, or Gū zgāns were the appanage of the Amīr, Muhammad, brother of Mas'ūd; and it was from thence that he was brought when he assumed the throne of Ghaznīn after the death of his father. Notwithstanding the details which our author gives respecting the great fortresses of Ghūr, Ghārjistān, and other parts, including the fortress of Tūlak, which appears to have been his own place of residence at the time, and also the home of his maternal relatives (see page 1066 and note 4), which he helped to defend against the Mughal invaders, and which must have been situated in one of the Gū zgāns, he never once, throughout his whole work, refers to Gū zgān or Jū zgān, except in connexion with his own name. See also notes to pages 186 and 232.

After the Ghūrīs obtained possession of Lāhor in 582 H., and they had seized the Sultān, Khusrāw Malik, the last of the Sultāns of Ghaznīn, our author's father was made Kāzī of the Ghūrīān army stationed at Lāhor, under the Sipah-Sālār, 'Alī-i-Kar-māk; and twelve camels were assigned him for the conveyance of the establishment of his office, his tribunal, etc., on the line of march.

Our author was born after this, in the year 589 H., the very year in which Dihlī, of which, and of which Musalmān kingdom, he was subsequently to become the chief Kāzī and Ṣadr, was made the seat of the Musalmān government in Hindūstān by the Turk Mamlūk, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, who was, in after-years, to become its first Mu'hammadan Sultān. That our author was born at Lāhor, as the Dāghistānī, referred to farther on, asserts, cannot be correct; for, from what he himself states respecting his arrival at Uchchah in 624 H. [see pages 541 and 722], that was the first time he set foot in Hind. Had he been born at Lāhor, he would, doubtless, have mentioned it, and he would probably have been styled and known as the Lāhori in consequence.

The next mention he makes of his father is, that, when
MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR.

Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, ruler of Bāmīān and Tūkhrāristān, succeeded his father on the throne, he desired that our author's father, the Maulānā, Sarāj-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, should take up his residence in his kingdom, and enter his service. With the sanction of his own sovereign and patron, and Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām's suzerain, namely, the Sultān of Ghūr, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, the Maulānā proceeded to the Court of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, and was made Kāżī of the kingdom of Bāmīān and Tūkhrāristān, with the judicial administration over its forces, was made censor, with full powers as regards ecclesiastical law, and intrusted with the charge of two colleges, and their funds. This happened in 591 H., when our author was in his third year. He states that the diploma conferring these offices upon his father, in the handwriting of the Wazīr of the Bāmīān state, was still contained in the kharīṭah [a bag of embroidered silk for holding documents] containing his own diplomas, his banner, and turban of honour.

The mother of our author was the foster-sister and school-mate of the Princess, Māh Malik, the daughter of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, mention of which lady will be found in several places in the following pages; and his mother appears to have continued in her service after her marriage. Our author distinctly states that his early years were passed in the Haram of the Princess, until the period of his entering upon adolescence, when, according to Musalmān usages, he had to be sent elsewhere. He speaks in terms of much gratitude of the fostering kindness and protection he received while dwelling in that Princess's household. Under these circumstances, Lāhor can scarcely have been the place of his birth.

When Sultān Takīsh, Khwārazm Shāh, withdrew his allegiance from the Khalīfah, Un-Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn-Ullah, and the latter's troops had been defeated by him, Ibn-ur-Rabbī', and Ibn-ul-Khaṭīb, on two different occasions, came as envoys to the Courts of the Sultāns of Ghūr and Ghaznīn, to demand aid from these monarchs against Sultān Takīsh. In consequence, the Imām, Shams-ud-Dīn, the Turk, and the Maulānā, Sarāj-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Tājgīk, our
author's father, were directed to proceed to Baghddd, to the Khalifah's Court, along with the envoys. They set out for Baghddd by way of Mukran; and, in some affray into which they fell on the road, they were attacked by a band of robbers, and our author's father was killed. Intimation of his death was received in a communication from the Khalifah to the Sulthan, Ghiyas-ud-Din, Muhammad-i-Sam, in these words: “Furthermore, Saraj-i-Minhaj perished in an affray on the road. The Almighty recompense him!"

Another of our author's relatives, his mother's brother's son, was Ziy-ud-Din, Muhammed, son of 'Abd-us-Sallam, Kazi of Tulak, who was left in command of the fortress of Tabarhindah, with a force of 1200 Tulakis, by the Sulthan, Muizz-ud-Din, Muhammed-i-Sam, when that Sulthan was about to retire from Hind before the hot season of 587 H., intending to return after it was over and relieve him. The Kazi of Tulak was to hold the place for seven months; but, as the Sulthan, just after this arrangement was made, was defeated by Rae Pithorah, and severely wounded in the battle, and an expedition into Khurasan soon after intervened, he was totally unable to come to the Kazi's relief, as agreed upon, in the following season, and, consequently, after having held out over thirteen months, the Kazi, Ziy-ud-Din, Muhammed, had to capitulate.

At the time Sulthan Ghiyas-ud-Din, Mahmid, son of Ghiyas-ud-Din, Muhammed-i-Sam, was assassinated by the Khwarrazm refugees, in Safar, 607 H., our author was dwelling at Firuz-koh, and was then in his eighteenth year.

In 611 H., the year preceding the surrender of his capital, Firuz-koh, by the last of the Sulthans of the Ghurri dynasty,

---

1 He was despatched on this mission by Ghiyas-ud-Din, Muhammed-i-Sam, Sulthan of Ghur, the elder brother and suzerain of Muizz-ud-Din, Muhammed, Sulthan of Ghazin, who, in a paper in the "Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal," Part I., No. I., for 1880, page 28, by Mr. C. R. Stüppnagel, is styled Muwas-ud-din. The writer is at a loss to know why the elder brother's name appears on his younger brother's coins, and informs us that "of Sulthan Ghias-ud-din scarcely anything is known." I beg to recommend him to study the twenty-three pages respecting him in the following translation, and to refer to note 6, page 472, and 8, page 489. Here again "Muwas" is turned into "the first Pathan king of Dehil!" See also Part I., No. II., page 84, of the "Journal."
our author proceeded thither. Two years after we find him in Sijistān, at Zaranj, the capital, where he remained some time. At this period the whole of the territories which had formed the empire of the Ghūris, including the dominions of Ghaznīn, and extending east of the Indus into the upper part of the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah of the Panj-āb as far as the Jhilam, had fallen under the sway of the Khwārazmis. These events must, in some way, have been the cause of his sojourn in Sijistān for seven months, but he is quite silent on the causes which led him there. See page 195.

In 617 H., during the first inroad of the Mughals into Ghūr and Khurāsān, before the Chingiz Khān himself crossed the Oxyx with his main army, our author was living at Tūlak; and, shortly after, in the same year, took part in the defence of that fortified town against the invaders, who kept prowling about it for about eight months. During a period of four years, from the above mentioned year up to the close of 620 H., during which the Mughals made several attempts upon it, he helped to defend it.

In 618 H., the year in which he says the Chingiz Khān crossed the Jihūn into Khurāsān, and he was in his thirtieth year, he married the daughter of a kinsman of his own; and, in 620 H., he determined, as soon as circumstances permitted, to leave his native country, and proceed into Hindūstān, not liking, apparently, to dwell in a country overrun by the Mughal infidels. In 621 H. he was despatched from Tūlak, where he was then living, and in the defence of which against the Mughals he had just taken part, by Malik Taj-ud-Din, Hasan-i-Khar-post, to Isfīzār, after Khurāsān had become clear of Mughals, and from thence into the Kuhistān—the Chingiz Khān had, at that time, returned homewards—to endeavour to arrange for the re-opening of the kārwān routes, which, during the Mughal invasion, had been closed, and the traffic suspended.

On a second occasion, in 622 H., he again proceeded from Tūlak into the Kuhistān for the same purpose, at the request of Malik Rukn-ud-Din, Muḥammad, son of 'Uṣmān, the Maraghani, of Khāesār of Ghūr, the father of
Malik Shams-ud-Din, Muḥammad, the first of the Kurat dynasty, as the Tājīl—not Afghān, I beg leave to say—rulers of the sīfs of Hirāt and Ghūr and their dependencies, who were the vassals of the Mughals, were styled. The following year he again set out on a journey into the Kūhīstān, on the part of Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, that the kārwān route might be re-opened. From Khāesār he first went to Farāh, and from thence proceeded by way of Sijistān into the territory referred to, and returned to Khāesār again.

In 623 Ḥ., our author, who appears to have left Tūlak and was residing at Khāesār, with the permission of Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, went to Farāh in order to purchase a little silk required by him for his journey into Hindūstān. Having arrived in the neighbourhood of Farāh, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīghīn, the Khwārazmī, who then ruled over Sijistān, and was engaged in war with the Mulāḥīdah of the Kūhīstān, induced him to undertake a journey into the latter territory, to endeavour to bring about an accommodation between himself and the Mulāḥīdah governor of that part, the Muḥtashīm, Shams-ud-Dīn. Our author was accompanied by the son of Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, whose name is not mentioned, but, in all probability, it was the identical Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the founder of the Kurat dynasty. Our author succeeded in effecting an accommodation, but it does not appear to have been on terms acceptable to Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīghīn, for he wished him to return to the Muḥtashim’s presence and declare war again. This he declined to do, as he had several times put off his journey into Hind, and was now desirous of departing without further delay, and before the Mughals should again appear. Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tīghīn, was wroth at this refusal, and shut him up within the walls of the fortress of Ṣafhīd of Sijistān. There he was detained for a period of forty-three days, but, Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, having interfered in his behalf, he was set at liberty.

He did not allow the grass to grow under his feet after this; and in the fifth month of the following year—Jamādi-ul-Awwal, 624 Ḥ., [in another place he says it was Rajab, the seventh month, while in another place—page 612—he
says it was in 625 H.], by way of Ghaznīn and Banīān, he reached Uchchah by boat; and, in the following Zi-Ḥijjah, Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḭabā-jah, ruler of Uchchah and Multān, placed him in charge of the Firūzī College at Uchchah, and made him Ḷāṣī of the forces of his son, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh.

Our author could distinguish the winning side, and preferred it; for, no sooner had Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, ruler of Dīlī, ᬐabā-jah's rival, appeared before Uchchah, than he deserted ᬐabā-jah and the Firūzī College, and went over to his rival. In the first place, our author presented himself before Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān, who was in command of the van of I-yal-timish's forces; and, a few days after, I-yal-timish himself having arrived, he waited on him. He was favourably received, and was appointed to officiate, in his priestly capacity, within that Sulṭān's camp. After the fall of Uchchah, he accompanied I-yal-timish to Dīlī; and reached it in Ramaẓān, 625 H.

He subsequently accompanied the Sulṭān, in his priestly capacity, to Gwāliyūr in 629 H.; and, in the following year, after that stronghold was taken possession of, was made Ḷāṣī, Ḫaṭṭīb, and Imām of Gwāliyūr and its dependencies, under the governor, Rashīd-ud-Dīn, 'Alī. In the early part of Sulṭān Raẓiyyat's reign he returned to Dīlī, but he was not removed from office, neither was he a "forgiven rebel;" 3 and, during his absence from Gwāliyūr, his Deputies acted for him. On reaching the capital, in 635 H., that sovereign added to his offices that of Superintendent of the Naṣīrīah College at Dīlī.

In the year 639 H., in the reign of Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, our author was made Chief Ḷāṣī of the Dīlī kingdom, and of the capital as well. In the disturbances which arose between that Sulṭān and his Amīrs, our author, and other ecclesiastics, endeavoured to bring about a peaceful accommodation, but without effect. In Zi-Ḵa'dah of the same year, the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr, bribed a number of villains to murder him; and, after the conclusion of the Friday's prayers, on

---

the 7th of that month, they actually attacked him in the Jāmi' Masjid, but he escaped without hurt.

Soon after, on the accession of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, on the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, being re-appointed Wazīr, our author, in 640 H., resigned the Chief Kāzī-ship, and in Rajab of that year left Dihlī in order to proceed into the territory of Lakhānawatī. There he remained about two years, and there he acquired his information respecting it and its rulers. While residing in that country, he accompanied Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān in his expedition against the Rāe of Jāj-Nagar, and was present at the attack on the frontier post of Katāsin, in Shawwāl, 641 H. On the removal of that Malik from the government of Lakhānawatī in 643 H., our author accompanied him on his return to Dihlī, and, in Şafar of that year, presented himself at Court. Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn had in the meantime been put to death by the Amīrs; and, through the interest and efforts of his subsequent munificent patron, Malik Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn, Balban (afterwards Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam, and subsequently Sulṭān of Dihlī), who held the office of Amīr-i-Ḥājib, three days after his return, he was put in charge of the Naṣīridah College once more, and entrusted with the administration of its endowments, the lecture-ship of the Jāmi' Masjid, and the Kāzī-ship of Gwāliyūr, according to the previous grant. Subsequently, in the same year, he accompanied the army which advanced to the banks of the river Bīāh for the relief of Úchchah when invested by the Mughals.

In 644 H., at Jalhandar [in the Panj-āb], on the return of the army, on the occasion of performing the services prescribed for the ʿId-i-Aẓhā in the hall of the College there, the new Sulṭān, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, to whom this History is dedicated, presented our author with a cloak, a turban, and a richly caparisoned horse. In 645 H., he wrote a description, in verse, of the expedition against Talsandah, entitled the "Naṣīrid Nāmah." The Sulṭān rewarded him for this with a yearly stipend, and Malik Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn, Balban, the hero of the poem, and commander of the expedition, gave him the revenues of a village in the Hānsī province, which was that Malik's fief at that period. In
649 H., for the second time, the Chief Kāzī-shi[p of the Dihli kingdom, with jurisdiction over the capital as well, was conferred upon him; but, when, two years after, in 651 H., the eunuch, 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān, succeeded in his conspiracy for the removal from office of our author's patron, who had been raised to the title of Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam in 647 H., and he was banished the Court, our author, like others of the Ulugh Khān's clients and supporters, was removed from the office of Chief Kāzī, and it was conferred upon one of the Rayhāni's creatures, notwithstanding our author stood so high in the estimation of the weak and puppet Sultān. In 652 H., matters improved a little: a new Wazīr succeeded; and, while in the Kol district, whither our author appears to have accompanied the Sultān's Court, the title of Sadr-i-Jahān⁴ was conferred upon him.

At the close of the following year the Rayhāni was ousted from office, the Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam again assumed the direction of affairs, and our author, who, for months past, had been unable, for fear of his life, to leave his dwelling, even to attend the Friday's service in the Jāmi' Masjid, was, in Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 653 H., for the third time, made Chief Kāzī of the Dihli kingdom, with jurisdiction over the capital as before.

With the exception of his remark at page 715, in winding up the events of the year 658 H., that if his life should be spared—he was then in his seventieth year—and aptitude should remain, whatever events might subsequently occur would be recorded, our author henceforward disappears from the scene, and we hear no more of him. At the end of his account of the Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam farther on, he does not renew that promise, nor does he do so when finally closing his History. The munificent rewards he received on presenting copies of his work to the Sultān and to the latter's father-in-law, the Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam, are mentioned at page 1294. He refers to his family casually, now and then, in the following pages, but, with a single exception, enters into no particulars whatever. At page 820 he says, with reference to the Malik-ul-Ḥujjāb [Head of the Chamberlains], 'Alā-ud-Dīn, the Zinjānī, that he is "his son, and the light of his eyes;" but he could not have been

⁴ See page 698, and note ⁸.
his son from the fact of his being styled "the Zinjānī," that is to say, a native of Zinjān in Khurāsān. He may have been his son-in-law, or an adopted son.

When the emissaries from Khurāsān were received by the Sultan, Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, as related at page 857, our author composed a poem befitting the occasion, and this, he says, was read before the throne by one of his sons. He also, in one place, refers to a brother.

Between the time when our author closes this History in 658 H., and the Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam succeeded to the throne of Dīlī under the title of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, in 664 H.—the date generally accepted, although Faṣīḥ-i says it was in 662 H.—is a period of about six years; and, as no other writer that we know of has recorded the events of that period, it is a complete blank in Indian History, which, I fear, cannot be filled up. Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Barani, in his Tārīkh-i-Firuz-Shāhī, which is not much to be depended on, says he takes up the relation of events from the time our author left off, but this is not correct, for he begins with the reign of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Balban.

Our author died in his reign, but when cannot be discovered, neither can the place of his burial. Possibly some inscription may hereafter turn up which may tell us, but there is no record available in any of the works I have waded through in search of the information. Whether his health failed him; whether he grew out of favour with his old patron, the new Sultan; or whether circumstances arose which, as regards the Ulugh Khān's conduct towards the weak-minded, but amiable, Sultan, Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, would not bear the light of day—for there are vague statements of foul play on the part of the Ulugh Khān, but no proofs—who shall say? Some writers state that the Sultan died a natural death, which is most probable, and some further add that he, having neither offspring nor heir, nominated his father-in-law, the Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam, his successor, which was but natural, seeing that, for nearly twenty years, he had virtually ruled the state. That the Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam poisoned him appears unworthy of credence, since, had he desired to supplant him, or get rid of him, he might have effected either object years before. See note 4, page 716.
The only mention I can find, after much search, respecting these years, between the closing of our author's History and the accession of the new Sultan, is the following from Fašīh-i. "Sultan Nāšir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, died in this year, 662 H., and great anarchy and disorder arose throughout the territory of Hindūstān. At last, since among the great Amirs of Hind, for prudence, counsel, wisdom, munificence, dignity, magnificence, and power, the Amir, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn [the Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿẓam] was preeminently distinguished, and as he had obtained his freedom previously—a matter never alluded to by our author—he, with the unanimous accord of the great nobles and grandees of the kingdom, ascended the throne of Dihli in the beginning of this year, 662 H."

The Dāghistānī, previously referred to, in his Taṣkīrah, under the letter س—s—has the following:—"Sarāj-ud-Dīn-i-Minhāj is the author of the Ṭabakāt-i-Nāṣirī, which he completed in the name of the Malik of Hind, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn. His birthplace was Lāhor, and his origin was from Samr-ḵand."

This last sentence of the Dāghistānī's is sufficient to show that he is not entirely to be depended upon, in this instance at least. Our author's family was from Samr-ḵand. The Dāghistānī also gives the following as a quatrain of our author's:—

"That heart which, through separation, thou madest sad;  
From every joy that was, which thou madest bare of;  
From thy disposition I am aware that, suddenly and unexpectedly,  
The rumour may arise that thou hast broken it."

In the "Akbār-ul-Akhīr"—a Biographical Collection of Notices of Saints—of 'Abd-ul-Ḥaḳḳ [he died 1052 H. = 1642 A.D.], the following will be found respecting our author:—"The Shaikh, Kāzī Minhāj, the Jurjānī, the author of the Ṭabakāt-i-Nāṣirī, was a saint, and one of the most learned and excellent of his time, and one of those who would become filled with religious ecstasies on hearing the singing at Zikrs or Taṣkīrs. When he became Kāzī of Hindūstān that office assumed integrity and rectitude. The Shaikh, Niẓām-ud-Dīn, states:—"I used, every Monday,

4 This, probably, is no other than the celebrated saint of Dihlī.
to go to his Tażkirs, until, one day, when I was present at one of them, he delivered this quatrain:—

"'The lip, in the ruby lips of heart-ravishers delighting,
And to ruffle the dishevelled tresses essaying,
To-day is delightful, but to-morrow it is not—
To make one's self like as straw, fuel for the fire.'"

"'When I heard this verse,' says the Shaikh, Nizām-ud-Dīn, 'I became as one beside myself; and it was some time before I came to my senses again.'"

Our author appears to have been deeply imbued with the tenets of Şūfi-ism, for a brief essay on which, see the Introduction to my "Poetry of the Afghāns." Professor Sprenger tells me that he was a notorious Şūfi. A good account of these Zikrs, or Tażkirs, will be found in the notes to the Third Chapter of Lane's "Thousand and One Nights."

Before closing this brief memoir of our author, it will be necessary to mention the reasons which led him to write this History. These he gives in the Preface dedicating the work to the Sulṭān, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, and this divested of much of its fulsome adulation and redundant expressions, may well appear as the Preface to this translation of his History.
THE AUTHOR’S PREFACE \textsuperscript{1} AND DEDICATION.

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate!

Thus sayeth Abū-'Umar-i-'Uṣmān, son of Muḥammad-al-Minhāj-al-Jurjānī, that, when, through the blessing of Almighty God, the diadem and throne of the dominion of Hindūstān became graced by [encircling] the blessed head, and adorned by [being pressed by] the august foot of that Lord of the World, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Abū-Il-Muẓaffar-i-Maḥmūd Shāh, son of the Sulṭān, I-yal-timish—May his reign long continue!—and the khuṭbah and coin became embellished with his titles and his name, and, during the reign of which august sovereign, the justice-seat of the Ẓāzi-ship of the empire of Hindūstān was consigned to this loyal servant, on a certain occasion, in the tribunal of law and justice, a book came under his observation which the learned and worthy of former times had compiled \textsuperscript{2} for the edification of the select and distinguished of posterity. This had been taken from the annals of the Prophets and Khalifahs—On whom be peace!—together with their genealogies, and the histories of the reigns of great Malik[s] of bygone times—The splendour of the Almighty illumine their tombs!—and had been written down in tabulated forms, and abbreviated after the manner

\textsuperscript{1} This Preface varies in some copies, particularly at the commencement, to the extent of a page or more.

\textsuperscript{2} I do not find any trace in the Preface to either of the copies collated, of the "tabular chronicle compiled by the Imām Mohammad Ali Abu l-Kāsim Imādī, in the time of Nāṣir ol-dīn Soboktikīn," mentioned by Col. Lees, LL.D., in the English Preface to the Calcutta Printed Text, nor is it to be found in its Persian Preface. The words are جمع الأئل سكك The Imām's "Tārīkh-i-Majdūl" is mentioned in Section XI.
of an epitome, in the time of the Sultāns of the dynasty of Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Sabuk-Tīgīn—The Almighty guard their last resting-place!—from every flower-garden a flower; from every sea a drop, they had brought together [in this book]. After mentioning the Prophets, and giving their genealogies, and that of the Khalīfahs of the Bani-Um-miyah and Bani-Abbās, the Malik of 'Ajām, and the Akāsirah, they rested content with an account of the family of the august Sultān, Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgīn-i-Ghāzī—On whom be peace!—and abstained from any mention of other great Malik, or the dynasties or annals of the Sultāns of the past.

This frail one desired, therefore, that this meagre History should be filled up from first to last, from beginning to end, with an account of the whole of the Malik and Sultāns of Islām, both of 'Arab and of 'Ajām, and that a candle out of every dynasty should be enkindled in this assembly, and that, to the head of every race, a cap might be stitched, by the relation of events and occurrences and illustrious actions. Therefore, an account is recorded here, of the Tubbā-yawa' of Yaman, and the Ḥimyar Malik; and, after mention of the Khalīfahs, an account of the Tāhiris, Sūfāris, Sāmānis, the dynasty of Buwīah, the Saljūks, Rūmīs, Shansabānis, and the Sultāns of that family who were sovereigns of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, and Hind, the Khwārazm-Shāhs, the Kurd Malik who are Sultāns of Shām, and the Muʿizzīzah Malikis and Sultāns, who became Rādshāhs on the thrones of Ghaznīn and of Hind, up to the present time, which is the reign of the heir to the diadem and throne of the dominions of the I-yal-timish dynasty and house,

Sultān-ul-Muʿazzam, Sultān-us-Salāṭīn Fl-l-ʿĀlamīn,
NAṢĪR-UD-DUNYA WA-UD-DĪN,
ABŪ-L MUZAFFAR-I-MAḤMŪD SHĀḤ,
Yamin-i-Khalīfah Ullah, Kāsim-i-Amir-ul-Mūminīn
—Khuld Ullah Salṭanataluh!*


b
and this History is reduced to writing, and adorned with his august titles and name, and is entitled the

TABAḴĀT-I-NĀŠIRĪ.

It is his implicit hope, through the perfect grace of the Creator, the Most High and Holy, that, when this book shall be honoured by the blessed sight of this Bādshāh, the Asylum of the World, it may meet with the felicity of his approbation; and that from the zenith of the firmament of benefaction, and the summit of the sphere of favour, a ray of the royal grace may shine upon this frail one; and, after his removal from this temporary dwelling, from its readers may a kind invocation endure; and, should they become cognizant of any error or omission, may they veil it with the skirt of the robe of forgiveness, since whatever was to be found in trustworthy chronicles is herein recorded.

4 In Elliot, vol. II., page 261, the editor, Mr. Dowson, tells us that, "The eulogistic way in which he [our author] always speaks of the successor of Nāṣiru-d din would induce the belief that the work appeared in the reign of that Sultān, and the fact is proved by his more than once offering up an ejaculatory prayer for the continuance of his reign." Again, at page 362 of the same work, in a foot-note, we are informed that "The text says 'the Sultān (may God prolong his reign)', plainly showing that this part of the work [the notice of Ulugh Khan—the text at page 807 of this Translation is referred to] was written in the reign of Balban." What our author says above, as well as his other statements noticed in the body of the work, and up to it very conclusion, are, perhaps, undoubted proofs that this work was neither written, nor appeared, in Balban's reign.