ADDITIONAL NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

There is some disadvantage in publishing an extensive History of this kind in parts after each portion is completed, because any extra information obtained during the progress of the work cannot be inserted in its proper place. To remedy this, as much as possible, I have embodied here such further information in the form of Additional Notes and Emendations.

Page 34. — Further research shows that Arg or Ark—ṣl — is an error of the copyists for Ük — ṣl — the ḥ having been mistaken for ḫ, as suggested in note 8. The word is correctly given in the last Section. See pages 1120, 1124, and note, page 1122, para. 5. It was a celebrated fortress of Sijistān, and was still an important place when Amīr Timūr took it.

Page 36. — "Sanjarīs," in note 9, taken from Faṣīḥ-ī, is an error for Sijīzīs or Sigīzīs, that is to say Sijistāns or Sigistāns. See note 6, page 34. This error is frequently made by oriental authors as well as scribes.

Page 52, note 9. — All the copies of the text are wrong with respect to this word, and have ḫ for ẓ. Üz-ḵand of Turkistān is meant, not Ürgānḫ the capital of Khwārazm. See note 7, page 1097.

Page 68, line 5. — There is no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the text here respecting Sabuk-Tīgīn’s nickname ; and that one man could possibly be nicknamed “black troop,” or “black uproar,” is very improbable. See note 4, page 852, and Elliot’s India, vol. viii., page xii., where, if not “ghauhd,” there is, at least, “ghubār-angesi.” I have not followed the printed text in this Translation, because it is very incorrect as well defective.

The Turk Amīr-ul-Umarā of Baghdād, who was accidentally killed by some Kurds in 329 H., bore the name of Buj-kum [بوجکم], as written with the vowel points, which is the same word as I supposed that applied to Sabuk-Tīgīn to be from the way it was written in one copy of the text, which Turkish word means, in the Tājīk language, ghajz-ghāo [غژگاو]. See the last para. of note 4, and the Bodleian copy of the Kitāb-ul-Kāmil of ʻIzz-ud-Dīn-i-Ibn-ul-Āṣīr, under the year 329 H. It is therefore quite clear that Jūk [not Ḥūk (حوك)], which is the same word less the vowel point of (_: left out by the copyists : a similar name occurs at page 477], entitled Sabuk-Tīgīn, was, by his Turkish comrades, nicknamed “the Karā Buj-kum,” the Tājīk translation of which is “the Siyah Ghajz-Ghāo,” which is the Kutās of Mīrzā Hādār, the Doḡlātī Mughal, who gives a description of that immense and formidable animal. The English translation thereof is “The Black Wild Yāk,” siyaḥ here signifying furious as well as black, and the Turkish ḫarā will bear the same construction. See note at page 922, and at 948, para. 2.

Page 77, note 8, para. 1. — There is no doubt whatever as to the point of junction of the rivers of Nūr and Қīrāt at Darūnṭhah, now a well-known place. The words in the original are انور و قراث but the printer has carelessly let
the drop out after the type was set up, and the proof passed for press. I have described the Darah of Nūr, as well as Daruṅțahā, in my "Notes on Afgānīstān," page 168, and there they will be found. Mr. Dowson appears to have forgotten what is contained in his second vol., page 465. See also vol. i., page 394, which is certainly amusing.

Page 95.—The fortress of Gfrī here mentioned, I believe, refers to the fortress of Gibar Kot in Bājnawr. See "Notes on Afgānīstān," page 117.

The word "Tafkīf" in para. 5 should be "Tīghaf." 

Page 101.—The singular of the word murghān [مұرغان], which I have rendered "carrier pigeons," "signifies a bird absolutely" [نғاير], and not a fowl only, as Mr. Dowson imagined; and as fowls do not carry news, and carrier pigeons are referred to by the same word as is here used in note 4, page 1280, para. 4, I had no hesitation in adopting the rendering I have. Another proof that carrier pigeons were meant is the fact that one day was not sufficient to convey the news from Ghazānī to the fortress of Bāz-Ghīnī, afterwards known as Kīshk-i-Sūltān, for that was at Frīz-Koh, a distance of about 240 miles as the crow flies, and a very difficult tract of country to traverse.

Pages 104, 105.—There is an error here respecting our author's ancestors, caused by some confusion in most copies of the text, which have "great-great-grandfather," whereas, from his statements elsewhere, his third ancestor, or great-grandfather is meant. It should stand "great-grandfather" at page 104, and "That princess bore him a son, whom he named Ibrāhīm, and he was the father of the Maulānā, Minhāj-ud-Dīn, 'Uṣmān-i-Ibrāhīm, upon whom be the mercy of the Almighty!" The Maulānā, Minhāj-ud-Dīn, was the father of the Maulānā, Sarāj-ud-Dīn," etc., etc.

Page 106.—The text is not —"chand bārah wa ḥaṣbah"—as Mr. Dowson imagined; and even if it were, although bārah means "walls," it does not mean "a fortification," much less "fortifications," but the text has—bārah—not "bārah," and no— and the signification, of the sentence, in the idiom of the East, is as rendered in the Translation. The very same word occurs at page 821— 822 of the printed text—but that Mr. Dowson leaves untranslated. See also printed text, page 259 and page 1294 of this Translation.

Mr. Dowson (Elliot's India, vol. v., p. xi.) is very wroth with me about my criticisms, to one of the errors in which work the above refers, and says he has "noticed them, and examined them seriatim," but this is a mistake, and the "Cradle of Irāk," in note 4, page 107, is one of very many others to which, very wisely, he has not referred.

Page 107.—The words of the text are not as Mr. Dowson assumed, except in the printed text, in which, two words have been left out before and the first is redundant. The reason why Arsalān assumed the throne in the Garmšīr, instead of waiting until he reached Ghazānī, the capital, is elsewhere explained.

Page 112, note 4, para. 2.—There seems to be an error of ten years here. The writer doubtless meant the year of the Ribāt, instead of the Hijrāt, which would make a difference of ten years. Our author distinctly states, at page 111, that Bahrīm Shāh was succeeded by his son, Khusrau Shāh, in 552 H. See note 4, and note 5, page 347.

Page 115.—Our author has made a mistake here, or rather, his copyists for him, of ten years, for, as related at pages 457, 458, and in other places, the campaign against Sultān Shāh in Khurāsān occurred in 587 H. See also Appendix A., page 11.
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Page 122, note 9.—The proper title and names of this Chief are "Amr 'Imād-ud-Daulah, Dā'īd-i-Jaghar Beg, or Jagharī Beg," son of Miftā'il [Faṣīb-i says, son of Tagharī Beg], son of Abū-Sultān, son of Saljūk. The word Miftā'il has been left out accidentally after Jaghar Beg.

Page 154, line 6 after poetry.—The word Kābālik, written in the text, is an error for Kāblīk—قبرLIKE—the i was made i by the copyists. For the details respecting it see page 900, and note 2. Karā-Khiṭā in the same paragraph should be Karā-Khiṭā, the latter word, or Karā-Khiṭā, being the proper name, the substantive, applied to the country, and the former, the adjective, applied to the people, as correctly given a few lines under, and farther on.

Pages 159, 160.—Kizil is the more correct mode of writing this Turkish word, signifying "red," and so it should be read in all cases.

Page 162, note 4.—The Nū-fān or Nū-yān, Tājū, is the same leader as is mentioned at page 1237, and is the Tānjū of the Pro-Mughal writers. See note at page 1191, line 10.

Page 163, note 4, line 9.—"Abghā" Khān cannot be correct, for the period indicated was the interregnum which occurred between the death of Kyūl Khān, and the accession of Mangū Ka'tān in 648 H. Ab-ghā, Ab-kā, Abāghā, or Abākā Khān, Hulākū's son, appears to be referred to here, and he only succeeded his father in 661 H. See note at page 1287, para. 2.

Page 164, line 15.—The Nū-fān, Aljāktā, here mentioned, is the Aljāktāe, or, more correctly, Iljīdāe, Iljīkhīdāe, or Iljīkhtāe, as it is variously written, the desolator of Hirāt. Much about the latter Sulṭāns of Rūm will be found in note 7, page 1261.

Page 188.—The campaign against Khiṭā mentioned here refers to the war with the Gūr Khān of Karā-Khiṭāe, mentioned at pages 261 and 934.

Page 201.—"Arg of Sīstān," This refers, as previously mentioned, to xCD. According to the Pro-Mughal writers, the investment took place in 627 H., but it actually commenced in 625 H., and terminated in 627 H., the place having held out nineteen months. See page 1120.

Page 224 and note 8.—The chroniclers of the Crusades say that "it was proposed that Joan of Sicily, sister of Richard Cœur de Lion, should be given in marriage to Saphaddin," as they write the title, Saif-ud-Dīn, "and that Jerusalem should be yielded to the partes in this strange alliance." The Princess, however, refused to give her consent, and so the affair came to nothing.

Page 233, line 6.—After Muḥammad there should be an isāfat, namely, "Muḥammad-i-'Uṣmān," because 'Uṣmān was his father. See page 1198.

Page 233, line 12, and note 6.—Subārī is the same place as is referred to at page 227, and again at page 237, where it is said to be in Türkistan.

Page 235, line 12.—This well-known place is called Guzarwān, and Juzarwān by 'Arabs, and people of 'Arab descent. Its correct name, according to the pronunciation of the people inhabiting it, was Gijarwān, as mentioned in the note below. See note 8, pages 257 and 258, and pages 376 and 475.

Page 239, note 1.—There is an error here: it should be sixteen, not "eight" years, for, from 551 H., as mentioned in the preceding note 8, to 567 H., is a period of sixteen years.

Page 254, line 18.—At page 240 the Khān of Kitchak is styled Akārān or Ikārān. This was his Turkish name, and Kadr, which is 'Arabic—Kadr Khān—his Musalmān title only. Our author, to avoid confusion, ought to have given both.
Page 257, note 3, line 7.—Shihāb was his first title, by which some Indian Muḥammadan writers, who knew not the fact of the change, nearly, if not always, incorrectly style him. His elder brother and sovereign assumed a new title on ascending the throne, and a new one was also assigned to Shihāb-ud-Dīn, his brother. See page 370.

Page 260, and note 5, para. 5.—Kūlj Khān cannot refer to the Gūr Khān, for his Khīṭā-i name, which is very different, is given at page 928, and Kūlj is again mentioned distinct from the Gūr Khān.

Page 263, note 1.—The frontiers of Jund are referred to here; and the correct name of the territory referred to in the following para. is Saghnāk, as confirmed by other writers.

Page 267.—The Kadr Khān, son of Yūsuf, here mentioned, is the same person as is referred to at page 1097, as son of Šafaktān-i-Yamak. It appears, therefore, that, in this instance also, Yūsuf is his Musalmān name, and Šafaktān his Turkish name. The Yīghur, or İghūr, here mentioned, and at page 270, is written Saghar at page 960, which see, also note 6 to that page.

Page 267, note 9, to “this very year” should have been added “according to some,” for, as given farther on, the first month of 617 H. was the year of the Sultān’s flight. See note 5, para. 2, page 972, and page 274.

Page 268, note 4, line 5.—Takrit is an error of the writer from whose work the extract was taken. It should be Makrit, a well-known tribe; and Karakuram is an error, often made, for Karakum. These errors have been rectified at page 1097.

Page 270, para. 3, line 6.—“Tingit.” The name of this country is written Tingkut by the Pro-Mughal writers.

Page 270, and note 7.—The Sayyid, Bahā-ud-Dīn, is a totally different person from the Badr-ud-Dīn of Guzīdah, and Aḥmad, the Khujandī. The Sayyid was a man of high position and dignity, and is again referred to at page 963, where the subject is more fully detailed.

Page 280, and note 9.—The movements of the Chingiz Khān and his sons are given in greater detail at page 968. Tūlī was not sent into Khwārazm, but, when the two eldest sons of the Chingiz Khān began to quarrel at the siege of Gurgānj, or Ūrgānj, its capital, Uktāe, the youngest of the three there present, was directed to assume the chief command. See note at page 1099, para. 2.

Page 288, note 1, line 5.—Wāmīān or Bāmīān, and Wāliān, mentioned below, are neither of them correct. Our author, in the text above, did not give the name of the place, but he does so farther on. It should be Wāliātīn—والان and the two—والان—left out the three points of the letter, and thus led others who followed to read the word Wāliān—Wāliān—omitting the MS. form of—ṣ—which is without the points, putting two points under instead of over, and thus turning it into —and causing great confusion and error. Wāliātīn is the same place as is mentioned at page 319, but, in the same way as in Gūzgān and Gīzgānān, the singular form of the word, and also its plural, as if there was more than one place or district so called. The same mode of expression is used with regard to the Lamghān district, which is also known as the Lamghānāt or the Lamghāns.

The Chingiz Khān, moreover, was not investing Tāe-kān, twenty miles east from Kundus, as mentioned in the fifth line from the bottom in the same note, but Tāl-kān, about three hundred miles west of Kundus, and much the same
distance from the Parwān Pass. His main army was encamped at and around the Fushīt-i-Nū'mān, near by. It is a common error for writers to mistake Tāl-kān, which is in Khorāsān, for Tās-kān, which is in Tūbārīsān; and these errors are contained in the Tārikh-i-Jahān-Kūshā, and other works consulted by me, which led me to suppose that our author’s statement at page 290 might possibly be wrong, but he was perfectly correct, and the others wrong. At page 1016, likewise, our author mentions Wālīgān as the identical place invested by the Mughals which Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn marched to relieve, and there the details will be found.

Page 290, note 4.—Tāl-kān had fallen after a long siege, and before the Chingiz Khān set out in pursuit of the Sulṭān. The writers, who mistake that place for Tās-kān, make the Chingiz Khān move towards Ghaznāf by way of Andar-āb, Bāmān, and Kābul, thus making the geography suit their statements. He reached Ghaznāf by a much more direct route; and such a place as Bāmān is not once referred to. See page 1016, and note 6.

Page 318, line 1.—“Ayḵān-ābād.” From the way in which the first part of this word is written elsewhere, and what is stated at pages 350 and 448, and in note 4, this might be more correctly written Al-Tīgīn-ābād, and might refer to Tīgīn-ābād, about which so much is said, but the site of which, unless old Kandahār stood on it—which I am sometimes inclined to think, because the latter name begins to be mentioned when the other disappears—has been altogether lost.

Page 319, line 1.—“Tājfr-Koh.” This I believe to be the Nakkhīr of Bāhāḵī, or in some way connected with it.

Page 319, line 11.—It was not my MSS. which “enabled” me “to correct” the words “the fīsh mountain is Faj Hanisdr” in Elliot (see vol. viii., p. xviii.), but the knowledge that faj is a common term for a defile or pass, in the same way that I was aware what rāsfāt meant, and that “the mountains of Ḑālab” was, and is, an impossible translation, whether “worthy of consideration” or not. I was also aware that “Sarha-sang” was not a proper name, as supposed, and rendered in Elliot, which Mr. Dowson wisely passes over in his “seriatim examination,” but two very simple, everyday words.

Page 341, note 7.—See note at page 348, last para. Bahrām Shāh is said to have died in 543 H., the year previous to Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, the Ghūrī, but our author distinctly states at page 111 that Bahrām Shāh was succeeded by his son nine years later, namely, in 552 H. The former date may refer to the Riblat.

Page 370, line 4 from the bottom.—The meaning usually assigned to Sar-i-Jān-dār, as here given, is not correct, but, at page 603, I have mentioned its correct significance. See also pages 410 and 447.

Page 378, line 8.—Kāfīf, or Kūfīf, is probably the town on the Oxus of that name, only, in our maps, it is placed on the farther (north) bank.

Page 379, note 6.—See page 469, and Appendix A., page ii.

Page 391, note 8.—As subsequently shown, ‘Igḥārī was the name of a Turk-mān tribe, and the territory held by those people was sometimes called after them. See pages 1015 and 1043.

Page 392, last line.—The Ürgān here mentioned may possibly refer to Ürgūn of Ghazmān. See my “Notes on Afghanistan,” page 85.

Page 427, last para. of note 6.—“Rāṣif.” The name of this place is also written Arṣaf.—رَسَاف— in several histories, the first letter being placed second.

Page 429, line 4, and note 4.—Rār is the name of a place near Sahzwār,
but the Imām was probably styled Rāzī, not as being a native of that place but of Ra'i, the inhabitants of which are styled Rāzī.

Page 433.—The Beghūn, referred to here, and in note 4, also written Beghūn, with the “n” nasal, is the name by which the Kārlūks or Kūrlūghs are also known, an account of whom is given in the notice of the Afrāsiyāb rulers at page 909. In MS, the letters , and are very liable to be mistaken one for the other, as the point of the latter is often omitted.

Page 435, line 13.—The Hazār-Darakhtān here mentioned is not that northeast of Ghasmīn, but more to the west, on the way from that city towards the Bāmīān district. There are several places so called.

Page 477, note 8.—I think it probable that all the errors that have been written as to the gates of Ghasmīn having been shut against the Sultān by his most trusted slave, and his successor to the throne of Ghasmīn, have arisen from the act and name of the slave, mentioned in the text above, Ayyah, Jūk (Sa'buk-Tīgīn’s Turkish name was Jūk. See ante), who seized the bridle of the Sultān’s charger, and dragged him out of the fight. The “king of Multān” is no other than the Khokhar Rāe.

Page 482, note 18 from bottom.—Amīr Muḥammad, son of Abī ‘Alī, was the Sultān’s kinsman, and also son-in-law to the late Sultān, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn. He was entitled Žiyā-ud-Dīn before he succeeded to the throne of Fīrūz-koh after the death of his father-in-law, upon which he was styled Sultān ‘Alā-ud-Dīn.

Page 483, note 1,—“The year 4 of his rule,” mentioned in the second para., cannot refer to his rule in Hind, because 589 h. was the year in which Dīhlī was made the capital, as mentioned at page 469. Lāhor was acquired as early as 582 h., but some say in 583 h.

Page 495, line 9.—It is probable that the name Aektān would be more correctly Al-Tīgīn, for both may be written as one word thus—اکتāن—and as two.

Page 499, note 5.—This requires a little explanation. The lower road did not lead by the Dara’h of Kārmān, but the northern or higher routes did: one leading by Kohāt to Peshawar, and the other through Bānū. The route by Kābul, and Nangrāhār, or Nek-Nihār, or Nek-Anhār, through the Khaibar jay or defile, was rarely used at the period in question. The flourishing province of Kārmān, so called after the small Dara’h of that name, in those days was of considerable extent, and very populous. In after years, at the period of Akbar Bādshāh’s reign, it constituted the Sarkār of Bangash, but its condition had greatly changed for the worse. The “lower road” into Hind was by the Gumul. See “Notes on Afghānistān,” etc., previously referred to, Section Second.

Page 503, note 8.—The Jalāl-ud-Dīn, referred to in line 7, cannot, from the dates, refer to the gallant Sultān of Khwārāzm, but to Jalāl-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī, son of Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, Ghūrī, of Bāmīān. See page 493, and note at page 527.

Page 513, note 1, last line, should be I-bak-i-Shil, as repeated in the second line over leaf, or the nickname would not be complete, for I-bak, alone, does not convey the meaning ascribed to it, from the simple fact that at least half-a-dozen I-baks are mentioned in this work, and the whole of them could not have each had a fractured finger.

Page 525, line 2.—It must not be supposed from our author’s mode of narrating events that Malik Kūṭb-ud-Dīn set out from Lāhor for the presence of Sultān Mahmūd, the late Sultān’s nephew. It is only his way of relating
events which happened subsequently, before others which happened previously. Malik Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn had gone to join the late Sulṭān in the expedition against the Khokhars, as related at page 604, under the reign of I-yal-timāsh, and had not left the Panj-āb. Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, was assassinated on the 3rd of Shā‘bān, the eighth month of 602 H., and Malik Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn, according to our author, assumed sovereignty at Lāhor in Zī-Ḳa’dah, which is the eleventh month. But there is, I think, no doubt that the correct date of his assuming sovereignty was 605 H., as stated at page 398, for it was only in that year that he received his manumission from Sulṭān Maḥmūd; and it is very certain that an unmanumitted slave could not assume sovereignty. It is very possible, however, that Sulṭān ‘Ālā-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, who had been made Sulṭān of Ghūr on the death of Sulṭān Ghiyāṭ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, may have sent Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn the investiture of Hindūstān when Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn was assassinated, and before he was himself ousted by his rival, Maḥmūd, to whom Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn, as stated at page 398, sent soliciting his manumission. See also note to page 525, para. 2.

Page 529, note 4.—It is barely possible that the words Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn’s "brother’s son"—بْنُ عَفَاطِلِ رَأَهُ—may have been intended by Abū-l-Faṭl and others, and that in some copies the word یا ṭalā' may have been left out by the scribes, but, whether Abū-l-Faṭl says so or not, it is clearly stated that Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn had no son: still, on the other hand, we are not told that he had a brother. An adopted son is by far the most probable.

Page 531, last line.—This word, like Ai-Tīgīn, may be, more correctly, Ai-Tīmūr, as no diacritical points are given in the text.

Page 539.—The Khaliṣ, not "Khilj," are by no means "hypothetical," but a well-known tribe, as may be seen from these pages. See Elliot, vol. viii., p. xviii. There was no "army of Khilj," but a contingent from the Khaliṣ tribe served in the army of the Sulṭān of Khwārazm. A Turk tribe, or part of a tribe, all the males being armed, was a lashkar in itself, and who and what the Khaliṣ were who sought refuge in Sind is explained in the note. That these few formed "all the forces of Khwārazm" is a blunder pure and simple. What the forces of Khwārazm were composed of is mentioned in many places in this work.

Page 551, text, para. 2.—Two or three copies of the Persian text have these additional words at the beginning of the para: "For one or two years, in this manner, he used," etc.

Page 553, note 4, line 7.—559 H. is a printer’s error for 590 H., as the context plainly shows.

Page 562, note, last para., line 4, where "Ḍīnjā-pūr" occurs, is also a mere press error, unobserved by the printer's reader, for Ḏīnjā-pūr. It is correctly given in the preceding note 1, pages 558—559, and Ḏīnjā-pūr should be read in all places.

Page 567, line 11.—"Nūnīs" is incorrect: it is an error in the text of for The Tūns are described farther on, page 1157. The Kar-battan of our author may be Shigatze of the latest maps, or where Shigatze now stands; and the great river in which the Musalmān troops perished is, doubtless, the Sānpo. They must have penetrated to within a few marches of Lhāsā. Names of places become changed in the course of six or seven centuries, especially when old dynasties, one after the other, have been overthrown, and others have arisen.

Page 581.—See Elliot's India, vol. viii., p. xx. The Editor, Mr. Dowson, does not see the least necessity for my criticism of the incorrect
translation of this sentence in vol. ii. of that work, and says that the words are (in the text) "Nān-i khurish-i safriyāna," and that "bread for travelling food" is its literal translation, explained in dictionaries as "travelling provisions," and adds that mine is "a paraphrase, not a translation."

Safar certainly means "journey," "travelling," etc., but "safr" does not. The printed text, which Mr. Dowson says he so implicitly followed, has the words before the "travelling food." What has become of them in the "literal translation"? The words for the food are not "nān-i-khurish-i safriyāna,"—there should be no isāfat after nān—but nān-khurish-i safariānah, nān-khurish being a well-known compound word, signifying some dainty or savoury morsel to eat along with bread, such as meat, fish, cheese, pickles, or the like, and is equivalent to the 'Arabic word ماء which word, as well as nān-khurish, he will probably find in his dictionary if he refers to it.

Page 582.—There is no necessity to "venture upon any explanation of the position" of Basan-koṭ, as suggested by Mr. Dowson, because it is sufficiently well known; but, in Elliot, the proper name has been left out entirely.

Page 583, note 9.—"To better his means." The next page shows how he bettered them. He came, as others still come from the very same parts, to better his means, and the word in the Translation is correct as rendered. He was an eminent ecclesiastic and good preacher, and was, therefore, invited to deliver "a discourse" before the pious and orthodox Sulṭān and his Court, as I have translated the sentence, and as any one else would do who knew what he was translating.

Mr. Dowson, however (vol. viii., p. xxii.), "cannot admit Major Kaverty's improved rendering of the words," although he is himself "not satisfied with the Munshi's rendering in Elliot "his name was mentioned at Court," and considers "Having recited a commemorative (speech or ode) he came to Court," would be much better, or, he thinks, "the author's meaning would have been more clearly rendered [mark the words] by He came to Court and delivered an eulogistic speech."

In other places he can admit "preach," "sermon," and even "discourses," which is the same in signification as "discourse" used by me.

At page 615 of this Translation, our author—himself a good preacher and ecclesiastic of repute—says he was called upon, on first entering Hind, to deliver discourses within the audience tent of Sulṭān I-yal-timish when that Sulṭān was investing Úchchah. The corresponding place in Elliot is page 326 of vol. ii., but the whole passage has been left out, and so we have no "commemorative speech or ode," nor an "eulogistic speech."

At page 619, our author relates, that, during the time the same Sulṭān was investing Gwāliyūr, he "was commanded to deliver discourses at the private pavilion of the Sulṭān;" that "three times in each week discourses were fixed;" that "in Ramaẓān—the fast month—a discourse used to be delivered daily;" and that "ninety-five times congregations were convened at the entrance of the Sulṭān's pavilion." The words of our author here, as elsewhere, I have rendered literally; and the printed Persian text agrees with the MSS. I used. See also page 745.

The corresponding place in Elliot is page 379, and there it is stated that the author "was ordered to preach in turns [sic, but not in the original] at the door of the royal tent;" that "Discourses were appointed to be delivered three times every week;" and winds up with "Ninety-five times religious assemblies were convened at the royal tent."

At page 651, our author says "a discourse was delivered" by him in the
Kašr, named Safed [White Castle], and the same word is again used two lines under.

The corresponding place in Elliot is page 338, and it is rendered, "there was a sermon in the Palace of the White-roof," and two lines under "sermon" is again used.

At page 656, our author again says, on the news of the Lahor disaster, that—and the rendering is literal—"to the writer of these lines the Sultân gave command to deliver a discourse, and the people pledged their fealty [aneu] to the Sultân." In a note I say, "Compare Elliot, vol. ii., p. 340, for, at that page, the corresponding passage of the text is thus rendered, "The Sultân assembled the people of the city at the White Palace [there is no White-roof here], and the writer of this book received orders to preach and induce the people to support the Sultân." This too is literal possibly.

Again, at page 845, our author says—and the translation is literal—that he, on the occasion of the invasion of Sind by the Mughal infidels, "by command, delivered an exhortation with the object of stimulating to holy warfare, and the merit of fighting against infidels," etc.

The corresponding place in Elliot is page 379, which is there rendered "the author received orders in the royal tent to compose an ode, to stir up the feelings of the Muhammadans and to excite them to warlike fervour for the defence of their religion and the throne." This is certainly very far from literal, even without the "ode."

Which is the most probable, the delivery of an exhortation, lecture, sermon, or discourse, by an eminent preacher and one of the highest ecclesiastics in the kingdom, on such an occasion, or "the composition of an ode"? and would "odes" be delivered three times a week, and "religious assemblies convened" ninety-five times to "compose" or listen to "odes" or "eulogistic speeches"? The very idea of such a thing is absurd.

Now I must mention that in every instance here referred to in which I have used "discourse" or "exhortation," the very same word is used in every copy of the Persian text, the printed text included, and that word is مکتوم and it was ignorance of the correct signification of this simple word, the idiom of the language, and the usages of the Musalmāns, which has given rise to all these blunders, and yet they must not be noticed!

There are several other instances in our author's work of the delivery of discourses, lectures, or exhortations. At page 190 it is stated that his grandfather, an eminent ecclesiastic and preacher, was called upon to deliver a discourse—مکتوم—before the ruler of Sijistān; and the subject he chose for his discourse or lecture was "on defiling emissions." Mr. Dowson "cannot admit" my "improved rendering" of the word "discourse" for مکتوم Does he think "the author's meaning," in this instance, "would have been more clearly rendered" by "He came to Court and delivered a eulogistic speech on defiling emissions," or that he "composed an ode" on the subject?

Because, in the course of my work, I have had to point out such like errors as these—but this last "is a gem of its kind"—Mr. Dowson, in the Preface to vol. viii. of Elliot's India, must call it "hostile criticism!" and has been so foolish as to dig up "the late Lord Strangford," who, to suit certain purposes, had the assurance to write a criticism on my Pahlavi works, without knowing a single word of the language, except "what he read up for the purposes," in the course of a few days, as I was informed on undoubted authority. I could say much more on this subject, but I will only remark here that the writer's object was not attained, and that I hope he possessed a more practical
knowledge on the other subjects upon which he is said to have written. Better Mr. Dowson had admitted the errors, and eschewed "gauhád." It seems that a writer must shut his eyes upon, and conceal the most palpable errors in Oriental history and geography for fear of "hurting the susceptibilities of those who made them," and must refrain from correcting them lest he be declared "hostile" and "offensive." But I undertook this "Translation," and have devoted years to it, to correct errors.

Page 587, note 4.—Mr. Dowson is not altogether disingenuous in his "Examination" of my criticisms, and in this one, xxxiii. of his replies, he would make it appear that I objected to his rendering of the words "territories of Lakhnauti," at page 319 of the volume referred to, but what I say is, that there is nothing, even in the printed text, to warrant such a statement as "that Júj-nagar ever formed part of the Lakhnawati territory." They were totally different: one was a Muḥammadan state, the other Hindú.

Page 600, note 4.—Mr. Dowson appears to have assumed that, because herds or droves of horses are mentioned in the same page with merchants, the latter may be turned into "a dealer." There is nothing in the original to show that the merchants were horse-dealers, but the contrary; and the herds of horses—not "a drove," for the plural form is used—evidently belonged to the Ilbari tribe because the pastures are also mentioned. I contend that the bāsargān—here too the plural form is used—were not necessarily horse-dealers any more than ass-dealers, cow-dealers, or any other dealers. The word bāsargān signifies a merchant, but, in the translation in Elliot, the words, "into the pastures" have been left out.

Mr. Dowson considers this last criticism "a gem of its kind;" and, at the beginning of his "Examination" of my criticisms, says he has noticed and examined them seriatim." He is mistaken: a great many "gems" are passed over unnoticed by him, and not with reference to the Ṭabākāt-i-Nāṣīrī only; for example, at pages 311, 557, 579, 580, 664, 686, 687, 853, 1023, and several other places.

Page 623, and note 4.—For the identification of Banīūn see my "Notes on Afghānistān," page 281.

Page 633, note 7.—Further research has shown that this Turkish title should be read Tāl-ū. See reference to page 732 farther on.

Page 644, note 4, para. 2.—Balkā Khān is referred to at length at page 1283. The name of this monarch is generally written with "r."—Barkā—as our author writes it, but in Turkish words "1" and "r" are often interchangeable. See page 617 and note 4.

Page 645.—The Turkish name of Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn is sometimes written Kārā-Kūsh, and sometimes Kārā-Kūsh, and Kārā-Kūsh, which last two forms are the most correct ones, and signify, literally, "a large black bird," kūsh or kūsh signifying a bird in general, but the term Kārā-Kūsh is the name by which the Golden Eagle is known in Turkistān. Such names often occur, as for example Kārā-Sūnḳar, a species of black or dark falcon. Kārā-Kūsh was also the name of the celebrated engineer from Egypt, who built the citadel of Al-Kāhirah, and had fortified Acre, and took part in its defence when besieged by the Christians in 1189 A.D., which was considered "one of the mightiest events of the middle ages."

Page 677, note 4.—I have previously referred to the identification of Banīūn. Instead of "hilly tract west of" read "hilly tract west of the Jhilam," etc. The year 644 refers to the Khi ṭat, which is equivalent to 654 H. The details will be found at page 1201.
Page 716.—As the Ulugh Khan's son, whose Turkish title was Bughrä Khan, and his Musalmän title Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd—and evidently so named after his father's sovereign and son-in-law—married a daughter of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, it is very evident that the idle tales about the latter having only one wife must be incorrect. He must have had more than one, or a concubine at least, since the Bughrä Khan could not possibly have married a daughter of his own sister, even though she is the only wife mentioned. As this daughter of the Sultan had children by the Bughrä Khan, and a son of hers, Kāi-Kubād, succeeded her father, Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Balban, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, can scarcely be said to have left no offspring or heir, unless she died shortly before her father, but even then an heir survived.

Page 717, note 1, para 8. The Malik of Kābul is an error on the part of the writer from whom this extract was taken, or the scribe who copied it possibly, for the Malik-i-Kāmil, an account of whom is given at page 1274.

Page 732, and note 2.—The title of Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn is, correctly, Tāf-shī, not Ṭā-yasa'. It is a Turkish title. The scribes appear to have read the three diacritical points of ṣ as ṣ. See Additional Note, page 866, para. 7.

Page 901, note, para. 4.—Gardez is not really in Karāmān, but, at the period in question, it was included in the province of Karāmān. See "Notes on Afghanistān," page 75.

Page 932, note, para. 4.—The word Ī-lāgh, in the original ūlāgh is possibly an error for Talāgh, which would be written ūlāgh the two points above instead of below making all the difference. Ī-lāgh and Īlāmīgh are both plainly written, however, in several works. Talās, also written Ṭalās, is the name of a city of Turkistān. There is also a little district so called immediately north of Lower Sūwāt.

Page 967, note, para. 1, line 6.—"Darah of the Sarīgh-Kol" [Jarī ]—the latter a Tājīk word—is, literally, Valley of the Yellow Lake, a mistake constantly made. The correct name is "The Lake in, or of, the Sarīgh Kol" [Jarī ]—the last a Turkish word—or Yellow Valley.

Page 1043, note.1.—The most correct mode of writing this word is Gībarf or Gībarī, and not "Gabarī." The fort referred to near the Indus is known to the Afghan, and other inhabitants of the locality, as Gārī Kapūra'h. See "Notes on Afghanistān," page 247.

Page 1201, note, para. 5, line 2 from end.—Can the Chingiz Khan here mentioned be the person referred to whose coin is given by Thomas, in his "Pathān Kings of Dehli," page 91? See also pages 711, 784, 792, and 884.

Page 1216, note, para. 3.—Jāng, in Turki, signifies "cold," and, if the word be read Chāng, it means "dust" in the same language. We have a tract called Karā-Kum, or Black Sand, and another called Karā-Kuram, or Black Shale, etc., and, therefore, a Karā-Jāng, or Black Cold, or a Karā-Chāng, or Black Dust, is not improbable after all.

Page 1220, note, last line.—The great river Khān-Ling here referred to is evidently "the Kyan-lin" of the Chinese, mentioned six paragraphs farther on.

Page 1229, note 8.—The "Ibn" prefixed to the word would rather indicate that "the 'Alḵāmī"' is the father's name.
ERRATA.

Page 9, note 1, for Zū-l-Yamanain read Zū-l-Yamanain in all places.
10, line 6, , A’yun , A’yun, also at page 30, line 11.
, , Abwāz , Abwāz in all cases.
11, , 3, , Taḥḥah , Taḥḥah.
12, , 12, should be Māwarā-un-Nahr in all places where otherwise, not Māwar, the last syllable of the word having escaped notice for some time. It is correctly written subsequently.
14, line 17, for Al-Mutaṣim read Al-Mu‘taṣim.
15, , 3, , Zū-l-Ḥijjah , Zū-l-Ḥijjah always.
, , Muḥammad-ī-Tāhir read Muḥammad-ī-Tāhir.
19, , 3, , There should be a comma after Sarāj.
21, , 7 from bottom. After Laīṣ should be a semicolon.
, , 20, for Lāṣ read Laīṣ.
22, note 6, , Shapūr, and Ya‘kūb read Shāpūr, and Ya‘kūb in all cases.
23, , 1, , Badghais read Badghais.
24, , 8, , Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīkh read Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīkh.
, , Naķib , Naķib.
25, line 7, , Muḥammad Bašhiro , Muḥammad-ī-Bašhiro, that is, son of Bašhiro, which he was.
note 6, , Ibrahāmī , Ibrahīmī.
27, line 15, , Khāddāt , Khaddāt.
29, , 5, , Kāshghar is written in other places Kāshghar.
, , 7, , Irān read Irān always.
32, note 6, , Haķ , Haķ.
33, line 18, , Zakrā read Zakarīa, also at page 37, note 9.
34, note 6, , Haft Aḵlim read Haft Iḵlim.
35, , 4, , Dowāti and dowāt read Dawātī and dawāt.
, , 3, , Ibrahāmī , Ibrahīmī.
36, line 9, and page 38, line 16, for Nāyab read Na‘īb, and in other places.
38, note 6, for MS. , MSS.
39, line 4, also page 63, for Jībāl read the Jībāl, and where otherwise.
40, last line, and note 6, , Alb-Taǧīn read Alb-Tiǧīn, as in other places.
44, line 2 from bottom , Ḥisām , Ḥusām in all cases.
45, , 25, for Ī-lāk , Ī-lāk.
46, , 15,—Abī ’Alī is often written Abū ’Alī, and both are of the same meaning, and sometimes Bū is written for Abū.
note 6, third line from bottom, should be “from Kāshghar to Chīn, not, the Jīhūm.”
52, lines 3 and 10, and note 6, for Zī-Ka‘dah read Zī-Ka‘dah.
note 6, for Ibrahīm , Ibrahīm.
, , 6, line 13 from bottom, for Abū Ismā‘īl read Abū Ibrahīm.
53, last line of text, , Ilyās , Ilyās.
ERRATA.

Page 58, line 2, the comma after "he" is redundant.

2, for "Tabrāf" read Ṭabarāf.

59, 10, for "Mūṣil" read Mūṣil, as correctly written in other places.

61, 18, "diffe-rent" read differ-ent, the printer has incorrectly divided the word.

64, note 1, para. 2, for Burhān Ḍayf read Burhān-i-Ḍayf, always.

70, 3, for "Ghazī" Ghāzī.

72, 1, para. 3, line 2, should be "Amīr Maṇṣūr, son of Nūḥ, son of Naṣr."

77, 1, first line after the Persian, for "Tawarīḵh" read "Tawarīḵh."

80, 2, for "Maḥmūd" read "Maḥmūd."

2, "overcome" "overcame."

81, 4, "different place to" read "different place from."

86, 28, "Al-Zawzanī" read "Az-Zawzanī" in all places.

87, 1, para. 1, "'Amīd" "'Amīd."

2, line 6.—The words "works of" have been left out after "in."

88, 4, for "Jalāl-ul-Millat" read "Jamāl-ul-Millat."

4, line 6, for "Māmlūks" read "Mamlūks," and next line, after "contrary to" a comma is required.

89, 8, line 9, for "Iyāz" read "Ayāz," also at page 102, note 4.

90, line 14, "Mawdūd" should be "Maudūd" in all cases.

97, 13, for "Sūlimān" read "Sulīmān."

101, 23, the date should be 443 H., as in note 9, page 102, not 344 H.

3, and note 7, for Bar-Ghūnd and Buz-Ghūnd read Baz-Ghūnd.

102, 10, for Raṣīl-ud-Dīn read Raṣīl-ud-Dīn.

107, note 6, line 5, for Baḥākī, Baḥākī.

109, line 15, there should be a comma after "the Martyr."

note 8, last line, for "Taimūr" read "Ṭīmūr."

110, 1, first line.—The year 548 H. is an error for 514 H., as the context shows, and as given immediately under.

112, 1, line 6, for "western" read "eastern," the present Panj-āb is referred to.

113, 13, "Badāūnī" "Budāūnī."

4, line 4, para. 11, for "Seyr" read "Siyar;" and after "others" there should be a comma.

115, note 9, as at pages 450 and 498.

117, 4, para. 3, line 2, for "Tughril" read "Tagharf."

123, 6, line 6 from bottom, for "Sāljuḵs" read "Saljuḵs" as before.

128, 2, after "p. 142" there should be a full stop.

134, 3, 3, for "Gūr Kūnā" read "the Gūr Khān."

9, last, for "early" read "yearly," the letter "y" has been allowed to fall out.

140, 3, line 3 from bottom, for "Khaṭā-i" read "Khīṭā." -There should be a colon after the word "field," instead of a comma.

151, 6, line 11 from bottom, for "Ibn-i-Khalkān" read "Ibn Khallīkān," as in note, page 1278.

6, last line, for "Mughīs" read "Mugīs."

152, line 4 of the poetry.
ERRATA.

Page 154, line 6 of the poetry.—The note refers to "white steed's," and not to
girths, therefore, the figure 9 should be over the former.

" line 2 of text under poetry, for "Khiṭā-i" read "Khiṭāe," and in
all other places. Khiṭā or Khiṭāe is the name of the country, and
Khiṭā-i is the adjective derived from it.

161, note, line 14 from bottom, for "fifth" read "fourth."
167, , 8, line 8, for "Yafā'i" read "Yafāt," as in other places.
170, , 8, 10 from bottom, for "Shirwān" read "Shirwān."
171, , 1, for "Muḥammad, Jahān Pahlawān," read "Jahān Pahlawān,
Muḥammad," as in the note above.
172, , line 14, for "Buwāh" read "Buwāh."
180, , 4, for "Changiz" read "Chingiz," as in other places.
183, line 9, after "himself seen" there should be a comma
185, note, line 5, para. 2, and para. 3, line 4, for "Husain 'Ali" read
"Husain-i-'Ali," with an ʾiyāfīt, for Husain was 'Ali's son accord-
ing to other writers who have bin.

190, line 10 from bottom, after "learning" a comma is required.
199, note 7, last line.—"Kurt." This name is more correctly written
"Kurat." See note 9, page 1198.
200, line 6, for "Mangabarni" read "Mang-barni."
202, note 4, "Sufed," "Safed."
204, line 4, for "Lakhaṇaṭī" read "Lakhaṇawatī," also in note 1 of
preceeding page.
205, note 4, for "Ibn-i-Khalkān," read "Ibn Khallikān," as in note,
page 1278.
208, , 1.—After "Zangi" there should be a comma.
211, line 3.—There should be a comma after "Rūm," and another after
"other" in line 10.
217, note, line 5 from bottom.—There should be a comma after "Vertot."
220, , 8.—After "force" in line 2, after "Jerusalem" and "Nov., in
the next line, and after "knight's" in the next, there should be
commas.
221, , 4, line 5, for "different" to read "different from."
222, line 11, "Azīz," "Afsāl."
225, note 4, next to last line of para. 1, also at page 226, note 4, for "Miṣ-
ṣūfūkīn" read "Miyyā-ṣūfūkīn," as at page 1268, and note 9.
229, , 3, last para., line 7, for "Manṣūrah" read "Manṣūriyah; and
"Kaff or Kayif" appears to be meant for "Katif."
235.—There should be no comma between "Abī" and "Muḥammad" in
lines 16 and 19; and for "Kutlaḥ" in the latter read "Kutlaḡh," and
in all cases.
242, note 9, para. 1, for "Dajlah" read "Dijlah," as in other places.
246, , 7, three lines from the bottom, instead of "that man," the
sense requires "that that man," etc. the other that has been
left out.
247, , para. 2, line 10 from bottom, after "his brother" a comma is
required.
250, , 6, line 4, for "Sultān Shāh" read "Malik Shāh," as above.
252, , 2, , 3, after "brother" should be a comma.
253, para. 4, line 7, for "Garmsīr" read "the Garmsīr."
ERRATA.

Page 271, note, para. 1, line 2 from bottom, for "Tatār" read "Mughal."
272, fourth line from bottom of text, and next line, and in first line of note 5, add Khān after Chingiz, for alone, without the Khān, the word Chingiz, which only means "the great," etc., is meaningless.
273, note 6, line 5, the number should be 5000, as at page 970, not 50,000. Karajah and Karāchah are often written the one for the other.
276, 6, line 20, for "Kalât" read "Kalāt."
277, line 12, for "Tamīshah," read "Timmishah."
282, note 4, line 10, for "Tatār," read "Mughal," also in note 4, line 3 from bottom, page 283.
283, 4, line 11 from bottom, for "Jīrāf," read "Jīrafi," as in other places: the letters have been misplaced.
285, line 2 from bottom, for "Karrmān," read "Karmān."
286, 2, an isāfāt is required between Muḥammad and 'Alī—Muḥammad-i-'Alī—for 'Alī was Muḥammad's father's name, as mentioned elsewhere.
287, note 1, last line, for "Amīn-ul-Mulk," the more correct name is "Yamin-ul-Mulk." See note 3, para. 3, page 1014. He is sometimes called Yamīn Malik.
288, 3, see under Emendations.
290, 4, para. 2, line 4 from bottom, there should be a bracket after "Ghūrī," thus "Ghūrī.
292, 6, line 5, for "Khurdabīḥ" read "Khurdādbīḥ," as in other places.
295, 6, para. 1, line 3, para. 2, line 5, for "Hūkal," read "Haukal," as correctly rendered in other places.
298, 6, para. 2, line 2, read "'Alī-ud-Dīn, Kai-Kubād," not "son of Kai-Kubād."
301, 5, last line, not "Sa'iyyid" but "Sayyid," as before.
305, line 4 from bottom, for "Dimawand" read "Damawand."
319, 11, for "Khāṣṣār" read "Khāṣṣār."
322, note, para. 5, line 7 from bottom, there should be a bracket before "This seems," etc.
332, line 2, for "Rāzīl" read "Rāzi," as correctly rendered in other places.
341, note 8, line 8, and note 7, last line, for "'Utba" read "'Uṣba."
342, line 7 from bottom, for "Kazīl" read "Kīzīl."
346, note 9, for "Pathorā," read "Pithorā," as correctly rendered at page 458. The reference, "page 125," is incorrect: it should be 391.
383, line 7, for "Saraj-ud-Dīn, son of Minḥāj-i-Saraj," read "Saraj-ud-Dīn, son of Minḥāj-ud-Dīn."
405, note 4, line next to last, for "different place to" read "different place from."
408, line 17, for "Irān" read "Ī-rān," and for "Malīk" in the following line read "Malik."
413, 13, for "cholic" read "colic."
415, note 8, the reference should be "page 489," not "205."
420, line 12, for "'Ārifān" read "'Ārifīn."
423, note 8, para. 3, for "Nushewrān" read "Nūshīrwān," or, as it is also written, "Nūshīrwān."
ERRATA.

Page 426, note 6, line 16, for "Tāl-kān" read "Tāk-kān," and see note 4, 1008.
435, "4, line last, for "See his reign," read, "See his brother's reign," etc., and see pages 495, 496.
464, "2, next to last line, for "pears" read "spears," and in the following line for "wir" read "wār." The "wār" in the first line and the "a" in the latter, were carelessly allowed to fall out, and were not detected by the printer's reader.
470, "2, para. 1, last line, for "Changiz" read "the Chingiz," and for "Ung" read "the Åwang," as in note at page 940.
484, "2, para. 4, "possession" is the printer's devil's mode of spelling "possession," and passed by the printer's reader.
489, last line of text and under, for "Lakhānawatī" read always "Lakhānawatī" if "p" and "t" are not marked correctly.
491, line 3 from bottom, for "Janbād" read "Junbād." It is also called Gunbād by Tājiziks, and is in the Kūhistān.
496, note 8, line 8, for "firs" read "first,": line 12, for "mounta" read "mountain;" line 16, for "wi" read "with;" in the next for "o" read "or;" and in the next note, line 1, for "the" read "that;" and in next line from bottom, for "oth" read "other."
The printer has very carelessly allowed six letters to fall out from the ends of as many lines.
499, "2, para. 2, line 7, for "Torīs" read "Tūrīs."
504, "4, last line, for "etrms" read "terms." Through some mystery connected with the printer's art, proofs after being read over and corrected time after time, get changed again, and the printer's reader passes them as "read for press."
521, "1, para. 3, line 10, after Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir there should be a bracket and a comma, not a full stop, for the sentence is unfinished. It should stand thus "Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir, etc.
530, last line of text, for "Mālik" read "Malik."
; note, line 2, the 'Arabic Jl has, through the printer's error, been turned into Jl a mistake liable to occur, but the signification is evident from the interpretation.
532, "8, for "Inda-khūd" read "Inda-khūd."
535, "3, para. 5, line 2, and page 540, note, para. 3, line next to last, for "Changiz" read "Chingiz."
543, "6, sixth line from the bottom. Here again, through carelessness in printing, three letters have been let drop out, and have been unnoticed—"n ee" for "on the."
548, "4, line 4, for "wātī" and "wātī" read "wātī" and "wātī" with "tā" as in the word immediately above.
550, "6, line 4, for "Karmah-nasah" read Karam-Nāsah, or Karam-Nāsā.
551, "9, next to last line, for "Hizabar" read "Hizabr," as at page 549, line 11 of text.
556, line 9, after "kingdom" there should be a comma.
559, note 5, line 3, for "Nudā" read "Nūdā."
564, "2, para. 2, line 6, the comma after "Lakhanawatī" is redundant.
564, "4, line 7 from bottom, should be "Chingiz" not "Changiz."
585, "7, "1, and line 5, for "Barinda" read "Barindah."
586, "8, "4, for "Dhākah" read "Dhākah."
594, "9, the reference "page 219," should be 319.
ERRATA.

Page 595, note 8, line 5, for "Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Iwās," read "Nāṣir-ud-Dīn-i-'Iwās," with an isdāfat, that is, son of 'Iwās, for Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwās, was his father.

597, 3, line 3, for "very different to" read "very different from."

602, 2, "Nāṣir," "Naṣīr."

610, para. 2, line 1, for "D'Ahsson" read "D'Ossman."

615, last para. of note 8, next to last line, for "page 389" read "page 398."

621, note 8, line 12, for "minārah" read "manārah" as before.

622, 5 from bottom of last para., for "Afaghinah" read "Afaghinah."

627, line 9, after "Yal-dūz" there should be a comma.

, 15, for "Gūjah" and "Kūjah" read "Gūjah" and "Kūjah," as at page 750.

637, 11, after "justice" there should be a comma.


650, note 1, "line 2, for "and to the office" read "and refers to the office," etc.

651, 1, para. 2, line 3, for "different statement to" read "different statement from."

662, 7, line 3, for "'Abbāsīs" read "'Abbāsīs."

680, 3, para. 3, line 3, for "Kīnna'īj" read "Kīnna'īj."

690, end of note 8, for "page 694" read "page 695."

, note 1, end of para. 1, the printer has again carelessly let the letter ġ fall out.

694, 4, para. 2, line 3, for "Nāyab" read "Nā'īb."

705, 5, 3, "mawās," "māwā."n

706, line 3 under the Twelfth Year, for "Ban" read "Bat. Bat Khān is No. xvi. among the Malikis of Hind.

712, text, last line, for "Balarām" read "Balārām," and also in note 6, three lines from the bottom.

716, note 4, para. 2, line 12, for "Zīyā" read "Ziyā."

720, text, line 11, for "fi ul-'Ālamīn" read "fi l-'Ālamīn."

726, note 4, the printer has put "See the reign under" instead of "See under the reign," and the printer's reader has passed it over.

749, line 15, for "Awwāl" read "Awwal."

759, note 8, for "Sharṭ-badār" read "Sharṭ-bardār."

751, 6 from bottom, after "which" there should be a comma.

752, 8, for "ee" read "See." Here also a letter has fallen out.

761, line 11, for "Shāhnaqī" read "Shāhnaqī."

764, 16, for "Lakhanawātī" read "Lakhanawatī," as in tenth line above.

775, note, para. 4, line next to last, for "stated above" read "as stated above."

778, 5, line first, for "as far it goes" read "as far as it goes."

780, 7, for "page 650" read "660."

784, line 12, "Kurt." See page 1198.

809, note 2, line 5, for "Tukhāristān" read "Khurāsān."

810, 2, "664 H." is an error for "646 H."

820, line 6 from the bottom, "-i-" after Kaghif Khān is a printer's blunder: it should be "Kaghif Khān, I-bak-us-Sultān."
ERRATA.

Page 822, line 10, for "Zl-Ka'-dāh" read "Zl-Ka'dah."
324, "16, and next page, line 9, as before noticed, instead of "Tā-
yasa'," the correct title is "Tā'i-shī." See note, page 866.
383, "15, after "Kasmandah" there should be a comma.
867, note, line 13 from bottom, for "Baliban" read "Balban."
873, "14, para. 1, line 8, for "Saqlabs" read "Saqlabs."
"875, "18, next to last, for "different to" read "different
from."
877, "20, after the words "vowel points," the comma is redundant.
877, "22, third line from bottom, "Kaschāk," etc., may be
also written "Kifchāk" and "Kifchāk," as at pages 254, 796, and
914: with "i" in the first syllable is, perhaps, the most correct.
890, "24, line 2, "Irdīsh" is also written with "a"—Arūšah, as in note
at page 950, para. 3.
"892, "26, para. 6, line 5, for "occasion" read "occasion."
899, "28, "24 " " " Tā'fjūt " " Tānjūt," as at page 938.
900, "30, "24 " " " Mughuls " " Mughals."
908, "32, "7 " " " Itsiz " " Itsuz."
913, "34, "5 " " " Tāyā-Ghō " " Tāyā-Ghō."
920, "36, last line in page, "Muran" "Murān."
956, "44, "2 " "5 " " Jabbah " " Jabah."
957, "46, "3 " " next to last, for "Ja'fīr" read "Ja'far."
968, text, line 2, after "sovereignty" there should be a comma.
969, note 9, for "shrob" read "sharāb."
973, "27, for "Jūfī" read "Jūfī."
979, line 3, for "juzbī" read "juzbī."
980, note 1, para. 2, line 2, for "Ghū-Rafīgh" read "Ghū-Bālīgh."
981, "4 " "3 " " " Šūtādah " " Gurūdah."
983, "5 " "2 " " Gūr Khūn " " Gur Khān."
985, "4 " "11 " " šuyā " " šuyā."
"5 " "2 " " Kankulī " " Kankulī."
986, "1 " "6 from bottom, after the bracket and before
"gave him" there should be a comma.
"882, "3 " " last, line 3, for "Mughūl" read "Mughal."
988, "52, para. last, line next to last, for "Jīhūn" read "Jīhūn."
"892, "24 " " line 13, for "Baisut" read "Baīsūt," as at page 1094.
989, "24 " "14 " " Tūkājār " " Tūkāchār, as in the
preceding page.
"894, "4, line 3, for "touvedal" read "touyal," part of the "y" has
been broken in printing.
991, "4, line 3, for "touvedal" read "touyal," part of the "y" has
been broken in printing.
1002, "4, line 2, for "was styled" read "was also styled."
1010, "2, para. 2, line 1, for "Ibn-Khalīkān" read "Ibn Khallikān," 
as at page 1278.
1011, "2, para. 2, line 7 from bottom, for "Tāl-kān" read "Tāl-kān," 
and the comma after the word is redundant.
1014, "4, para. 4, line 7, for "Umāra" read "Umāra."
1015, "3 " "12 " "Aghrāk " " Ighrāk," as in other places.
ERRATA.

Page 1020, note, para. 4, line 9, the full stop after 30,000 men is a printer's error, and is redundant.

1025, ' ' , para. 4, line 1, for "Mamälîk" read "Mamâlik."
1027, ' ' , para. 2, next to last line, for "Taghachâr" read "Taghâchâr," also in para. 3, line 3.
1029, note, para. 4, line 2, for "Bahâ-ud-Mulk" read "Bahâ-ul-Mulk."
1032, ' ' , 2 , 5 , after "Jahân" the comma is redundant.
1046, ' ' , 3 , line 6, for "Al-Birûnî" read "Al-Birûnî."
1048, text, last line, ""Hîrât" "Hirât" as in other places.
1073, note 4, para. 4, line , for "Turân" read "Türân."
1074, ' ' , five lines from bottom of page, for "Shîwstân" read "Shîwstân."
1095, ' ' , line 3, for "Mughâl" read "Mughal" as in line 2 above.
1099, ' ' , para. 2, line 17, for "the two" read "the other two."
1116, ' ' , 3 , 4 , "Itmâs" "Itmâs."
1119, text, line 7 from bottom, "Tâ-îr" may also be written "Tâîr" as in note 2, para. 3, next page.
1126, note 6, para. 2, lines 2 and 3, for "Mukânî" and "Mukâtî" read "Mükânî" and "Mükâtî," and also in next two paragraphs.
1132, ' ' , para. 2, line 2, before "Humâyûn" there is an empty space for the word "to," which, through carelessness, the printer has allowed to fall out after revise, and a letter in the next to get out of its place.
1135, ' ' , 3 , para. 2, next to last line, for "eve" read "even," a letter has fallen out here too.
1137, ' ' , para. 4, line 3, for "tumâns" read "tomâns."
1161, line 15, after the words "inclined to it" there should be a comma.
1164, ' ' , 6 , for "Chingiz" read "Chingiz," as it has been printed scores of times before.
1166, note, para. 2, line 3, for "Bashghîrd" read "Bâshghîrd."
1180, ' ' , 1 , 4 , "Ughûl" "Ughûl."
1188, end of note 7, for "hat" read "that," a letter has been allowed to fall out again.
1194, note, para. 2, line 6, for "Jâmî" read "Jâmî" as in fourth line above.
1196, ' ' , 3 , line 1, here again, through carelessness, the "g" of excepting has fallen out unnoticed.
1197, text, line 14, and 1198, line 17, for "Isîrâr" read "Isîzâr."
1201, ' ' , 1 , for "kârwâns" read "kârwâns."
1203, ' ' , 3 , the "b" in "Tabas" should be doubled thus—"Tabbas."
1220, note, second line from bottom, and next page, line 7 of note, for "Taghachâr" read "Taghâchâr."
1234, ' ' , 4 , line 4, for "Usmanli" read "Ushmânil."
1239, ' ' , para. 3, line 7, for "Ilkâ, or Ilkâ, or Ilkân," read "I-yalkâe, or I-yalkâ, or I-yalkân."
1255, ' ' , para. 1, last line, for "Ibn 'Umrân" read "Ibn 'Amrân."
1260, ' ' , 6 , line 3, for "Ilkâ" read "I-yalkâ."
1267, ' ' , 6 , para. 3, line 4, for "Kurdîâh" read "Kurdîâh."
1276, ' ' , 3 , 2 from end, for "Umârâ" read "Umarâ."
THE present portion of this translation commences with Section VII. of the original.

The first six Sections are meagre, and the first eight pages will contain a résumé of their contents, which will be given on the completion of the work, with Title-page, and Table of Contents.

SYSTEM OF PRONUNCIATION.

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. Some of the new systems proposed are difficult and complicated, and, in the translator's opinion [as far as he can understand them], in many instances entirely incorrect.

The vowels are three short—a, i, u, equivalent to — — and —; and three long—ā, ī, ū, equivalent to ʌ — ʌ — ʌ.

All consonants, except the following, are pronounced precisely the same as in English:—ω—ς, as th in thing, or lisped s; ɛ—ch, as ch in church; ɛ—h, strongly aspirated, and occurs only in purely 'Arabic words; ɛ—kh, as ch in loch, and as German ch; ɛ—q, pronounced by applying the tip of the tongue inverted to the palate; ɛ—z, as th in thine, by 'Arabs, dh; ɛ—r, as r uttered by striking the point of the tongue on the palate; ɛ—j, as s in pleasure, or soft French r; ɛ—gh, as th in shell; ɛ—q, as ss in dissolve; ɛ—γ, as dwed; ɛ—t, as t with a slight aspiration; ɛ—ς, as English s with slight aspiration; ɛ—', a deep guttural without any audible aspiration, and when initial to a word the ' is placed before its vowel, as in 'All, and when not initial, after its preceding vowel, as in Mas'ūd and Rāfī'; ɛ—gh, a guttural sound like that produced in gargling, or Northumbrian r, and something similar to gh in ghost; ɛ—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; ɛ—h, slightly aspirated; at the end of a word it is often unaspirated. When e occurs at the end of a word preceded by ā, 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.

H. G. R.
TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS REQUIRING CORRECTION.

Page 11, note 3, for Tālḥah, read Tālḥah.

,, 21, for Lāiš, read Laiš.

,, 23, for Al-Mawafik, read Al-Muwafik.

,, 23, note 1, for Bāḏghais, read Bāḏghais.

,, 25, note 2, and notes 4 and 5, page 35, for Ibrāhīmī, read Ibrāhīmī.

 ,, for Tāhir, read Tāhir in all cases; and for Niṣām, read Niṣām.

,, 36, note 9, for Sanjāfs, read Sījīfs.

,, 40, last line, and note 4, for Tagīn, read Tīgīn.

,, 41, note 5, for Fanākātī, read Fanākātī.

,, 58, next to last line, for Tābrī, read Tābarī.

,, 59, line 10, and in all cases, for Mūsīl, read Mauṣūl.

,, 69, paragraph 2 of note 4, line 15, for ١٥٥١, read ١٥٥١.

,, 75, line 19, for SULTĀN-UL-‘AZAM, read SULTĀN-UL-‘AZAM.

,, 80, note 2, for overcome, read overcame.

,, 86, note, line 28, for Al-Zawzanī, read Az-Zawzani, and in all cases.

,, 90, line 14, and notes 4 and 5, for Mawdūd, read Mauḍūd in all cases.

,, 97, line 13, for Sūlimān, read Sulīmān.

,, 101, line 23, for ٣٤٤ H., read ٣٤٣ H.

,, 109, line 15, for the martyr Sultān, &c., read the martyr, Sultān, &c.

,, 110, note 1, line 1, for ٥٤٨ H., read ٥٤٨ H., and note 5, for ٥٢١ H., and ٥٢٢ H., read ٥٤١ H., and ٥٤٢ H.

,, 112, note 5, for year ٥٢٣ H., read ٥٤٣ H.

,, 113, note, line 11 from bottom, for Seyr, read Siyar.

,, 115, line 1, and line 12, for Muḥammad, Sām, read Muḥammad-i-Sām and in all cases.

,, 137, note 3, for ٥٥٥ H., read ٥٥٥ H.

,, 140, note 5, for Khāṭā-i, read Khīṭā-i, and in all cases.

,, 145, note 4, line 4 from bottom, for Almūt, read Alamūt.

,, 146, line 1, for AzZAM, read ‘AZAM.

,, 167, note 8, line 8, for Yafā-i, read Yāfa-i.

,, 172, note 3, paragraph 2, line 15, for up to this time, even, read up to this time even, &c., &c.

,, 176, note 1, line 6, for Istākhur, read Istākhur.

,, 177, note 6, for ٦٠٣ H., read ٦١٣ H.

,, 184, note, line 4 from bottom, for Bamm, read Bām.