SECTION XIX.

ACCOUNT OF THE SULTĀNS OF GHAZNĪN OF THE SHANSABĀNĪAH DYNASTY.

The frail and humble author [of these pages], Minhāj-i-Sarāj-i-Dīn-i-Minhāj ¹—the Almighty shield his deformity!—thus states, that this Section is confined to the mention of the Shansabānī Sultāns from whose majesty the throne of the court of Ghaznīn acquired splendour and magnificence, and from whose sovereignty the countries of Hind and Khurāsān became glorious, the first of whom, of the Shansabi race, was Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, and, after that, Sultān' Alā-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain took Ghaznīn, but did not rule there. After that, Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām, captured it ²; and, when he attained martyrdom, he devised that throne to his own slave, Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and with him that sovereignty terminated. The mercy and pardon of the Almighty be on the whole of them!

I. SULTĀN SAIF-UD-DĪN, SŪRĪ, SON OF 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN.

Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, was a great monarch, and was greatly endowed with valour, vigour, clemency, decision,

¹ A title he sometimes gives himself which will be explained in the Prefatory Remarks. The ‘deformity’ was not bodily.
² I fear our author had a very bad memory. At page 377, and 449, he says his elder brother, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, took it, and conferred the government of it on Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, as his lieutenant. Here it is contradicted, and the copies of the text agree as to this name. Here too he says that Mu'izz-ud-Dīn “devised” the throne of Ghaznīn to his slave, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and, in his account of the latter, that he desired to bequeath it to him. The idiom of the text here again differs, but only the idiom, in the two different sets of copies.
justice, beneficence, a graceful presence, and kingly grandeur. He was the first person of this race to whom they accorded the title of Sultān.

When the news of the misfortune which had befallen his elder brother, the Malik-ul-Jibāl, was brought to his [Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrf’s] hearing, he set about taking revenge upon Sultān Bahram Shāh, and caused a numerous army to be got in readiness from the different tracts of Ghūr, and set out towards Ghaznin, overthrew Bahram Shāh, and took Ghaznin. Bahram Shāh fled from before him, and retired.

1 This personage should have been mentioned first after the death of his father, whose successor he was, and when the dominions were divided, and separate petty dynasties formed. Who “they” were who accorded him the title of Sultān the chronicler does not say.

4 كتيب-عذ-دين, معاوام, مالك-الجبل. جبل signifies mountains: “جبل” nothing. At page 339 our author states that Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrf, in succession to his father, ascended the throne of Ghūr, and divided the territory among his brothers.

Alīf says that Bahram Shāh put Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, Ghūr, the Malik-ul-Jibāl, to death in 536 of the Rihlat [547 h.], on which ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Al-Husain, [Guẓdah and Khuṭb-ut-ul-Akhbār, and Ḥabīb-us-Siyar also agree] advanced against Ghaznin for the purpose of avenging him. Bahram Shāh fled to Karman, situated in a strong country surrounded by hills, where cavalry could not act, and made it his residence. ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, having gained possession of Ghaznin, left his brother, Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrf, there, and returned himself to Ghūr. Sūrf, placing dependence on the Amirs and troops of Ghaznin to support him, remained there with but a few of the Ghūrī troops. When winter arrived, Bahram Shāh advanced from Karman with an army of Afghānīs and Khaļīfās, which he had raised, on which the Amirs seized Sūrf. This took place in Muḥarram 537 of the Rihlat [548 h.], but Guẓdah and Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh say in 544 h., and both Guẓdah, Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, and Fānākāt state, that Bahram Shāh was dead before ‘Alā-ud-Dīn [who is said to have been known as A’rāj, or the lame from birth] reached Ghaznin the second time.

Since writing note 2, page 347, I find that, in 543 h., some time after Sultān Sanjar’s defeat by the Karā-Khiṭa-īs [authors disagree as to the date of his overthrow. See note 2, page 154], and when he had retired into ‘Irāk, Sultān Bahram Shāh, his sister’s son, sent him a despatch intimating his recovery of Ghaznin, and the death of Sām and Sūrf, the Ghūrīs [namely, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, and Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrf. See pages 340—343], who had previously acquired power over that territory, on which Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Khaḥlid, Fūḥanji, a poet of the Court of Sanjar, composed the following lines:

“They, who in thy service falsehood brought,
The capital-stock of their heads in jeopardy placed.
Far remote from thee, Sām’s head, in frenzy sunk,
And now the head of Sūrf they’ve to ‘Irāk brought.”

This tends to confirm the date mentioned by Guẓdah and others, and to show that the Ghūrīs had been guilty of hypocrisy, as many authors state, towards Bahram Shāh, as well as Sultān Sanjar. See page 343.
towards Hind, and Saif-ud-Din, Sūrī, ascended the throne of Ghaznīn, and made over the dominions of Ghūr to his brother, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, the father of [the Sultāns] Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, and Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn.

Having brought Ghaznīn under his sway, the whole of the Amīrs and soldiery, the notables and great men of Ghaznīn and of the adjacent parts submitted to him; and he bestowed upon those classes ample gifts and favours, so much so, that the soldiery and Amīrs of Bahārām Shāh became overwhelmed in the benefits he bestowed upon them.

When the winter season came round, he commanded that the forces of Ghūr should have permission granted them to return to their own country, and entertained the followers, soldiery, and petty officials of Bahārām Shāh in his own service, and placed confidence in them. The Sultān and his Wazīr, Sayyid Majd-ud-Dīn, Mūsawī, along with a small number of persons from among his old retainers, were all that remained with him, and the rest [both] at the court, and [stationed] in the Ghaznīn territory, were all the soldiery of Ghaznīn.

When storms of snow and excessive cold set in, and the roads and passes of Ghūr became closed from the excessive snow, and the people of Ghaznīn became aware that it was impossible that troops or succour could reach Ghaznīn from the side of Ghūr, they despatched letters, secretly, to the presence of Bahārām Shāh, saying, “throughout the entire city and parts around, only a small number of persons have remained with Sultān Sūrī of the forces of Ghūr, the whole of the remainder are the servants of the Maḥmūdi dynasty. It behoveth [the Sultān] not to let the opportunity slip through his hands, and he should repair to Ghaznīn with all possible haste.” In accordance with those letters and solicitations, Bahārām Shāh, from the side of Hindūstān, advanced unexpectedly and reached Ghaznīn, and made a night attack upon Sultān Sūrī. He came out of Ghaznīn with his own particular followers who were from Ghūr, and along with his Wazīr, Sayyid Majd-ud-Dīn, Mūsawī, took the road to Ghūr.

-- Some copies have, ri‘ayā, —the people, the peasantry, &c.
-- It would have been just as difficult for him to reach Ghūr from Ghaznīn, as it was impracticable for troops from Ghūr joining him at Ghaznīn.
Bahrām Shāh's horsemen set out in pursuit of him, until they discovered him in the precincts of Sang-i-Surākh [the Perforated Rock or Stone]. Sultān Sūrī, with the few followers that were along with him, joined battle with Bahrām Shāh's cavalry, and fought and opposed them as long as it was possible so to do; and, when compelled to fight on foot, they took shelter on the hill [side]. It was impossible to surround the Sultān, his Wazīr, and his own followers, whilst an arrow remained in their quivers. When not an arrow remained in their quivers, Bahrām Shāh's troops, by [entering into] stipulation, and pledging the right hand, seized them, and secured them.

When they reached the gate [one of the gates?] of the city [of Ghaznīn], two camels were brought, and Sultān

7 There are three or four places bearing this name, the correctness of which there is no doubt of. It is the name of a kotal or pass near the Halmānd river, about N.N.W. of Ghaznīn, on the route from that city, and also from Kābul into Ghūr; but "Sang-i-Surkh, a strong fort in Ghor, probably near the Hari river," is as impossible as "the mountains of Faj Hānisr" and "the Rāsit mountains."

8 If a little liberty were taken with the text, then it might be "by promise [of safety], and their [Bahrām's officers] pledging their right hands, they were captured and secured," &c.; but, seeing that they were at the mercy of Bahrām's troops, I do not see what stipulations were necessary. Our author, as usual, wishes to soften it down.

9 According to others, he was not so much honoured as to be placed on a camel, but was seated, with his face blackened, on an emaciated bullock, and paraded through the capital. From statements noticed in Dow's and Briggs' translations of Fīrishtāh's History, to which all modern compilers of Histories of India resort, as authorities not to be doubted, but which statements, I was convinced, could not be correct, I have taken the trouble to examine Fīrishtāh's text, more particularly, because that writer quotes our author as one of his principal authorities, and often quotes him verbatim. I have also used in this examination the lithographed text which Briggs himself edited, or, rather, which was edited under his superintendence; and, as I expected, particularly in the passages now to be pointed out, I have found Fīrishtāh generally correct, and his translators wholly wrong. I am not the first, however, who has noticed them, and I beg leave to observe that I have no desire whatever to take, from Dow or Briggs, any credit that may be due to them, although I dare say there are some who will view what I have done in quite another light; but if truth in history be desirable, and correct translations of native historians wanted, it is time that these grave errors were pointed out and corrected, however distasteful it may be to those who have written their histories, fancying these versions reliable, and disgusting to those who, not even knowing a letter of any Oriental alphabet themselves, have presumed to declare such Histories compiled from such incorrect translations, "works of undoubted authority." To expose and correct such errors is a duty, when it is taken into consideration that such incorrect statements, which are not con-
Süri was seated upon one, and his Wazir, Sayyid Majd-ud-Din, Mūsawi, was placed on the other, and they were both

tained in the original work, have been, and are still being taught in our colleges and schools. A careful writer like Elphinstone, by the translations above referred to, has been betrayed into terrible errors, and others have repeated and re-echoed them down to the present day.

To those conversant with the Persian language and who can read for themselves, I say: do not fail to see for yourselves, for the lithographed text of Fīrishtah is as easy as possible. It does not matter if, in translating, the literal words are not given; but facts must not be distorted, or made to appear what they are not.

Dow.

"He [Byram, which is the name he gives to Bahārām] soon after publicly executed Mahomed Prince of Ghor, who was son-in-law to the rebel Balin. . . . Seif ul dien, surnamed Souri, Prince of Ghor, brother to the deceased, raised a great army to revenge his death. . . . The Prince of Ghor, without further opposition, entered the capital, where he established himself, by the consent of the people, sending Alla, his brother, to rule his native principality of Ghor. . . . It was now winter, and most of the followers of the Prince of Ghor had returned, upon leave, to their families, when Byram, unexpectedly, appeared before Ghizimi, with a great army. Seif ul dien being then in no condition to engage him with his own troops, and having little dependence upon those of Ghisni, was preparing to retreat to Ghor, when the Ghisnians entreated him to engage Byram, and that they would exert themselves to the utmost in his service. This was only a trick for an opportunity to put their design in execution. As the unfortunate prince was advancing to engage Byram he was surrounded by the troops of Ghisni, and taken prisoner, while Byram in person put the forces of Ghor to flight. The unhappy captive was inhumanly ordered to have his forehead made black, and then to be put astride a sorry bullock, with his face turned towards the tail. . . . When this news was carried to the

Briggs.

"He [Beiram] soon after publicly executed Kooth-ood-Dien Mahomed Ghoory Afghan [this last word is not contained in Fīrishtah at all, and is the translator’s own. Malcolm too, Persia: Vol. i., note *, page 344, quotes Price—Vol. ii. page 309—as an authority for "Syfadun Souri" [Saif-ud-Din, Süri?] being "an Afghan prince of Ghour." I felt convinced that Price would never have said so, and, on reference to the page, find he makes no such statement. It must be Briggs to whom Malcolm referred], to whom he had given his daughter in marriage. . . . Seif-ood-Deen-Soory, Prince of Ghour, brother of the deceased, raised a great army to revenge his death. . . . Seif-ood-Deen Ghoory, without further opposition, entered Ghisny, where, having established himself with the consent of the people, he sent his brother, Alla-ood-Deen Soor (sic) to rule his native principality of Ghour. . . . It was now winter, and most of the followers of the Prince of Ghour had returned to their families, when Sooltan Beiram unexpectedly appeared before Ghisny with a considerable army. Seif-ood-Deen being in no condition to oppose him with his own troops, and placing little reliance on those of Ghisny, was preparing to retreat to Ghour, when the Ghisniveides entreated him to engage Beiram, promising to exert themselves to the utmost. This was done only to enable them to put their design of
publicly exposed about the streets of Ghaznin, and, from the house-tops, dust, ashes, and excrement were launched

ears of his brother Alla, he burnt with rage, and, resolving upon revenge, with all his united powers, invaded Ghisny."—Vol. i. pages 124-5.

But what says Firishtah?—"In the latter part of his [Bahram's] sovereignty, Kutb-ud-Din, Muhammad, Ghurf, Surf [this is incorrect: he was not named Surf, Saif-ud-Din was so named. I also beg to remark that this is the name of a man, not of a race or tribe], who was his son-in-law, was put to death at Ghaznin by command of Bahram Shah. Saif-ud-Din, Surf, in order to avenge his brother's blood, set out towards Ghaznin. . . . Saif-ud-Din, having entered Ghaznin and become possessed of it, and, placing faith in the Ghaznavids, was there located. He sent back his brother, 'Ala-ud-Din, along with the whole of the old Amirs, to Ghur; and, notwithstanding that Saif-ud-Din, Surf, used to treat the people of Ghaznin with lenience, and that the Ghurids did not dare to oppress them, the Ghaznavids wished for Bahram Shah; and, although they used, outwardly, to show amity towards Saif-ud-Din, Surf, secretly, they used to carry on a correspondence with Bahram Shah, until the winter set in, and the roads into Ghur were closed by snow, and people were unable to pass to and fro. At this time Bahram Shah unexpectedly reached Ghaznin with a large army of Afghans [he does not say they were Surf or Ghurfs, Khalb, and other dwellers in the wilds. At this time when not more than ten leagues intervened between them, Saif-ud-Din, Surf, having received information of it, held consultation with the Ghaznavids—who had been talking of their friendship and attachment—as to fighting, or retreating towards Ghur. They, making hypocrisy their garment, did not give him just counsel, and excited and stimulated him to fight. Saif-ud-Din, Surf, placing faith in the counsel given by them, issued from the city with a body of the men of Ghaznin, and a few of the men of Ghur, and marshalled his ranks opposite those of Bahram Shah. As yet the preparations for battle were not completed, when the Ghaznavids seized Saif-ud-Din, Surf, and, in high spirits, delivered him over to Bahram Shah. He commanded that the face of Saif-ud-Din, Surf, should be blackened; and, having placed him on an emaciated and weak bullock, which put one foot before the other with a hundred thousand shakings, they paraded him throughout the whole city. [There is not a word about with his face to the tail—which is an Indian bazar term.] . . . When this terror-striking news came to the hearing of 'Ala-ud-Din, the fervour of his nature burst out, and, with the determination of avenging his brother, with a furious and relentless army, he set out towards Ghaznin." This is a literal translation of Firishtah's words.

Then follow, in the two translations, things respecting 'Ala-ud-Din and his
upon their sacred heads until they reached the head of the doings, still more absurd and incorrect, which had better have been noticed in the account of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, but, at that time, I had not the least conception that Briggs and Dow were so much alike, and had not compared their statements with the original. Both translators leave out Firīsṭah’s statement, that, “before the arrival of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh had died, and his son, Khusrau Shāh, had succeeded to the throne, and was made captive by means of treachery,” and they merely give what Firīsṭah says was the common tradition that Bahrām encountered 'Alā-ud-Dīn, as our author states. “Allā” is supposed by the translators to have replied to “a letter” written by Bahrām Shāh, in these terms:—

Dow.

“‘Allā replied, ‘That his threats were as impotent as his arms. That it was no new thing for kings to make war upon their neighbours; but that barbarity like his was unknown to the brave, and what he had never heard to have been exercised upon princes. That he might be assured that God had forsaken Byzantium, and ordained Allā to be the instrument of that just vengeance which was denounced against him for putting to death the representative of the long-independent and very ancient family of Ghor.’”—Page 126.

BRIGGS.

“Allā-ood-Deen replied, ‘That his threats were as impotent as his arms; that it was no new thing for kings to make war on their neighbours, but that barbarity like his was unknown to the brave, and such as he had never heard of being exercised towards princes; that he might be assured that God had forsaken him, and had ordained that he (Allā-ood-Deen) should be the instrument of that just revenge denounced against him for putting to death the representative of the independent and very ancient family of Ghor.’”—Page 152.

There is nothing of this kind in the original. FIRĪSṬAH says: “Bahrām Shāh despatched an emissary with a message. 'Alā-ud-Dīn replied: ‘This act which Bahrām Shāh has perpetrated is a sign of the wane of the dominion of the Ghaznavids, because, although sovereigns are used to lead armies against the dominions of each other, and, having overcome each other, are in the habit of depriving each other of their precious lives, still not with this disgrace and ignominy; and it is certain that heaven will take vengeance upon thee as a retribution and exemplary punishment, and will give me triumph over thee!’ There is nothing more than this in the original. Compare these passages in PRICE’S Mahomedan History, vol. ii. pages 309—311. He translates it from Firīsṭah correctly although he does not profess to do so literally.

One more specimen here and I have done with this reign:—

Dow.

“At first the troops of Ghizni, by their superior numbers, bore down those of Ghor; till Allā, seeing his affairs almost desperate, called out to two gigantic brothers, whose name was Chirmil, the greater and the less, whom he saw in the front, like two rocks bearing against the torrent... Byzantium fled, with the scattered remains of his army, towards Hindostan; but he was overwhelmed with his mis-

BRIGGS.

“At first the troops of Ghizni, by their superior numbers, bore down those of Ghor; till Allā-ood-Deen, seeing his affairs desperate, called out to two gigantic brothers, denominated the greater or lesser Khurmil [In a note, he says, he doubts whether this word should not be Firrnul, and says there is a tribe so called!] Elliot: INDEX, page 157, note, writes their name Sinfil, and says Briggs [who
Pul-i-Yak Tāk [the One-arch Bridge] of the city. When they reached that place, Sultān Sūrī, and his Wazīr, Sayyid Majd-ud-Dīn, Mūsāwī, were gibbeted, and they were both hung from the bridge. Such was the cruelty and ignominy with which they treated that handsome, just, intrepid, and laudable monarch. The Almighty bestowed victory upon Sultan ‘Alā-ud-Dīn. Husain, Jahān-soz, the brother of Sultan Sūrī, so that he took revenge for this barbarous deed and this dishonour, as has been previously recorded.

fortunes, and sunk under the hand of death, in the year five hundred and forty-seven, after a reign of thirty-five years."—Page 127.

The above is copied by MAURICE, and by ELPHINSTONE, although not quite in the same words; and is re-echoed by Marshman in his HISTORY OF INDIA, "written at the request of the University of Calcutta;" and Meadows Taylor, in the STUDENT'S MANUAL OF INDIAN HISTORY, who improves it, by inserting in the margin of page 89—"Ghuzny plundered by Alla ood Deen, Seljuk!"!!! Firishtah's account is as follows:

"When the two armies came in contact, and the noise of the clashing of swords, and the whiz of arrows reached the vengeance-pursuing heavens, Khar-mīl the greater [older], and Khar-mīl the lesser [younger], entered the field like unto two rampant elephants. Khar-mīl the greater with a poniard ripped up the belly of a famous elephant," &c. [There is not a word about "rocks," "torrents," or anything approaching it.] . . . "Bahrām Shāh, being without heart or strength in every way, fled towards the country of Hind, and, in a very short time, through grief and affliction at the loss of his son, and other matters, fell sick, and was removed from this host of mortality to the gardens of eternity. According to the authentic account, his death took place in 547 H., after thirty-five years' reign."

Firishtah himself is not an author on whom implicit reliance can be placed, even though he quotes from the works of others, for he often mis-quotes them. This is particularly apparent from his account of these events under the reign of Bahrām Shāh, and that of the same events in the chapter on the Ghūrīs, which is very different, and utterly contradictory, in many things, of his previous statements given above.

1 See page 355, and note 9.

2 Everything is barbarous, cruel, savage, and the like that others do to Ghūrīs; but inducing a sovereign to come out of and abandon his capital and surrender after pledging to him the most solemn oaths, and then imprisoning him, and afterwards murdering him, and the rest of his race; inducing a noble to turn his back before shooting him in a cowardly manner; inviting his brother to
II. SULTĀN-UL-AʿZAM, MUʿIZZ-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN, ABū-L-MUṢAFFAR, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF BAHĀ-UD-DĪN, SĀM, KĀSIM-I-AMĪR-UL-MŪMINĪN.

Trustworthy narrators have related after this manner, that, when Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, Jahān-soz, was removed from the habitation of the world, and Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, his son, ascended the throne of Ghūr, he commanded, that both the Sulṭāns, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, sons an audience, and having him basely assassinated; slaying a minister alive; digging up the bones of the dead; massacring women and children, and burning a city in a drunken fit, and mixing the blood of Sayyids with earth to make mortar, all these, on the part of a Ghūrī, are mildness, amiability, beneficence, greatness, and the like. Fānākātī says no less than 70,000 persons were massacred, on this occasion, in Ghaznī alone.

Some copies of the text, the idiom of which differs considerably here, have Sulṭān-I-Ghūfī; and most copies leave out the Kāsim, &c. His titles given at the end of his reign [which see] are altogether different.

Between the putting to death of Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrfī, and the establishment of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn at Ghaznī as his elder brother and sovereign's lieutenant, a period of no less than twenty-six years elapsed, but, as our author gives no dates, the uninitiated reader would imagine that Muʿizz-ud-Dīn succeeded close upon Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrfī. In reality, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn is the first of the Ghūrfān dynasty of Ghaznī.

Sulṭāns subsequently.

This personage is incorrectly styled by the impossible title of Shahīb-din, Shahāb-ood-Deen, and even Shahbadīn. Shihāb-ud-Dīn, which is Arabic, was certainly his title before his brother succeeded to the sovereignty of Ghūr, and his brother's was Shams-ud-Dīn; but soon after the accession of the latter both their titles were changed, as mentioned at page 370. Many authors, either not noticing this fact, or ignorant of it, continued to style the former by his first title of Shihāb-ud-Dīn, and some have reversed the order of things, and appear to have imagined that Muʿizz-ud-Dīn was his first title, which was changed to Shihāb-ud-Dīn; but no such title will be found on his coins. I have, myself, been led into the error of occasionally styling him Shihāb-ud-Dīn in my notes to the Khwārzmī dynasty, page 255-260, an oversight I now correct. Firīshṭāh calls him sometimes Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Ghūrī, and at others Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Ghūrī. Dow, in his translation of Firīshṭāh, chose to style him Mahommed Ghori, as though the last word was part of his proper name, instead of that of his country, and overlooked the fact of the ʿ at the end of Ghūr [غور], being the yā-i-nisbat, expressing relation or connexion, as Hind and Hindī, Kābul, Kābulī, &c., and so compilers of Histories of India have re-echoed the name of Mahommed Ghori down to the present day, although some follow Briggs, who sometimes styles him by the impossible titles of Shahāb-ood-Deen, and Moiṣ-ood-Deen; but he too generally follows Dow, and calls him Mahommed Ghooery. See also Elliot, INDIA: vol 2, page 292.
of Sām, who were imprisoned within the fortress of Wajir-istān, should be released, as has been stated previously in the account of Sultān Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn ⁶.

Sultān Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn abode at the court of Firūz-koh in the service of Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn [his cousin], and Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn proceeded to the court of Bāmiān to the presence of his uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas‘ūd-i-Husain ⁷, Bāmiāni.

When Sultān Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn ascended [the throne of] the dominion of Ghūr, after the catastrophe ⁸ of Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and the news of it reached Bāmiān, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas‘ūd, turned his face towards Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn and said: “Thy brother hath distinguished himself; when wilt thou do the like, and bestir thyself?” Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn hung his head in the presence of his uncle, and left the audience hall, and set out then and there for the Court of Firūz-koh. When he reached the presence of Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn [his brother], he became Sar-i-Jāndar [Chief Armour-Bearer], and he continued to serve his brother, and served him with assiduity, as has been previously recorded.

He continued in his brother’s service for the period of one year, when some cause of umbrage ¹ arose in his august mind, and he proceeded towards Sijistān, to [the Court of] Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Sijistān ¹, and there he remained one cold season. Sultān Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn despatched a distin-

⁶ Gurfdah, and some other works, mention that 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, made Ḥurfī his capital, and conferred the sovereignty of Ghalmīn upon his nephew, Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn, as his deputy [The others say “his nephews, Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn, and Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn ”], and that he [others “they”] succeeded, by treachery, in securing the person of Khusrau Shāh, in 555 H.; but from this statement, and what those writers immediately after state, it is evident, beyond a doubt, that they have confused Ghiyāš with Mu‘izz, and Khusrau Shāh with Khusrau Malik his son.

⁷ Eldest son of 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain, and first of the Ghūrfīn rulers of Bāmiān.

⁸ He was mortally wounded and left for dead in the action with the Ghuzz, by Abū-l-'Abbās-i-Shīf, brother of the noble he had so treacherously shot with an arrow when his back was turned. See page 367.

¹ The words خواهی کردن in Persia, and in the Persian of the East, signify “will thou do;” not “thou art doing.”

¹ Because his brother Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn had not conferred a separate appanage on him.

² The Malik-us-Sā’īs [the Sanguinary], Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, who succeeded his father Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Fatḥ, in 559 H. See page 189.
guished person and brought him back again, and committed to his charge the territory of Kasr-i-Kajürân and Istlāh. After he had brought the whole of the district of Garmsir under his authority, Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn entrusted to him the city of Tīgān-ābād, which was one of the largest cities of Garmsir. This Tīgān-ābād is the place about which, and the possession of it by the Sulṭāns of Ghūr, the downfall of the dynasty of Māhmūd-i-Ghāzi, son of Sabuk-Tīgān, has been caused, and about which Sulṭān’Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, had improvised and sent to Khusraw Shāh, son of Bahram Shāh, the quatrain, which is as follows:—

"Thy father first laid the foundation of enmity,
Hence the world's people all under oppression fell.
Have a care, lest for one Tīgān-ābād thou dost not give,
From end to end, the kingdom of Māhmūd's dynasty to the wind."

The Almighty’s mercy be upon the Sulṭāns of both dynasties!

When Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn acquired the territory of Tīgān-ābād, the Ghuzz tribe, and the chieftains of that sept, who, retiring defeated from before the forces of Khiṣā’, had moved towards Ghaznīn, during a period of twelve

3 Dow says, in his translation of Firīștah: "Mahommed Ghori was left by his brother [Yeas ul dien l] when he acceded (sic) to the throne of Ghor, in command at Tunganabad, in the province of Chorassan." Briggs has: "On the accession of Gheias-ood-Deen to the throne of Ghisny and Ghor, he appointed his brother, Meyis-ood-Deen Mahomed [not called "Mahomed Ghoryy" here], governor of Tukeeabad!" Firīștah, who quotes our author, says: "Ghīyās-ūd-Dīn, Muḥammad-I-Sām, on attaining the sovereignty of Ghūr, left his full brother, Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, who is renowned as Shīḥāb-ud-Dīn, at Tīgān-ābād, which belongs to the territory of Garmsir." He was only "renowned as Shīḥāb-ud-Dīn" by Firīștah, and a few other comparatively modern writers who, perhaps, knew not of the passage in our author where he mentions the change of title by both brothers. The Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir written, or, at least, begun before the Sulṭān’s death, does not mention the word Shīḥāb any more than our author.

4 The citadel of this place is situated on the Koh-i-Sher, and is sometimes called the fortress of Koh-i-Sher, and is mentioned by Baihaḵāf; but, in the MS. copies of Baihaḵāf, is called Aytkīn-ābād. This remark above would indicate that Khusraw Shāh, not Bahram, was ’Alā-ud-Dīn’s antagonist. See note 5, page 347.

5 Not Sulṭān then but Malik. The title was conferred after this.

6 The word used signifies an army [not "armies"], but, as all the able men of the tribe carried arms, I have not used the word in its literal sense.

7 Before the Kārughḫah Türk-māns. See note 6, para. 2, page 374.
years had taken the Ghaznīn territory out of the hands of Khusrau Shāh and of Khusrau Malik, and had brought it under their own sway. Mu’izz-ud-Dīn was in the constant habit of making raids upon the Ghuzz from Tigīn-ābād, and assailing them, and continued to harass that territory until the year 569 H. ⁸, when Sultan Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn subdued Ghaznīn, and placed Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Dīn upon the throne [of that territory] and returned to Ghūr again, as has been previously recorded.

The second year after this, [namely] in 570 H., Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Dīn brought the districts of Ghaznīn under his sway, and acquired Gardaiz ⁹; and, in the third year [571 H.] ¹⁰, he marched an army towards Multān and delivered it from the hands of the Karāmiṭah ², and, in this year, 571 H., the

---

⁸ There is some discrepancy among authors with respect to the date of the capture of Ghaznīn. Jahān-Ārā, and Haft Iklīm say, Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn acquired possession of Ghaznīn in 570 H., after which he conferred the government of it upon his brother, Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, as Wālī [Haft Iklīm says, deputy or lieutenant]; Faṣḥī f says Ghaznīn was taken in 569; the Zubdat-ut-Tawārīḵ, which copies our author, also says 569; Tabākāt-i-Akbarī agrees with Rauṣat-ut-Ṣafā, and Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīḵ, that Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn took Ghaznīn from the Ghuzz, in 569, and conferred it on his brother, Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, in 570; the Taṣkīrat-ul-Mulūk of Yahyā Khān, Mir’āt-i-Jahān-Nūmā, and the Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīḵ say 569; the Lubb-ut-Tawārīḵ-i-Hind says Ghaznīn was given to Mu’izz-ud-Dīn in 567; and states that the Mahmūds had regained possession of it, and that Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn took it from the Amirs of Khusrau Malik (sic!). Budā’īnī states that some say Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn took it from the Ghuzz in 569 H., and others, that he took it from Khusrau Malik who had re-taken it from the Ghuzz. Alīf states that Khusrau Shāh himself returned to Ghaznīn after the withdrawal of ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, but the Ghuzz, who had defeated Sultan Sanjar [his great uncle], were perpetually making raids upon the Ghaznīn territory, and he, Khusrau Shāh [not his son, Khusrau Malik], again returned to Lāhor, and the Ghuzz, taking possession of Ghaznīn, retained possession of it for ten years. Firāštah, who does not always copy his authorities correctly, says Ghaznīn was taken by Ghiyāš-ud-Dīn in 567 H., and that the Ghuzz only held it two years!

⁹ Gardaiz is the name of a large darak of the Tājīks, or Tāḏīks, for both are correct [The Ghūns were themselves Tājīks], with lofty hills on either side, well watered, and once very populous and well cultivated. To the east and south-east are Afgāns. In Akbar’s reign there was a strong castle here named Gardaiz also. See note ⁷, page 498.

¹⁰ Three of the works just quoted state that Multān was taken in 570 H.; but Firāštah, who is evidently wrong, has 572 H.

² Who had regained possession of it some years previously. He does not mention the capture of Üçehah, which immediately followed that of Multān. An account of the capture of Üçehah and the conduct of Mu’izz-ud-Dīn has been given by Firāštah, which has not been correctly rendered by his translators, and makes the conduct of Mu’izz-ud-Dīn appear in a light contrary to
Sanūrān tribe broke out into rebellion, and committed great violence, until, in the year 572 H., he marched an

3 Faṣīḥ-ī is the only work, among those previously quoted, which mentions this affair. Therein it is stated that the Sanūrān were a tribe of the Ghuzz. They are referred to in the second paragraph of the note at the foot of page 290. This name, in some copies of the text, is written Sanūrān and Sufrān; and, in one of the oldest copies, Shafūzān. Shalūzān appears to be the present name of the locale of this tribe, which is also mentioned in the history of Tūmūr. See note 4, page 498. Some call it Shafūzān.

facts; and these mis-statements, to which I draw attention, have been re-echoed by all the Indian History writers.

Dow, vol. i. page 136.

"The prince of that place [Adja, this is intended to represent Ūchchah] shut himself up in a strong fort. Mahommed began to besiege the place; but, finding it would be a difficult task to reduce it, he sent a private message to the Rajah's wife, promising to marry her if she would make away with her husband.

"The base woman returned for answer that she was rather too old herself to think of matrimony, but that she had a beautiful young daughter, whom, if he would promise to espouse, and leave her in free possession of the country and its wealth, she would, in a few days, remove the Rajah. Mahommed basely accepted of the proposal, and the wicked woman accordingly, in a few days, found means to assassinate her husband, and to open the gates to the enemy. Mahommed confirmed his promise by marrying the daughter upon acknowledging the true faith, but made no scruple to deviate from what respected the mother; for, instead of trusting her with the country, he sent her off to Ghisny, where she soon died of grief and resentment. Nor did her daughter relish her situation better; for, in the space of two years, she also fell a victim to grief."

Firishta's account is as follows:—

"The Rajah of that country took refuge therein [in Ūchchah], and Sulṭān Shīhāṣ-ud-Dīn pitched his tents and pavilion around the fort, and set about preparations for investing it. As he knew that to overcome that Rajah in battle and capture the fort would be arduous, he despatched a person to the
army against them, and fell upon that people, and put the greater number of them to the sword. They have related that most of the Sankurān tribe were manifestly confessors of the Kurān creed, who, on this occasion, obtained martyrdom; but, as they had stirred up rebellion, they were put to death, as a matter of exigency, according to sovereign prerogative.

In the following year after this event, Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din marched an army towards Nahrwālah by way of Uchcha and Multān. The Rāe of Nahrwālah, Bhim Dīw, was young in years, but he had numerous forces and many elephants; and, when a battle took place, the army of Islām was defeated and put to the rout, and the Sultan—wife of the Rājāh, who was despotic over her husband, and cajoled her, and promised, saying: 'If, by your endeavours, this city shall be taken, having contracted marriage with you, I will make you the Malikah-i-Jahān [Queen of the Universe, i.e. his consort; but there is not a word about 'making away with,' or 'delivering up her husband:' the offer is her own]. The Rājāh's wife, frightened of or at the power and grandeur of the Sultan, and knowing that he would be victorious [over her husband, and capture the place], sent a reply, saying: 'No worthiness remains to me, but I have a daughter possessed of beauty to perfection, and grace. If the Malik consents, he may take her into the bonds of marriage; but, after taking the city, if he will not evince any avarice towards my own peculiar property and effects [not a word about entrusting the country to her], I will remove the Rājāh.' The Sultan agreed, and in a short time that woman caused her husband to be put to death, and delivered up the city. Sultan Shihāb-ud-Dīn, having fulfilled his promise, made the Rājāh's daughter a Musalmān according to the rites of the sublime law of Muḥammad, contracted marriage with her, and both of them, mother and daughter, were sent to Ghazīn, that they might learn the duties respecting fasting and prayer and to read the sacred pages [of the Kurān]. The mother, whom her daughter held in abhorrence on account of her abominable act, and placed no faith in, shortly after died; and the daughter herself, after two years, from not having obtained the enjoyment of the Sultan's society [the marriage was never consummated], through grief and mortification, followed her mother."

The Rājāh above referred to, according to the Mirāt-i-Jahān-Numā, was chief of the Bhāf tribe, which previously held a large part of Sind. The same work states that Uchcha was taken by assault. The name is differently written by different authors—بہت and بہت—while some have بہت and بہت. Compare Abū-Rījān-al-Bhrūf, and see translation in Elliot's India, vol. i. page 61, and page 154.

4 If so, it is somewhat strange that such an orthodox champion of the faith should have massacred them.

5 "The following" year after 572 H. is 573 H.; but, just under, our author says 574 H., which is the year which most authors mention, but Faṣīḥ-ī has 575 H.

6 This is the correct name, confirmed by several other writers; but some copies of the text differ. One has رضوvertub—another رضوvertub—and three رضوvertub. The Rauṣat-uṭ-Tahirīn styles him Bhuj [بھوج]-Dīw.
i-Ghāzi returned again without having accomplished his designs. This event took place in the year 574 H. 7

In the year 575 H., Mu'izz-ud-Dīn led an army to Fūrshor 8, and subdued it; and, in another two years subsequent to that, he marched an army towards Lohor. As the affairs of the Maḥmūdī empire had now approached their termination, and the administration of that government had grown weak, Khusrau Malik, by way of compromise, despatched one of his sons, and one elephant, to the presence of the Sultān-i-Ghāzi. This circumstance happened in the year 577 H. 9

The following year, 578 H., the Sultān led an army towards Dīwal 2 [or Dibal] and possessed himself of the

7 Our author slurs over this affair because it was a reverse, but it was not dishonour. Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's forces were completely worn out with their long march, the latter portion of it through the sandy desert, and suffering from thirst and want of forage for their cattle. The forces of Bhīm-Dīw were numerous, fresh, and well supplied. Numbers of the Musalāmān forces perished in the obstinate battle which took place, and the retreat was effected with great difficulty.

8 Previously spelt Furshor and Burshor, and in some copies of the text here Burshor likewise—the letters b and f, and b and w are interchangeable. In the passage at page 76, where mention is made of the idol temple which fell on the night of Maḥmūd's birth, the place supposed to be Fesāhāwar is written in every copy of the text with an extra letter. Nearly every author I have quoted mentions that, in ancient books, this place was known as Bagrām. See my account of it in Journal of Bombay Geographical Society, vol. x.

9 Our author should have added, "a renowned elephant, and the finest that Khusrau Malik possesses." His son is called Malik Shāh by some writers, including Firāštah; but one of his translators turns it into Muliḳ.

1 As to this date there is considerable discrepancy. Of the different works previously quoted, the majority state that the first expedition against Lāhor took place in 577 H., as our author has it; but two others mention 576 as the year, and three others that it took place in 575. Budā'īṉf says 580 H.; but he has omitted the first expedition, and mistaken the second for it. I do not quote Baizāwī or Guizdāh, for they are both at sea with respect to the two last Maḥmūdī sovereigns, and make one of them.

2 In the same manner, there is much discrepancy with regard to the invasion of Dīwal. Five authors give 577 H. as the year, one 578, one 576, one 575, and Budā'īṉf 581. Of these, some say the expedition against Purshor and Dīwal took place in the same year; others that it took place the year after Purshor was annexed, and the year before the first expedition against Lāhor; whilst others state that Dīwal was taken the year after; and some omit all mention of it. Āḥmad, son of Muḥammad, Kazwīnī, the author of the Jahān-Ārā, which I have often quoted, on his way to visit Hindūstān, died at this place in 975 H.—1567 A.D. It is not the same place as Thāthah, but in the Thāthah province between Thāthah and Karūght. See note 5, p. 295.
whole of that territory [lying] on the sea-coast, and acquired much wealth, and returned.

In the year 581 H., he [again] led an army towards Lohor, and ravaged and pillaged the whole of the districts of that territory; and, on his return homewards, directed that the Hišār [fortress] of Sīāl-koṭ should be restored. Husain son of Khar-mil was installed therein, and

8 The name of this city—which is a very ancient one—is also written Lāh-nor [لاهناور], as well as Lohā-war [لاهوار].

The Ṭabākāt-i-Akbarī, Mirāt-i-Jahān-Numā, and Firīštah say that this second expedition took place in 580 H., and the Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārikh says it was in 579; but the others agree with our author as above. The astonishing thing, however, is, that our author himself, in his account of Khusrav Malik's reign, at page 115, which see, only mentions true expeditions to Lāhor—one in 577 H., and the other, when it was taken, in 583!  

4 Most authors, including Firīštah, make a great error in asserting that Mu'izz-ud-Dīn founded the fortress of Sīāl-koṭ. Such is not the case, and some of the authors I have been quoting very correctly state that it is a very ancient place, founded by one of the early Hindū rulers. Mu'izz-ud-Dīn found it in a dilapidated condition on the occasion of his retirement from the Panjāb, and unsuccessful attempt to take Lāhor; and, considering its situation a good one for his purposes, he put it in a state of efficiency, and garrisoned it at the suggestion of the Rājah of Jamūn. I extract this statement from a History of the Rājahs of Jamūn [the n is nasal], which the author states to be composed from Hindū annals; and in no other writer have I seen the same details, although another contains a portion of it, which I shall subsequently refer to.

"In the year 1151 of Bikrāmaditya, Rājah Jakr [or Chakr] Dīw succeeded his father as ruler of Jamūn; and, in the middle of his reign, in 555 H., Khusrav Malik, the descendant of Mahmūd, Ghaznavī, abandoned Ghaznī, and assumed the throne of Lāh-nor. The Jamūn Rājahs continued to entertain their natural hatred towards his dynasty, but without effect; and Khusrav Malik, by degrees, brought under his rule the northern parts of the Panjāb, as far as the foot of the mountains [the Alpine Panjāb]. The tribe of Khokhar, who dwelt round about Manglān [Mahīfāh], at the foot of the hills, who were subject to the Jamūn-wāl [the Jamūn dynasty], having received encouragement from the Lāh-nor ruler, and sure of his support, refused any longer to pay tax and tribute to Jamūn, and threw off its yoke.

"At this time, the year 579 H., Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, the Ghūrī, who had taken possession of Ghaznī, raised the standard of conquest; and Rājah Jakr [Chakr] Dīw despatched his full brother, Rām Dīw, with presents to the Sultān's presence, representing to him the state of affairs, and inciting him to invade Khusrav's territory, assuring him that, on his appearance, the territory of Lāh-nor would pass from his grasp. The Sultān, who received the emissary with favour, replied in writing to the Rājah, that 'his Mīn-jī [agent] had made known the Rājah's object, and that the time was at hand for the appearance of his standards in that part;' and in that same year the Sultān made a raid on, and possessed himself of, the Purāhor territory and Multān, and invested Lāh-nor, which Khusrav Malik defended.

"The Sultān, finding he could not gain possession of it easily, devastated and ravaged the country about Lāh-nor, and retired by the northern part of the
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the Sultan again retired. After his departure, Khusrau Panjab; and, at the suggestion and representation of the Rājāh of Jamūn, repaired anew the fort of Šāl-kot [Šāl is the name of a tribe of Jats, since displaced, and dwelling much farther south, at and around Jang-i-Šāl], which was then in a ruinous and dilapidated state, and left there Husain-i-Khar-mīl [turned into Husain Churmīlī by Dow, and Husain Fursully by Briggs!] as governor, with a garrison. The Mīn-jī, of Jamūn, was then dismissed, with a request to inform the Rājāh that next year his wishes would be fulfilled.

"Khusrau Malik, after the Sultan's departure, aided by the tribe of Khokhar, invested Šāl-kot; but, as Rājāh Jākr [Chakra] Dīv, assisted and supported the defenders, Khusrau Malik was unable to take it. At this period the Rājāh, who had attained to nearly his eightieth year, died, and was succeeded by his son, Rājāh Bij, who is also called Bijayī [Bijayī] Dīv, in 1221 of Bīkrāmaditya; and in that year, which corresponds with 582 H., the Sultan [Mu'izz-ud-Dīn] crossed the Sind at the Nīlāb ferry, where the Rājāh's Mīn-jī went to receive him; and on the banks of the Bihat [the Jilam] the Rājāh's son, Nar-singh Dīv, joined him with a considerable force. He was presented to the Sultan through Husain-i-Khar-mīl, and received with honour. He accompanied the Sultan to Lāh-nor, which was taken, and made over to the charge of Kar-māk [Ahl-i-Kar-mākh, who is turned into Aliy Kirmānī by Briggs], governor of Mūltān. The Rājāh's son and his agent were dismissed with honorary robes, and the town of Šāl-kot, together with the fort, was entrusted to the care of the Rājāh. Khusrau was taken to Ghazānī, and was subsequently put to death. From the circumstance of the Sultan, in his communications, styling the Rājāh's agents by the term Mīn-jī, according to the custom of Irān, instead of Wakīl, the whole family of the Jamūn-wāl [not the present dynasty], considering this title great honour, adopted it; and from it the abridged term Mīn, used by their descendants, is derived."

Dow, in his translation of Firīstah, states, under the reign of Khusrau Malik [page 129], that "the Emperor Chusero [Khusrau would not have known his own name thus written], in alliance with the Gickers, besieged the fort of Salcot, but, their endeavours proving unsuccessful, they were obliged to desist." Briggs, in his version, repeats this in the same words, with the exception of styling Khusrau, Khoosrow Mallik; and the Khokhars, Gukurs; and that Khusrau had to abandon the investment; but under the reign of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Dow [page 137] states: "This fort [Salcot], as we have before related, was effectually besieged by Chusero, in the absence of Mahommed," and Briggs also [page 176] says: "This fort, as we have before related, being successfully besieged and taken by Khoosrow Mallik," &c.; and thus both translators totally contradict their own previous statements. Firīstah, whom they translate, of course, states, as other writers do, that Khusrau Malik was unable to take it. Led away, I imagine, by this statement, and placing reliance on its correctness, Elphinstone has repeated [page 311] this absurdity. He says "Khusrau Malik, taking courage from despair, made an alliance with the Gakkars [Dow, Gickers; Briggs, Gukurs; Elphinstone, Gakkers!], captured one of Shahāb u-dīn's strongest forts, and obliged him to call in the aid of stratagem," &c. Thus a totally incorrect translation of a native historian's words, and a statement respecting which the translators themselves contradict their own previous translation, is handed down from one writer to the other. This is writing history with a vengeance.

The stratagem referred to above is related in Firīstah, which see but it
Malik assembled the forces of Hindūstān, and a levy of the [different] Khokhar tribes, and appeared before the gates of Sīlākot, and sat down before it for a considerable time, and again retired without being able to effect his object. After that, in the year 582 H., the Sultān-i-Ghāzī [Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn] appeared [again] before the gates of Lohor. As the Mahmūd sovereignty had reached its termination, and the sun of the empire of Sabuk-Tīgīn had reached its setting, and the Recorder of Destiny had inscribed the decree of Khusrau Malik’s dethronement, that monarch was not possessed of the power to resist, and he entered into negotiations for peace; and, for the purpose of having an interview with the Sultān [Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn], Khusrau Malik came out [of Lohor]. He was seized, and imprisoned, and Lohor passed into the possession of the Sultān-i-Ghāzī, and the kingdom of Hindūstān came under his sway.

is not related by any of the authors I have quoted, from some of whom he derived his own information.

The account contained in the Hindū history of Jamūn previously quoted, of Khusrau Malik’s attempt to take Sīlākot, which was a standing menace to his rule, agrees with the account given by our author and some others, with the exception that other tribes of unbelievers besides the Khokhars were engaged in it; and, although Khusrau Malik had got together a large following, he was unable to keep the field against the superior and more efficient forces of the Ghūrfs.

The Khokhars [ئظلو] are a totally distinct race from the Gakhars [خک]. The name of the former is sometimes written [خک] Khukhar, but the first mode is the most correct. Abū-l-Faṣl, in the A‘-īn-i-Akbarī, constantly mentions them, and he writes the two names very differently. There are still numbers of Khokhars in the Panjāb, some 20,000 families, and I have met with them constantly in the Multān district, and districts further to the north-west, towards the Indus, in the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah. Their chief location is about Bārih, Aḥmad-ābād, and Khusāb-āb. They still style their chief Sultān as well as Rāz, and will not give their daughters in marriage to other tribes, or, at least, used not to. The Chakars are still further northwards. Our author does not mention a word about these transactions with the Khokhars in his account of Khusrau Malik’s reign, and only mentions two expeditions against Lāhor, and therein states that Khusrau Malik delivered it up to Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn in 583 H.; but here he says in 582 H. Some of the works I have been quoting say Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn obtained possession of Lāhor in 582 H., while others say it happened in 583 H.

* This is the same person who subsequently gave his adherence to Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and then acted treacherously, and was ousted from Hirāt, and put to death. See note 3, page 257. His correct name is ’Izz-ud-Dīn, Husain. His father’s name was Khar-mīl.

* See page 115, where our author states that Khusrau Malik, under the faith of a treaty, was induced to come out.

7 That portion only over which Khusrau Malik ruled; but subsequently he conquered more.
The Sipah-Sālār, 'Alī-i-Kar-mākh, who was the Wāli [Governor] of Multān, was located at Lohor, and the father of the author of this work, Maulānā Sarāj-ud-Dīn-i-Minhāj, the Wonder of his Age, and Most Eloquent of 'Ajāmī, became the Kāzi of the forces of Hindūstān, and, dressed in an honorary robe, conferred upon him by Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, in the audience hall [or tent] of the camp he established his Court of Judicature. Twelve camels were assigned to convey his tribunal [on the march]. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him, and upon the orthodox Sultāns of the past, and the Musalmān Malikis of the present!

After these events the Sultān-i-Ghāzī set out on his return to Ghaznīn, taking along with him Khusrāw Malik; and from the court of Ghaznīn sent him to the court of Firūz-koh, to the presence of the Sultān-ul-A'zam, Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn. From thence Khusrāw Malik was sent into Ghurjistān and imprisoned within the castle of Balarwān, and it was commanded that his son, Bahrām Shāh [by name], should be detained within the walls of the fortress of Saif-rūd of Ghūr; and, when the outbreak and sedition of Sultān Shāh, Khwārazm-Shāh, arose in the year

8 Where public business was usually transacted.
9 For himself and the Muftīs. He did not continue at Bāmiān long then. See pages 431 and 433.
1 This, probably, is the son who had been given up as a hostage to Mu'izz-ud-Dīn. Firūshah, but on whose authority he does not mention, styles him Malik Shāh. There is not the slightest doubt as to who put them to death, and the text very plainly indicates who did, both here and at page 115. Compare Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii., note 1, page 295.
2 Not "Khwārazm Shāh" but his brother. He was not a Sultān; this is part of his title merely. See page 245. The error of calling him Sultān or King of Khwārazm is of common occurrence. Elphinstone, misled by translators or translations, calls him "King of Khārism." His name was Maḥmūd, and his title, Sultān Shāh-i-Jalāl-ud-Dīn. At page 115, our author says Khusrāw Malik and his son, Bahrām Shāh, were put to death when the affair of Sultān Shāh occurred in 598 H., and here says, 587 H., while twice, in his account of Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn's reign [see pages 378 and 379], he distinctly states that the engagement with Sultān Shāh, in which Kūt-ud-Dīn, I-bak, then only Lord of the Stables, was taken prisoner, took place in 588 H. [Jahān-Ārā, 588 H.]. The year 587 H. is that in which the first battle took place with Rāe Pithorā, according to the whole of the authors I have been quoting, as well as several others, including our author himself, and the second battle, in which Rāe Pithorā was defeated and [according to Musalmān accounts] slain, took place beyond a doubt [see page 468], in 588 H. There is no doubt whatever as to the dates our author gives, for they are as plainly written as it
587 H., they martyred Khusrav Malik and his son [Bahrām Shāh]. The mercy of the Almighty be upon them all!

Subsequent to these events, the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī caused the forces of Islām to be organized, and advanced against the fortress of Tabarhindah, and took that stronghold, and is possible to write, and all the copies of the text collated agree; but neither of these three dates can be correct. The campaign against Sulṭān Shāh, Khwārazmī, which lasted over six months, took place in 586 H., or early in 587 H., and in 589 H. he died. What tends to prove this to be correct, even from our author’s own statements, is the fact, that, between the acquisition of Lāhor, and the first battle of Tarā’in, no operations were undertaken east of the Indus by Mu’īzz-ud-Dīn, because occupied elsewhere. See also next page where it is said that the Kāšī of Tūlak was to hold Tabarhindah for the period of eight months, thus showing that the Sulṭān intended to come again the next cold season and relieve it. The Kāšī however held out for five months longer, and, the Sulṭān not having arrived, was obliged to capitulate. Here is further proof. Alīf and Jāmīl-ut-Tawārīkh say Sulṭān Shāh sent a message to Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn [after Sulṭān Shāh revolted against his brother's authority. See also page 246 and note 8], after he had gained possession of several places in Khurāsān with the aid of the Karā-Khūṭī’s, that he, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, should give up to him the places belonging to his [Sulṭān Shāh’s] father, otherwise to prepare for hostilities. Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn summoned his brother, Mu’īzz-ud-Dīn, from Hind to join him. Some writers affirm that up to this time the latter was styled Malik only, and that after that campaign the title of Sulṭān was conferred upon him, as well as on his cousin, Shams-ud-Dīn of Bāmīnān, from which period, and not before, the name and title will be found on his coins. In the neighbourhood of the Murghāb, in the valley of Marw-ar-Rūd, the two brothers, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, and Mu’īzz-ud-Dīn, Shams-ud-Dīn of Bāmīnān, and Tāj-ud-Dīn, ruler of Sījistān, being also present, after several months, encountered Sulṭān Shāh, who was defeated, and reached Marw with only forty followers. This is said to have taken place in 586 H. Sulṭān Takīs, Khwārazm Shāh, hearing of this reverse his rebellious brother had sustained, advanced from Khwārazm against him by forced marches; and Sulṭān Shāh again sought protection from the Ghūrs, who, some time after, aided him with a numerous force, and despatched him towards Khwārazm. This was in 588 H., for, his brother Takīs having marched into 'Irāk at the request of Kutlāgh Īnāj [see page 167, note 9] in that year, Sulṭān Shāh made a dash against Khwārazm, the capital of his brother.

Alīf further states, but it is somewhat contrary to other accounts, that, on the way, Sulṭān Shāh was taken ill, and died at the end of Ramāzān, 589 H. When the news of this event reached Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, he despatched orders for his troops to march back again.

Another reason why I consider 586 H. correct is, that all authors of any authority, as well as our author himself, say that the second battle of Tarā’in took place in 588 H., after which Kutb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was left to carry on operations in Hindūstān, and, if the campaign against Sulṭān Shāh took place in that year, and the two armies were six months in sight of each other, Kutb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, could not have been present there to be taken prisoner, and be at Kuhşām in Hindūstān at the same time. See page 515.

* All the copies of the text collated, both here, and elsewhere in the work, as well as many other authors, say Tabarhindah [or Tabarhindh].
made it over [to the charge of] Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, the Kāẓī Muḥammad-ī-' Abd-us-Sallām, Nisāwī, Tūlakī. This Kāẓī, Ziyā-ud-Dīn, was the son of the uncle of the maternal grandfather of the writer of this History, [namely] Kāẓī Majd-ud-Dīn, Tūlakī. At his [Kāẓī Ziyā-ud-Dīn's] request, they selected twelve hundred horse from the forces of Hindūstān and of Ghaznīn, all men of Tūlak, and the whole of them were ordered to join his Khayl [band or division], and were located within that fortress, under the stipulation that they should hold it for the period of eight months, until the Sulṭān-ī- Ghāzī should return again from Ghaznīn; but the Rāē Kolah ⁶ Pithorā, however, had arrived

printed text has Sirhind, and many authors of comparatively modern date, including the Takaḥāt-ī-Akbarī, Mirāt-ī-Jahān-Numā, and Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīḵ, also have Sirhind. The Tārīḵ-i-Alīf, and Zuhdat-ut-Tawārīḵ say Tarhindah, Budā'ūnī also has the same in one copy, and Tarhindah [the Persian] might have been left out by the copyist] in another; and, in another place, says it was Jai-pāl's capital. The Lubb-ut-Tawārīḵ-i-Hind says Tabarhindah now known by the name of Bitandah. Fīrishṭān has Pathindah in the latest lithographed copy of the Persian text which was so carefully collated, it is said, with several copies of the original, by Briggs himself, and Bathindah in other MS. copies I have examined, but, in his translation, Briggs has Bituhnda, and Dow calls it “The capital of Tiberhind.” I may mention that Bathindah, which is the place Briggs probably means, is some hundred miles west of Thānī-sar. See also note ², page 76, next to last para. ⁴ That is to say, he or his family came originally from Nisāwī, and he was Kāẓī of Tūlak, which was a considerable place mentioned by our author in several places. We might as well say Chief Justice Supreme Court, as “Kāẓī Tolak.” Instead of Nisāwī, some copies of the text have Būshārfī, and Būshārī, but the majority of the best copies have Nisāwī. Briggs turns him into “Mullik Zee-ood-Deen Toosuki,” and Dow into “Malleck Zee” ¹


The right word may be Golah, as both would be written īrāk. In Sarskrit, golak signifies the offspring by illegitimate connexion with a widow; but we hear nothing of such a connexion on the part of Pritīḥ Rāj’s father. Tod, in his usual highly imaginative way, however, considers Gola [Golah] to mean a slave:—“In Persian Gholam, literally ‘a slave,’ evidently a word of the same origin as the Hindu gola.” In another place, he asserts that Golah refers to the natural brother of Prithī Rāj. Vol I. page 179. Had Prithī Rāj been a golak, I do not think he would have been eligible to succeed his grandfather. The Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir, referring to the second battle between the Hindūs and Muḥammadans, calls Kolah [or the Kolah] the son of the Rāē of Ajmīr; and all authors with whom I am acquainted state, that Kolah or Golah, the son of Pithorā or Prithī Rāj, after his father was put to death, was made tributary ruler of Ajmīr by Mu’tiz-ud-Dīn, as do all the authors I have been quoting; and no other writer that I know of pretends that Pithorā was a natural son of his father or adds Kolah or Golah to his name. Our author has apparently confused the two names, and this seems the more likely, because he
near at hand, and the Sultan marched to Tarā'īn to meet him. The whole of the Rānās of Hind were along with the Rāe Kolah.

When the ranks were duly marshalled, the Sultan seized a lance and attacked the elephant on which Gobind Rāe,

has not said a single word about Pithorā's son having been set up by the Musalmāns, although they had to support him subsequently by force of arms.

This name is plainly and correctly written, in the different copies of our author's text, and all the authors I have quoted previously, as well as many others, call this place by the same name. Compilers of Histories of India, led astray by the translations of Firīštah [not by Firīštah himself] which supplied them with their materials, have turned this name into Narāin. Dow has "Sirauri upon the banks of the Sisutty," and Briggs, "Narain, now called Tirory, on the banks of the Sorsutty." Elphinstone, following Briggs, no doubt, calls it "Tirory, between Tankhar and Carnī," and Dowson [Elliot: India, vol. ii. page 295], in the translation of this passage of our author's text, evidently trusting to Briggs's translation rather than to the original text, is led to believe our author wrong; but acknowledges, in a foot note, that "the text [our author's] has Tarāīn," and adds "but Firīštah gives the name as Narāīn, and says it was afterwards called Tirauri. He places it on the banks of the Sursutī fourteen miles from Thānisar and eighty from Dehli." Now all this is incorrect as far as Firīštah is concerned, even to the lithographed text of Briggs's own revision, for the former has Tarāīn like other authors, not Narāīn. Mirzā Mujhī Beg, who, about eighty years since, made a personal survey of these parts, and the territories further west, says that "on the Shah-Rah [Royal Route] from Kamāl to Thānisar is A'qīm-āhād-ī-Talāwarī, where there is a large and lofty Rābāt of great strength and solidity which can be seen for miles round. Seven miles from this place, to the north, is Amin-ghār, a large village with a large and lofty Rābāt likewise. About two miles from the village of Chatang is a small river, filled in the rainy season only, running from right to left, which joins the river Sursutī. Six miles from Amin-ghār, still going northerly, is the city of Thānisar."

This is within a mile or two of the distance given by many other writers as well as Firīštah. There are several places called Talwanī, and one, on the road from Dihīf to Bhaṭnīr, called Talvarī [7}, but no other Talawārī. For an account of the engagement, as given in the Jamūn History, see next page.

In some copies Rāes: other writers say, a number of Rājpūt princes.

Thus styled [7] and also Gobindāh [7] in the oldest copies of the text. Some have [7] and both of which modes of writing the name confirm the correctness of the above, which is a common Hindū name; but some more modern copies of the text have Kand [7], Khān [7], and Khāndī [7]. Most other authors, including Firīštah, have this latter name also; but the Hindū bard, Chanda, calls him Rāe Gobind, like our author in the oldest copies. He led the van of the Hindūs on an elephant. Translators of Firīštah make him commander of the whole; but Rāe Pithorā was himself an experienced leader: the other led the van. Tod (vol. i. p. 119), says Chanda Rāe, which the historians of "Shahudin" style "Khandīrāi, was not brother of Pirth'hwirāj." He states that he was of the Dahima race of Rājpūts, one of three brothers, the eldest of whom, Kaima, was lord of Bīna [Blānah], and minister of Pirth'hwirāj; the second was
Rāe [Rājah] of Dihlī, was mounted, and on which elephant he moved about in front of the battle. The Sultān-i-Ghāzī, who was the Ḥaidar of the time, and a second Rustam, charged and struck Gobind Rāe on the mouth with his lance with such effect that two of that accrued one's teeth fell into his mouth. He launched a javelin at the Sultān of Islām and struck him in the upper part of the arm and inflicted a very severe wound. The Sultān turned his charger's head round and receded, and from the agony of the wound he was unable to continue on horseback any longer. Defeat befell the army of Islām so that it was irretrievably routed, and the Sultān was very nearly falling from his horse. Seeing which, a lion [hearted] warrior, a Khalj 2 stripling, recognized the Sultān, and sprang up behind him, and, supporting him in his arms, urged the horse with his voice, and brought him out of the field of battle: 3

“Poondir, who commanded the frontier at Lahore” [the utter absurdity of this assertion I have already shown, I think, in note 1, page 466]; and the third brother, Chaond Rae, was the principal leader in the last battle in which Pirthwirājā fell.” All the Muhammadan historians and three Hindū chroniclers agree in the statement that this person, styled Gobind by some, and Khāndī by others, was Pithorā’s brother, and that he was present in both battles, and was killed in the last.

1 These are the author’s exact words: there is nothing in the text about “on the other hand, returned the blow, &c.” The š or ल(signifies not a blow here, but a small spear or javelin, an Indian weapon, the point of which is sometimes barbed, and sometimes made with three barbs. From five to ten were taken in the hand [the left] at once, and launched at an enemy singly with the right.

2 Not a Ghulāf Afghān, I beg leave to notice, but a Turk.

3 Various are the different accounts given by authors respecting the incidents of this battle, and very erroneous and incorrect are the versions translated from Firīshṭāh which, as authentic statements are to be desired in all matters of history, ought to be corrected, and more particularly respecting this important period of Indian history.

The History of the Rājahs of Jamūn states that “Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, in 587 H., determined to undertake an expedition against the fortress of Tabarhind, which was the strongest place belonging to the great Rājahs of Hind. Rāe Pithorā, the Chohān, sovereign [Farmān-rawā] of Hindūstān, and eighth in descent from Bal-Dīw, Chohān, advanced to give battle to the Sultān. They met at Tarā’n-ghar, fourteen miles from Thānī-sar. During the engagement, Rāe Khān [sic in MS.] Rāe, ruler of Dihlī on the part of his brother, from the back of an elephant on which he was mounted, with a long spear wounded the Sultān in the upper part of the arm. He would have fallen from his horse from the agony of the wound, had not some of his slaves come to him at the moment, and borne him out of the fight. The Sultān, having sustained this defeat, retired towards Ghaznīn, and, near the banks of the Rāwī, a deputation from the Rājah of Jamūn presented themselves.”
On the Musalmān forces not seeing the Sulṭān, lamentation broke from them, until they reached a place where

Another history, written by a Hindū, says Kiḍī [کیدی] Rāe commanded his brother’s army, and that, after the Sulṭān had wounded him in the mouth, he wounded the Sulṭān in the head with his spear, and the Sulṭān received another wound in the side [by whom inflicted is not said], and he fell from his horse, when a Khālīj youth took him on his own horse, and, placing him before him, carried him safely out of the fight. Bud’ā’īnī also says the Sulṭān fell from his horse, and agrees with the above in the last clause of the sentence.

Other authors, including the Ṭabaḵt-i-Akbarī, and Taqkarat-ul-Mulūk, state that Khānī Rāe commanded the van, and was leading on the enemy when the Sulṭān attacked him. They state that the Khālīj youth was on foot at the time, and, seeing the state of the Sulṭān, he sprang up behind him, and carried him out of the mêlée to his own camp, whether his own troops had retired; and that the panic and anxiety which had arisen on its being found that the Sulṭān had not come out of the fight with the rest of his army subsided.

One of the oldest copies of our author’s text here differs from the others collated to a considerable degree. It says that “the Khālīj youth recognized the Sulṭān [in the mêlée and confusion], joined him, and replaced him on the horse’s back [thus implying that he had fallen or had to dismount], cried out with his voice to urge the horse, and brought the Sulṭān out of the battle.” This is the literal translation of the passage in that copy; and, in it, there is no mention of the youth having mounted the horse also.

The Sulṭān remained at Lāhor until his wound was healed before he returned to Ghaznīn.

But what say Firishtah and his translators on this subject?


“In the year 587, he [Mahommed] marched again towards Hindostan, and, proceeding to Ajmīr, took the capital of Tīberhind, where he left Malleek Zia, with above a thousand chosen horse, and some foot, to garrison the place. He himself was upon his way back, when he heard that Pītā Ra, the prince of Ajmīr, with his brother Candi Ra, king of Delhi, in alliance with some other Indian princes, were marching towards Tīberhind, with two hundred thousand horse, and three thousand elephants. Mahommed determined to return to the relief of the garrison. He met the enemy at the village of Sīrāuli, upon the banks of the Sīrusṭhi, fourteen miles from Tamassar, and eighty from Delhi, and gave them battle. Upon the first onset his right and left wings retired, being outflanked by the enemy, till, joining in the rear, his Briggs, vol. i. p. 171—173.

“In the year 587, he [Mahommed Ghoory] marched again to Hindustan, and, proceeding towards Ajmīr, he took the town of Bitukhanda, where he left Mulkī Zeez-ood-Deen Tūsukī with above a thousand chosen horse, and some foot to form its garrison. While on his return, he heard that Pithow Raī, Raja of Ajmīr, with his brother Chawand Raī, the Raja of Dehly, in alliance with other Indian princes, were marching towards Bitukhanda with 200,000 horse, and 3000 elephants. Mahommed Ghoory marched to the relief of his garrison; but, passing beyond Bitukhanda, he encountered the enemy at the village of Norain, now called Tirowry, on the banks of the Soorsutty, fourteen miles from Thāni-sar, and seventy from Dehly. At the first onset his right and left wings, being outflanked, fell back, till, joining in the rear, his army formed a
the defeated army was safe from pursuit by the infidels.

army was formed into a circle. Mahomed, who was in person in the center (sic) of the line when first formed, was told that his right and left wings were defeated, and advised to provide for his own safety. Enraged at this counsel, he smote the imprudent adviser, and rushed on towards the enemy, among whom he commenced, with a few followers, a great slaughter. The eyes of Candi Ra, king of Delhi, fell upon him. He drove the elephant, upon which he was mounted, directly against him. Mahomed, rising from his horse, threw his lance with such force at the elephant, that he drove out three of his back teeth [the elephant's !]. In the meantime the King of Delhi, from above, pierced the Sultan through the right arm, and had almost thrown him to the ground; when some of his chiefs advanced to his rescue. This gave an opportunity, to one of his faithful servants, to leap behind him as he was sinking from his horse, and, supporting him in his arms, he carried him from the field, which, by this time, was deserted almost by his whole army. The enemy pursued them near forty miles."

MAURICE, MURRAY, ELPHINSTONE, MARSHMAN, and MEADOWS TAYLOR, and probably others, such as MIII and THORNTON, take their accounts from the above versions of DOW and BRIGGS. Marshman adds, "He was pursued for forty miles by the victorious Hindoos, and was happy to escape across the Indus," perhaps unaware that he remained at Lähor till his wound was healed [as Dow states] and that there was no pursuit at all.

FIRISHTAH, from the revised text of BRIGGS has as follows:—

"In 587 H., he [Shihāb-ud-Dīn] determined to enter Hindustān, and he took the fort of Pathindah [1242] but the MSS. I have examined have Bațhindah [1242], which, in that day, had become the capital of Rājahs of great dignity, out of the hands of the men of the Rājah of Ajmīr. He left Malik Ziyyā-ud-Dīn, Tūlakā, in that fortress, with 1200 horsemen, each and every one of whom was selected and a picked man; and was desirous of returning. Suddenly, information reached him, that Pitho Rāē, Wālī [a ruler, a prince, the governor of a province] of Ajmīr, in concert with his brother, Khândā Rāē, Wālī of Dīhī, and bringing along with them several Rājpūt Rājahs, were advancing, by regular marches, with an army of 200,000 horse, and 3000 elephants, with the determination of retaking the fort of Pathindah [Bațhindah ?]. Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-Dīn, abandoning his intention of returning [to Ghazīnī], advanced to meet them, and at the mouża' [place,
Suddenly the Sulṭān arrived. A number of Amirs 4,
district, village] of Tarāfūn, on the banks of the Sursut, seven kuroh [a
distance of rather less than fourteen miles] from Thānsūr, now known as
Tarīwaf [but in several MSS. of Firīghtah, which I have seen, it is not
زلزٰلورپ (زازی، زاریپ), and forty kuroh from Dīhīf, an encounter and conflict took place.
The right and left wings of Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-Dīn having broke and faced
about [it does not say that they were actually broken by the Hindūs, and it
appears to mean that they declined the onset, or recoiled], and not a great num-
ber remained in the centre either. [There is not a word about his army
forming "a circle." ] At this juncture one of the Sulṭān’s confidential atten-
dants represented [saying] "the Amirs of the right and left [wings] who were
nourished by the beneficence and favours of your Court [or dynasty] not
keeping their ground resolutely, have taken to flight, and the Afghan [Firīght-
kah does not appear to have had authority for introducing Afghāns here, from
the statements of the contemporary writers of these times] and Khalj Amīrs,
who were the commanders of the advance, who continually boasted of their
valour and prowess, are not to be found [seen], and, should you promptly
I give the exact words, except adopting the second person plural for the
third] turn the reins of retrocession towards Lāhor, it seems expedient [so to
do]." This speech not agreeing with the Sulṭān’s temperament, he drew his
sword from its sheath, and, with the troops [remaining] of the centre, charged the
enemy’s forces and commenced the conflict. [Firīghtah then quotes some lines
to the effect that both friend and foe lauded his prowess.] Suddenly the eye
of Khāndīf Rāe, the Sipahsālār [commander of the army] of Dīhīf, falling on
the Sulṭān, he urged the mountain-like elephant on which he was mounted
towards the Sulṭān, who at once seized his spear and made towards him, and
smote him in the mouth with such effect, that many of his teeth fell out [رب.]
Khāndīf Rāe likewise [i.e. ַ]—which Briggs has read for ֵ—arrow] showed the
greatest audacity and agility, and, from the top of his elephant, inflicted
such a wound [with what weapon not said] on the upper part of the arm [١٥]
of the Sulṭān that he was nearly falling from his horse. A Khalj youth on
foot [there is not a word about his chiefs coming to his rescue] discovered it,
jumped up behind him on the horse, and, taking the Sulṭān in his arms, bore
him out of the battle-field, and conveyed him to the forces of the runaway
nobles which were twenty kuroh off ; and the tumult and disquiet which had
arisen, consequent on the defeat of the army of Islām, and not finding the
Sulṭān, subsided." . . . There is not a word about pursuit.

According to the Zain-ul-Ma’āṣir, quoted by Firīghtah immediately after
the above, "Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, having become faint from the effects of the
wound, fell from his horse. This not being noticed [in the nīlkh], no one came
to his aid. Night intervened, and, when one watch of the night had passed,
over party of his Turkish slaves came to seek him, and went into the battle-field
and began searching among the slain. The Sulṭān [who appears to have
revived], recognizing the voices of his faithful slaves, acquainted them with
his situation. His slaves gave thanks for his safety, and, taking him on their
shoulders, in turns, proceeded along throughout the night, and by day-dawn
reached their own people."

This battle is said to have taken place in the fifteenth year of the reign of
Rāe Pithorā, and the Hindū writers state that this was the seventh time the
Sulṭān had invaded Hind, in all of which he had been defeated!

4 The Malik-ul-Ḥaḍīt, Žiyā-ud-Dīn [subsequently 'Alī-ud-Dīn], Muḥam-
mad, the Sulṭān’s niece’s husband, was present in this battle. See page 393.
Ghúrī youths, and other distinguished men, had noticed the Sultān, along with that lion-like Khaljī, had recognized him, and had gathered round him, and broke spears and made a litter and a stretcher, and had borne him to that halting-place. The people [now] became composed, and once more, through [the safety of] his life, the true faith acquired vigour, and the dispersed army, on the strength of the safety of the life of that Sultān-i-Ghāzī, again came together, and retired, and turned their faces towards the Musalmān dominions.

The Kāzi of Tūlak was left [in charge of] the fortress of Tabarhindah, and Rāe Pithorā appeared before the walls of that stronghold, and fighting commenced. For a period of thirteen months and a little over the place was defended. The following year the Sultān-i-Ghāzī assembled the troops of Islām, and commenced his march towards Hindūstān, to avenge the [disaster of the] previous year.

5 The idiom varies considerably here in nearly every copy. Some have—

"On the strength of the safety of that Badshāh-i-Ghāzī, the army came together again [for rollied]," &c.

6 The same as mentioned at page 458.

7 I have here also to notice, and enter my protest against, a statement respecting the character of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, which Firīghtah's translators have incorrectly given, and which neither Firīghtah nor any other author asserts. In this instance the character of this Prince has been unjustly assailed, held up in a wrong light, and things are asserted which never happened at all.

Dow, vol. i. page 139.

"Mahommed remained a few months with his brother at Ghor, who still kept the imperial title, and then, returning to Ghizni, spent the ensuing year in indolence and festivity. But, ambition again fermenting in his mind, he recruited a noble army," &c.

Firīghtah says: "Sultān Shihāb-ud-Dīn, having taken leave of his brother [at Fīrūz-koh], proceeded to Ghaznī; and, with the determination of taking revenge [on Pithorā], having made sleep and rest unlawful to himself [I give the words literally], in a short time assembled troops, brave and ruthless," &c. This is a specimen of "pleasure and festivity," certainly!

Here is another specimen of the same kind, and it is repeated by one writer after another as undoubtedly true and correct.

Dow, page 140.

"When his[Mahommed's] victorious pears had advanced as far as Pak-awir, an old sage of Ghor, prostrating


"When he had advanced as far as Pishawur, an old sage of Ghor, prostrating himself before him, said,
The author heard from a trustworthy person, a distinguished man of the highland district of Tūlak, whom they used to style by the title of Mu'in-ud-Dīn, Uṣhtī, who said: ‘I was in that army along with the Sultān-i-Ghāzī, and the number of cavalry composing the army of Islām that year was one hundred and twenty thousand arrayed himself before him, said, ‘O King, we trust to thy conduct and wisdom; but as yet thy design has been a subject of much dispute and speculation among us.’ Mahommed replied, ‘Know, old man, that since the time of my defeat in Hindostan, notwithstanding external appearances, I have never slumbered in ease, or waked but in sorrow and anxiety. I have therefore determined, with this army, to recover my lost honour from those idolaters, or die in the noble attempt,’ &c.

‘O King, we trust in thy conduct and wisdom; but as yet thy design has been subject of much speculation among us.’ Mahomed Choory replied, ‘Know, old man, that since the time of my defeat in Hindustan, notwithstanding external appearances, I have never slumbered in ease, or waked but in sorrow and anxiety. I have therefore determined, with this army, to recover my lost honour from those idolaters, or die in the attempt,’ &c.

Here, again, Elphinstone has been deceived, and, quoting Briggs, further disseminates a wrong translation. Marshman says [vol. i. p. 44] that ‘he [Shahab] stated’ this ‘in one of his letters;’ but, unfortunately, Fīrūzābād himself says nothing of the kind! His words are:—‘When his [the Sultān’s] standards, the emblems of victory, reached the Peshāwar territory, one of the Pārs [a holy man, a saint] of Ghūr, who was [sufficiently] bold, bowing his forehead to the ground [only Pārs are wont to do so], represented [saying], ‘It is not understood at all whether the Sultān goeth, nor what his object is.’ Sultān Shīhāb-ud-Dīn replied: ‘O such an one [ālā!] I know for certain that, from the time I have been defeated by the Rājahs of Hind, I have abstained from my wife’s bed [I do not give the literal words to this part of the sentence, but it tends to show that he had but one wife, and his having but one child appears to prove it], and have not changed the clothes on my body; and, having passed this year in grief, sorrow, and sadness, I have not permitted the Amfirs of Ghūr, of the Khalj, and of Khurāsān, who, notwithstanding their ancient servitude, abandoned me in the battle and fled, to present themselves in my presence, nor have I seen their faces during this period. Now, placing dependence on the goodness of God, I am proceeding towards the country of Hind; and I have no expectation of the services of those old [ancient] Amfirs, who, from their cradles to this time, have been nourished by the favours of this [my] family.’ The Pār, hearing this statement, kissed the ground of service, and said, ‘Victory and success attend the followers at the sovereign’s stirrup,’ &c. This is rather different to the statements above.

The name of a town of Farghānāh, and also of a place near Baghdād. The person here referred to is no other than the celebrated Mu’in-ud-Dīn, Chishti, whose tomb is at Ajmīr, and so much frequented. The Emperor Akbar paid several visits to it. Some writers say that he only came into India towards the close of Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s career, and stayed to propagate the Musalmān faith.
in defensive armour." When the Sultan-i-Ghazi with such-like organization and such a force arrived near unto Rae Kolah Pithorâ, he had gained possession of the fortress of Tabarhindah by capitulation, and had pitched his camp in the neighbourhood of Tarain. The Sultan [now] made

It does not appear to have been steel armour. The meaning of the word used is, "a covering, a garment, vestment worn in battle, and also put on horses;"—defensive armour of some sort, some of steel, perhaps, and some of leather. This is what Firuzah appears to have turned into "helmets inlaid with jewels, and armour inlaid with silver and gold."

1 See note 1, page 459. Hasan Najam, in the Taj-ul-Ma'asir, a contemporary writer, who began his work the year before Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din's assassination, and who begins with this expedition, does not mention where this battle took place, but mentions that Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, on reaching Lâhor, despatched the Sadr-i-Kabir, Kiwam-ul-Mulk [these are his titles, not his name], Rukn [Râhu is a mistake]-ud-Din, Hamzah, to Ajnâfr to offer his ultimatum to Pithorâ Râe; but his inflated style greatly obscures the details. Some writers state that two emissaries were sent. The Sultan called upon Pithorâ Râe to embrace the Musalmân faith and acknowledge his supremacy. The Chohân prince sent an indignant reply; and, having received aid from most of the Rajahs of Hind, with 300,000 horse—Râjputs, and some Afghan, one author says—advanced to meet him, and they again met on the former battle-field. Pithorâ Râe sent a message to the Sultan, saying, "It is advisable thou shouldst retire to thine own territory, and we will not follow thee." The Sultan, in order to deceive him, and throw him off his guard, replied: "It is by command of my brother, my sovereign, that I come here and endure trouble and pain: give me sufficient time that I may despatch an intelligent person to my brother, to represent to him an account of thy power, and that I may obtain his permission to conclude a peace with thee under the terms that Tahirind [Tabarhindah], the Panjâb, and Multân shall be ours, and the rest of the country of Hind thine." The leaders of the infidel forces, from this reply, accounted the army of Islam as of little consequence, and, without any care or concern, fell into the slumber of remissness. That same night the Sultan made his preparations for battle, and, after the dawn of the morning, when the Râjputs had left their camp for the purpose of obeying the calls of nature, and for the purpose of performing their ablutions, he entered the plain with his ranks marshalled. Although the unbelievers were amazed and confounded, still, in the best manner they could, they stood to fight, and sustained a complete overthrow. Khândî Râe [the Gobind Râe of our author], and a great number besides of the Râes of Hind, were killed, and Pithorâ Râe was taken prisoner within the limits of Sursuf, and put to death."

There are, however, other versions of these events which, although partly traditioary, bear some measure of truth, and it will be well to notice them. The History of Jamûn, which agrees in some measure with the Râjput traditions, states that Pithorâ Râe, having been apprised by certain informers of the part the Râjah Bij, or Bijayâli Dîw, had taken in aiding the Musalmâns, proposed to march against him, and chastise him. At this juncture, hostility arose between Pithorâ Râe and Râjah Jai Chandra, ruler of Kinnauj [the details of which are too long for insertion here], respecting his daughter. In 588 H., Sultan Shihâb-ud-Dîn, having learned the state of Pithorâ Râe's affairs, prepared to avenge his previous defeat; and Bijayâli Dîw, Râjah of
disposition of his forces. The centre division of the army, the baggage, the standards and banners, his canopy of Jamūn, despatched his son, Nar-singh Dīw, with a body of his forces to join him, and Rājah Jai Chandra of Kinnauj, who had been in communication with the Sultān [TOD also says "the Princes of Kanouj and Putun invited Shabudin [Shihāb-ud-Dīn?] to aid their designs of humiliating the Chohan [Rāē Pithorā]. . . . The envoy was Chand Poondir, the vassal chief of Lahore, and guardian of that frontier, speedily joined his camp with his available forces"! vol. i. page 256.] Perhaps the writer was unaware that Lāhor had been in the possession of the Ghaznawīs for more than a century, and that Shabudin, so called, had only taken it from the last of that dynasty five or six years before, and since that time his own governor had held it. The Sultān came in contact with Rāē Pithorā on that same field of Talāwarf, and formed his forces into two divisions. The troops of Jamūn and Kinnauj were to oppose Khāndf Rāē of Dīhil, while the Sultān, with his own forces, encountered Rāē Pithorā. The battle was obstinately maintained, and it is related that Khāndf Rāē fell by the sword of Nar-singh Dīw of Jamūn, and the Sultān himself slew several of the enemy. Rāē Pithorā was captured alive and taken to Ghaznīn, where he was deprived of his sight. For further details on this subject, see page 485, note 3.

Alif gives another version of this battle, which is certainly curious. It states that the Sultān, having taken the route by Purghor, arrived within the limits of Dīhil [the territory of ?]. Pitho Rāē and Kandf [sic] Rāē prepared to oppose him, on which Mu'izz-ud-Dīn made a precipitate retreat. Rāē Pitho was following in pursuit of him until they had passed beyond Lāhor, and had reached the mouṣa' [village or district] called Shihāb-ud-Dīn [Shihāb-ud-Dīn pūr?], when the Sultān came to a stand. His object in retiring had been to separate Rāē Pitho from his own territory; and, at the place above mentioned, a battle took place, in which Rāē Pitho was defeated and taken prisoner. After this the Sultān advanced upon Ajmīr. He subdued that territory, and put Rāē Pitho to death; after which he made Kuft-ud-Dīn, I-bak, governor of it, and returned to Ghaznīn.

Another writer states that "Pithorā Rāē was killed in the battle, and Khāndf Rāē, the leader, escaped in safety;" whilst another says that "both were captured and slain."

The statements of both Dow and Briggs are equally imaginary with respect to the battle, where they say:—

Dow, vol. i. page 142.

"The Mussulmān troops, as if now only serious in fight, made such dreadful slaughter, that this prodigious army, once shaken, like a great building was lost in its own ruins."

Briggs, vol. i. page 177.

"The Moslems, as if they now had only begun to be in earnest, committed such havoc, that this prodigious army, once shaken, like a great building tottered to its fall, and was lost in its own ruins."

This last sentence is quoted by several writers, including Maurice, Elphinstone and Marshman; and Meadows Taylor says["The Student's Manual of Indian History," page 92], "'Like a great building, writes Firishthah, 'it tottered to its fall,'" &c.; but, unfortunately, Firishthah never wrote anything of the kind. His language here is particularly simple. Referring to the final charge by the Sultān, he says: "The dust of the battle-field was drenched with the blood of the brave; and, in the twinkling of an eye, he threw the ranks of
state, and the elephants, were left several miles in the rear. He marshalled his ranks, and was advancing leisurely. The light-armed and unincumbered horsemen he had directed should be divided into four divisions, and had appointed them to act against the infidels on four sides; and the Sulṭān had commanded, saying: "It is necessary that, on the right and left, and front and rear, 10,000 mounted archers should keep the infidel host in play; and, when their elephants, horsemen, and foot advance to the attack, you are to face about and keep the distance of a horse's course in front of them." The Musālmān troops acted according to these instructions, and, having exhausted and wearied the unbelievers, Almighty God gave the victory to Islām, and the infidel host was overthrown.

Rāe Pithorā, who was riding an elephant, dismounted and got upon a horse and fled [from the field], until, in the neighbourhood of [the] Sursūṭī, he was taken prisoner, and they despatched him to hell; and Gobind Rāe of Dihlī was slain in the engagement. The Sulṭān recognized his head through those two teeth which had been broken. The seat of government, Ajmīr, with the whole of the Siwālikh [territory], such as Ḥānsī, Sursūṭī, and other

the enemy into commotion. At this crisis Khār-mīl [Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khār-mīl] and other Āmirīs, from different directions, charged, and overthrew the Hindū troops." This is all: he then mentions the fall of Khāndī Rāe and other chiefs.

2 The object was to harass, and to induce them to break their order. The Sulṭān's tactics, from our author's description, as well as that of others, are not very clear. One writer, however, throws a little more light upon the matter; and from that it appears that the Sulṭān, leaving the central portion of his army—about half his entire force—some miles in the rear, with the baggage and other materiel, divided the remainder into five divisions, four of which, each of 10,000 light-armed horse-mounted archers—were to attack the enemy right and left, and front and rear, and retire, pretending flight. This mode of fighting having been carried on from about 9 A.M. to the time of afternoon prayer, the Sulṭān, considering that the enemy had been sufficiently wearied, with the remainder—his fifth division, the flower of his troops, consisting of some 12,000 horse—made a final charge, and put the Hindū army to a complete rout.

3 The ancient Saraswatī. Probably our author means in the tract near the Sursūṭī: the word is ٕ. Ibn-i-Baṭṭāṭah calls Sursūṭī a great city. In Akbar's time Sursūṭī was one of the Maḥalls of Sīrkār Sanbhal.

4 Like some other historians, our author calls that tract of country, lying south of the Himālayah, between the Sutlaaj and the Ganges, and extending as far south as Ḥānsī, by the name of Siwālikh; but some other native writers, including the author of the History of Jamān, include the whole of the Alpine
tracts, were subjugated. These events took place, and this victory was achieved, in the year 588 H.; and the Sulṭān placed Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak ⁵, in the fort of Kuhrah', and returned [home again] ⁶.

Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn advanced from Kuhrah to Mīrath, and took that city and fortress, and, in the following year, he possessed himself of the capital city, Dīhlī ⁷. In this same

tracts below the higher range, from the Ganges to Kāshmīr, that is to say, the extreme northern boundary of India—under the name of Koh-i-Siwālikh. Another writer says Siwālikh is the ancient name of the territory of Nāg-awr. See page 200 also. The Sulṭān returned to Ghaznīn along the skirts of the hills of the northern Panjāb.

⁵ Authors generally agree respecting this date; but, as already noticed, our author, in another place, states this was the year in which the campaign against Sulṭān Shāh took place. See note ⁵, page 456.

⁶ For the meaning of I-bak, see under his reign, next Section.

⁷ As written with the vowel points—not Kahām.

⁸ Our author leaves out entirely all mention of the son of Rāṣ Pithorā having been set up at Ajmīr as a subject and tributary ruler, as mentioned in the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir and subsequent histories; and hence his name, together with the Sulṭān's also, was impressed on the coins issued by him during the short period he ruled at Ajmīr.

⁹ Mr. E. Thomas [COINS OF THE PATHAN KINGS OF DELHI], page 22, note ⁴, says "The historical evidence as to the capture of Dehli by the Moslems, in 587 H., is complete and consistent with the best authorities," &c. He is mistaken, however, even on his own authorities. Ḥasan Nizāmī, in the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir [Elliot, vol. ii. page 216], gives no date at all; but, in the following page, says, "in the month of Ramadān [which is the ninth month], 588 H., Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn marched against Jatwān" to relieve Hānsī. After this he marched against Mīrath and took it; and, after that again, marched towards Dīhlī, and invested and took it [page 219]. I have compared the text of the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, and find above date quite correct. Our author, Minhāj-i-Sarāj [the version given at page 300 of ELLIOT, which is evidently translated from the printed text, is incorrect and imperfect], who often contradicts his own statements and dates, after saying here that the overthrow of Rāṣ Pithorā took place in 588 H., in his account of Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, farther on, says that Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn took possession of Mīrath in 587 H.; but immediately endeavours to correct himself, and says: "From Mīrath he issued forth, in the year 588 H., and captured Dīhlī; and, in the year 590 H.," accompanied the Sulṭān against Jai-Chand, &c. The fact is that the Hindus, having been overthrown in 588 H., in the battle of Tarāʿīn, Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn was left at Kuhrah, from which, towards the close of the same year, he moved against Jatwān, and relieved Hānsī, and then proceeded against Mīrath. These movements must have occupied some three months, and, in the last days of 588 H., or early in 589 H., he invested Dīhlī, and gained possession of it. Some works, however, such as the Tabakat-i-Akbarī, Haft-Iklīm, Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīkh, and Firīshtah, say Dīhlī was taken in 588 H. The Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh-i-Hind says, "Muʿizz-ud-Dīn advanced against Dīhlī, after taking Ajmīr, and, on the kinsman of Rāṣ Pithorā and Khāndī [Gobind?] Rāṣ, who then held possession of it, tendering tribute and submission, he was allowed to retain it; and the next
year likewise—589 H.—he [Kuṭb-ud-Dīn] took the fort of Kol. In the year 590 H., the Sultān [again] marched from Ghaznīn and advanced towards Kinnauj and Banaras, and, in the vicinity of Chandwār, he overthrew Rāe Jai-Chand, and by that victory three hundred and odd elephants fell into his hands.

Under the shadow of the ascendency and auspices of that victorious and just monarch, victory was conferred upon his slave, the Malik-i-Karīm [the Beneficent Malik], Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, so that he continued to subdue the territory of Hindūstān and parts adjacent, namely, the state of Nahrwālah, and Thankīr, the fort of Gwāliyūr,

year, 589 H., Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, who had been left at Kuhram, took it, and made it the seat of government;” and, in this, the works quoted above agree. The statement of our author, backed by the statement of Faṣīh-4, and the Tāj-ul-Ma’dīgir, and some others, is to be depended upon; but 587 H. is out of the question altogether, although that year is given in the Khulāsāt-ul-Askbār, and one or two others. If 587 H. is correct, in what year was Rāe Pithorā defeated the first time? See also note 2, page 456. The year 589 H. is a somewhat remarkable one:—Dihī was made the capital of Muḥammadan India; Richard Coeur de Lion fought in Palestine; Salāh-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf, Sultān of Mīsr, died; and Changīz Khān entered into friendly relations with Ūng Khān.

1 In some copies Chandwāl and Jandwāl, and in some other authors Chandwār and Chandāwar. The only place bearing a similar name at this time, and in the direction indicated, is what is styled Chandpūr and Chandanpūr, in the district of Farrukhābād, on the route from Bareilī to Fath-ghar, Lat. 27° 27’, Long. 79° 42’.

2 That is, he turned his arms against Kinnauj and Banaras. The Rājah of Kinnauj and Banaras, his former ally, according to the Hindū accounts, against Rāe Pithorā, had assembled numerous forces, in consequence of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak’s, aggressive policy, and was about to march against him. It was to support Kuṭb-ud-Dīn that the Sultān again came into India, and an encounter [the Hindū writers say “several” encounters] took place between them on the Jūn [Jamna], in which the Rājah [Jai Chandra] was slain. Some say as many as 600 and 640 elephants, one of which was a white one, were captured, besides a vast amount of other booty. The white elephant is probably the same as was presented subsequently by Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, the Sultān’s nephew, to Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh. Firāstah says the white elephant, which was taken on this occasion, soon after died. Jai-Chandra was killed in this action, and his body could not be recognized. At length, after much search, a body was found, but was so disfigured with wounds that it could not be distinguished for certain by his people; but, on examining the mouth, it was found to be the body of the Rājah, from the fact of his teeth being fastened in with pegs of gold [—signifies a peg, pin, &c., not a plate], he being an old man. The probability is they were false teeth, or a set not his own, fastened by gold pins or wires. His stronghold, Asnī, was also taken.

3 Here our author seems confused. In his account of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, he does not say that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn took Thankīr, quite the contrary; and, in his
and Budā‘ūn, the whole of which he took, the dates of every one of which will, please God, be subsequently recorded in the [account of the] Kuṭbī victories! When the august Sulṭān, Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of [Bahā-ud-Dīn] Sām, departed this life in the city of Hirāt, the victorious Sulṭān, Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām, was on the frontiers of Tūs, and Sarakhs, of Khurāsān, and, with the purpose of performing the account of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tūghrīl [Section XX.], says that Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn himself took it, and afterwards made it over to Tūghrīl, which is correct. There is great discrepancy here, too, among authors. The Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir, Alī, and others, say the Sulṭān marched against it, and then marched on Gwāliyūr, the Rājah of which agreed to pay tribute, and paid a large sum down. He was allowed to retain his territory, on these terms, for a time; and the Sulṭān returned to Ghaznīn. Alī says he took Thankrī, the present Bīnān, in 590 H.; Budā‘ūnī says 591 H.; and Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir says in 592 H. See account of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, next Section.

1 That is to say, the victories gained by Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak.

8 We now come to “Proceedings West of the Indus” [See Elliot, INDIA, vol. ii. page 297], and very important proceedings they are; and most of the proceedings hitherto related by our author have occurred west of the Indus. Ghaznīn, as well as Ghūr, is west of the Indus. Our author takes good care to trumpet the successes of the Ghūrīs, but conceals their reverses. He appears to have forgotten that, when Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn left Tūs, and abandoned the expedition against Khurāsān, on receiving intimation of the death of his elder brother at Hirāt, he left, in command of a large force at Tūs, and parts around, Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak, the chief of the Amīrs of Ghūr, and of the Ghūrfān champions, a second Rustam in valour. He began carrying his depredations as far as Abīward, made some of the Khwārazmī nobles captive, and slew a great number of men. Subsequently, he pushed on as far as Trāk against Tāj-ud-Dīn, Khali, a Khwārazmī officer. The latter sent his son to Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak as a hostage for himself; and, on the return of the latter towards Tūs again, the Amīr of Marāgheh sent his son to him also. Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak, becoming arrogant at this success, turned his face towards Marw. News now reached him that a force from Khwārazm had arrived near Marw by way of the desert. He advanced to meet it by way of Rūe. When the two armies came in contact, good fortune smiled upon the Khwārazmī forces; and, although Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak’s troops were twice as numerous, the Khwārazmīs charged them, and overthrew them. Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak, by a thousand contrivances, succeeded in throwing himself into Tūs. The Khwārazmī troops followed, made breaches in the walls, and took him captive; and, fearing his fury likewise, one of the Amīrs—Amīn Malik [styled, by our author, Malik Khān, of Hirāt, the Amīn-i-Hājīb, at page 415, and see page 287, note 9]—struck off his head, and despatched it to Khwārazm to the Sulṭān. He greatly disapproved of this act, but it filled Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn with amazement and anxiety, for Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak was the most valiant of his champions, and the pillar of his army. Such was his intrepidity, and the strength of his arm, that the Sulṭāns frequently pitted him in combat against the lion and the elephant, and he could overcome both, and could break the leg of a three-year old horse with his hands. This
mourning ceremonies for his brother, he came to Bādghais of Hirāt. Having performed the mourning rites, he nominated different Malik to the several siefs of the kingdom of Ghūr. He gave the city of Bust, and the districts of Farāh and Isfīzār to his late brother's son, Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and to Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, the Pearl of Ghūr, who was uncle's son of both the Sulṭāns, and the son-in-law of Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, the territory of Ghūr and Garmsīr, namely, the throne of Firūz-koh, and the town and territory of Dāwar, and also presented him with two elephants. To Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Alb-[Arsalān]-i-Ghāzī, son of Kazīl Arsalān, Saljūḵī, who was the son of a sister of the two Sulṭāns, Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn gave the city of Hirāt [and its dependencies], after which is the person styled Mahomed Zeevak, Prince of Murv, by Briggs; and Zireek, Prince of Murv, by Dow. In the revised text of Firīṣṭān, his name is turned into [Khair Beg]!

It was after this defeat of Muḥammad-i-Khar-nak that Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, was urged by his ministers and nobles to advance against Hirāt, as the sons [son and son-in-law] of the late Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, were quarrelling about the inheritance, and their nobles were inclined to join his service. Consequently, in Jamādi-ul-Awwal, 600 H., the Sulṭān marched towards Hirāt for the second time, and Alb-i-Ghāzī, the sister's son of the two Sulṭāns brothers, surrendered that stronghold to him, as already related in note 2, page 257. Muḥammad-i-Khar-nak must be the same person as is referred to at page 344, the son of Malik Saiūd-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, son of Malik Shīhāb-ud-Dīn, Khar-nak [son of Izz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain], the uncle of the Sulṭāns Ghiyās-ud-Dīn and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn; and the former's full name would be Shīhāb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad 'Alī-i-Khar-nak, and he was second cousin of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn and his brother.

My note 3, page 257, will show why and with what object the Sulṭān was between Tūs and Sarakhs, where he heard of his brother's death.

4 He divided the ancestral dominions amongst the family of Sām. His brother had died in the fifth month of 599 H., and, from this date only, authors state, "he assumed the title of Sulṭān;" but this must mean, that from that date he assumed the title of Sulṭān-ul-Aʿẓam—the greatest Sulṭān—which had been his brother and sovereign's title; his own, previous to his brother's death, being only Sulṭān-ul-Muʿāqqam—the great Sulṭān—as shown by his coins.

7 This is the Malik-ul-Ḥājj, who, after he received the investiture of Ghūr and Firūz-koh, received the title of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn. See pages 391, 397, and 417.

5 Here, too, the idiom differs in the copies of the text in the same manner as previously alluded to.

One sister, the elder, married Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, of Bāmīān; another married Alb-Arsalān-i-Ghāzī, son of Kazīl Arsalān, Saljūḵī; and the third was the mother of Taj-ud-Dīn, Zangī; but the father is not mentioned. See page 342, and note 4, page 425.
he returned again to Ghaznīn, and brought along with him to that city some of the Amīrs and Malikṣ of Ghūr to serve under him, and commenced his preparations for an expedition against Khwārazm.

In the year 601 H., he marched his forces into the Khwārazm territory; and Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, fell back discomfited before the Ghaznīn forces and

1 This expedition was undertaken to recover what had been lost, and avenge the defeat and death of Muḥammad-i-Khar-nak. See note 9, page 257.
2 Sulṭān Muḥammad’s “falling back discomfited” appears from the sequel. The Sulṭān’s object was to defend his capital. No action whatever took place between them until the Ghūrīs appeared in the neighbourhood of the city, and took up a position east of the Shāṭṭ mentioned under.

Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, having become aware of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn’s designs of carrying war into his enemy’s country, and his vast preparations, hastened back from Khūrāsān, by way of the desert, to Khwārazm; and his people prepared to give the Ghūrīs a warm reception. The Sulṭān asked for aid from Khūrāsān, both in shape of horse and foot, and Gūr Khān of Kara-Khitā was also asked for assistance. Sulṭān-Muḥammad’s camp was fixed on the western bank of the Shāṭṭ-i-Nūdwar or Nūdawār [یردود]—our author’s Kara-Sū, no doubt, but another work says the bank of the Nūr—and, in a short space of time, 70,000 men assembled. “The Ghūrīn forces were vast in numbers, and contained so many elephants,” says Yaḥyā-i, “that, had they desired, they might have drained the Jihūn.” But, setting aside all exaggeration, the number is said to have been 140,000 men, and about 300 or 400 great elephants. The Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh, which constantly copies Yaḥyā-i, says 70,000 warriors, and elephants [besides followers i].

Arrived on the banks of the Jihūn, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Ghūrī, took up a position on the east side of the Shāṭṭ, and pitched his camp, and gave orders to search for a ferry in order to cross over next day, and attack the Khwārazmī forces.

Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn was engaged in arranging his elephants, and making his preparations for crossing next morning at dawn, when news, suddenly and unexpectedly, reached him that Sulṭān Muḥammad had arrived, and along with him Sulṭān ‘Uṣmān of Samrākand [his son-in-law subsequently] and that the Khīṭā forces were pushing on. Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, finding that he was much in the same position as the “Lords of the Elephant”—“Hast thou not beheld how the Lord of Lords dealt with the Lords of the Elephant? Did He not make their evil design the means of drawing them into error, and sent against them flocks of birds, which cast upon them lumps of burnt clay which rendered the perfidious like unto the corn that has been reaped?” [Kur’ān: Chap. c. 5]—and that destruction awaited him if he remained, resolved to retire. He directed that the whole of the heavy material should be burnt during the night, and his army began to retire along the banks of the Jīhūn, but they were pursued by the Khwārazmīs next day at dawn, and, at Hazār-Asp [afterwards destroyed by the Mughals. Guzīdah and Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh call it Hazār-Sal], the Ghūrīs faced about and came to a stand, and drew up to fight. Sulṭān Muḥammad, with his forces, fell upon the right wing of the Ghūrīs, and overthrew it, and the rest gave way, pursued by the Khwārazmīs. In this affair several of the Amīrs of Ghūr, and a great number of men were
retired to Khwārazm. When the Sultān-i-Ghāzi appeared before the gates of Khwārazm, and carried on hostilities for some days, the people of Khwārazm commenced engaging the Ghūris on the bank of the aqueduct which had been drawn from the river Jiḥūn towards the east of the city, and the name of which place and water is Karā-Sū [the Black Water], and of the Amīrs of Ghūr several persons were slain and taken prisoners in that engagement.

As the capture of [the city of] Khwārazm was not accomplished on account of the scarcity of the appliances of the Ghaznīn forces, the length of the campaign, and the lack of forage, the Sultān withdrew his troops from the gates of Khwārazm and retired along the banks of the Jiḥūn, and towards Balkh. The forces of Khītā, and the Malikās and Amīrs of Turkistān had arrived on the banks of the Jiḥūn, and had possessed themselves of the route of the army of Islām. When the Sultān-i-Ghāzi reached Andkhūd, on a Tuesday, at the time of evening prayer, the van of the infidels of Turkistān reached the Sultān’s position, and set to fight. The commander of the van of the army of Islām was the Sālār [chief, leađer, &c., Husain-i-Khar-mil, and he put the infidels to the rout. He was one of the Malikās of taken prisoners. After a time the Khwārazmīs gave up the pursuit, and Sultān Muḥammad returned to Khwārazm, where he gave a great banquet, and made great rejoicing.

In this action the Ghūris lost still more of their war material and elephants, and they continued their retreat towards Andkhūd [Guzhāla says, within the limits of Tāl-ḵān] and, on reaching it, found that the troops of Gūr Khān of Karā-Khītā, under Bānīko of Ṭarāz, were there posted to bar their retreat, and appeared on all sides of them. The Ghūris fought with great bravery from dawn to the setting of the sun, and darkness put an end to the fray, in which, according to Yāfī, the Ghūris lost 50,000 men. Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh says the Ghūris were broken on the first charge of the Khītā-īs. See following page for a specimen of our author’s exaggeration.

Some copies have "on the other side or bank of the aqueduct"!

The Karā-Sū is some eight or nine miles from the city—or rather the city here referred to.

Almost as absurd a reason as our Central Asian oracles pronounced would render the success of the Russians against the same territory "utterly impossible," a few months ago. Mu’izz-ud-Dīn was only five days before the place. The preceding note shows why the Ghūris had to retire.

Not Andkhod. See note on this in the account of Kabā-jah farther on.

He is particular about the day of the week and time of day, but not the day of the month.
Juzarwān⁸. He at once represented to the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī the fact of the success of the Islāmī forces and the repulse [¹] of the infidel troops. “It is advisable,” he said, “that the sovereign of Islām should command that the army of Islām should mount at once and pursue the routed infidels, and fall upon them unexpectedly, whereby a great victory may be achieved⁹.”

The Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī replied: “For years past I have been seeking such an encounter as this. I shall not be found to hold back: to-morrow, at dawn, by the guidance of the Most High, we will do battle face to face, and see unto whom Almighty God will bestow the victory. I shall at least have acquired the merit of having fought for the faith as by creed enjoined.” Malik ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl¹⁰, perceiving that the mind of the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī was imbued with this intention, was convinced that the Sulṭān gave vent to these words by virtue of unbounded reliance in the true faith, and the ardour of piety; [for regard had to be given to the fact] on the other hand, that the host of the infidels which had come upon them was countless, and all fresh and calm, while the Musālmān army was wearied by the march from Khwārazm, and the horses were emaciated, and would not be strong enough to withstand the enemy; and he withdrew from the service of the Sulṭān, and, with the whole of his retinue and followers, to the number of five thousand horse, set out, at night, towards Juzarwān⁸, and almost all the troops [also] whose horses were weak and emaciated departed.

---

⁸ This place has been often mentioned as Guzarwān and as above: g and j are interchangeable.
⁹ In the next paragraph our author contradicts this absurd statement.
¹ The same who after this was Wālī of Hirāt. His conduct here was in keeping with his doings there. See note ⁹, page 257.
¹⁰ One copy only has “the town of Juzarwān,” but it is a comparatively modern copy. There was a town, probably, as well as a district so called.

This desertion of the Sulṭān by ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl, appears to have given rise to the improbable story related by Firūshī and some others, and repeated by Briggs in his translation of Firūshī, but Dow does not give the whole. This story is repeated and re-echoed by Briggs’ copyists, and people are led to imagine that Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s most trusted, most devoted, and loyal slave, whom he delighted to honour, and whom he intended as his successor, had refused to admit his master and sovereign into Ghaznīn, of which he is styled governor, after the Sulṭān’s defeat and accommodation with the allied forces of Khīṭā and Sulṭān ‘Uṣmān. We know that Tāj-ud-Dīn,
In the morning, notwithstanding that only a few horsemen of the centre division and his own slaves remained

I-yal-dûz, held the government of Karman, but where is it stated that he held Ghazin at all at that time? It appears that he had not been removed from Karman up to the period of the Sultan's death, and the honour shown to him by Mu'izz-ud-Din, only a few months after his return from Khwarazm, when marching against the Khokhars, precludes the possibility of I-yal-dûz's having acted in the way asserted by Firisteh; and it was only when Ghias-ud-Din, Mahmtûd, conferred on him the investiture of Ghazin, with a deed of manumission, and the title of Sultan, that he proceeded thither from his government of Karman. See page 500, note 3. It is also stated that another

of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din's chiefs "went straight" from the field of battle at Andkhûd to "Mooltan," and seized it. Where Andkhûd? Where Multân? This story, absurd though it seems, appears to have emanated from the Taj-ul-Ma'âshir, and something similar is related in Guzîdah, the Jâmi'-ut-Tawârîkh, and in Alfi, noticed farther on; but no mention whatever is made in these works about closing the gates of Ghazin by I-yal-dûz [Iladz-giz, in Guzîdah] or any other person; and it appears to have received great amplification from Firisteh himself, for the Tabâkit-i-Akbâr, a work of authority, written a few years before, says not one word about anything of the kind. See also note 1, page 481. The Taj-ul-Ma'âshir has the name of this rebel written in four different ways, in as many copies of the text, namely, I-bak'i-Bâk [Ibaq al-Ã²], I-bak-i-Nâ-pâk [Ibaq al-Nâ-pak], and the unintelligible names of Jâl al-Ma'âshir or al-Qa'âshir, but in a fourth al-Jâl without points. [It is evidently the same name as occurs in Jami'-ut-Tawârîkh-Iik-Tal [Iick Tal]. Guzîdah styles him I-bak, Bâdshah of Multân! \("a Turkî slave—one of the most trusted servants of the kingdom fled from the field of battle with Khwârazmîs, thinking that the Sultan had been killed, and some calamity hadbefallen the state, and made for Multân with all possible despatch. Arrived there, he stated to the Amir-i-Dad [chief justice], Hasan, that he had important matters to communicate to him in private within the Kâsr, by the royal command, and which it was by no means advisable should become known to others.” Having succeeded in getting a private audience, he gave a sign "to a mean Turk” who assassinated the Amir-i-Dad, who appears to have held the chief authority there under the governor of the province of Lâhor and Multân, Amir Mu'hammad, son of Abî 'Ali. For some time this affair remained secret, and it was thought that Hasan had been imprisoned by the Sultan's commands; but, at length, it became noised abroad, far and near, through Hind and Sind. See note 1, page 481. The Taj-ul-Ma'âshir then passed, at once, to the outbreak of the Kokars [Khokhars—natives of Khurasan and Europeans generally leave out the h in pronunciation of the Hindî 槐], while Firisteh gives a long account of the slave's reduction and punishment. He says, “the Sultan, unable to enter Ghazin, proceeded towards Multân, encountered I-bak-i-Nâ-pâk [otherwise Yal-bûr, &c.], took him captive, and marched towards Ghazin with the frontier troops of Hind.” At Ghazin, the Sultan, through the intercession of the great men of that city, overlooked the conduct of Iladz-giz [this is the name Guzîdah and Firisteh use for this personage, and Yal-dûz, for Taj-ud-Din, I-yal-dûz], and, having disposed of that matter, entered into a treaty of peace with Sultan Muhammed, Khwârazm Shâh, and, after that, made preparations for his expedition against the Khokhars. Firisteh, like some other more moderne writers,
with him, the Sultān drew out his ranks and commenced the engagement. The army of the unbelievers, having formed a circle round about the troops of Islām, came on, and, in despite of the remonstrance his slaves were using that of the army of Islām only a small number of men remained, and that it was advisable to retreat, the Sultān-i-Ghāzi still continued to maintain his position, until, of cavalry and his own personal slaves, only about one hundred horsemen remained, who, with a few elephants, the Turkish slaves, and the Ghūrīān leaders, who were the Sultān's grandees, in front of his charger's head, were hurling back the infidels, devoting their lives, and obtaining martyrdom.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that the Sultān-i-Ghāzi stood his ground so persistently that his august state canopy, from the wounds of the arrows of the infidel Mughals [and the arrows remaining sticking fast], became like unto a porcupine, and he would not turn his head round in any direction, until one of his Turkish slaves, whose name was Ayyah, Jūkī, came up, seized the Sultān's bridle, and dragged him away towards the fortress of And-

styles them Ghakars—这意味着他几乎不能料到他知道这个差别，甚至Elliot，在他的Index [page 160, note 2], after writing the word properly, supposes Gakhar [Gakhar] and Khokhar [Khokhar] one and the same race, but there is as much difference between them as between an Afghan, and a Khārjī Jaṭ, as those who have served in the Panjāb well know. The Šābagat-i-Akbarī, a work of greater authority than Firūghtāh [whom I do not consider an authority in these matters any more than respecting the presence of cannoniers [cannoniers] at the battle of Tarā'īn], says nothing of the kind; and, had I-yal-dūz, I-bak-i-Nā-pāk, Līk-Tāl, or any other person, been guilty of the acts mentioned, there is no doubt our author would, at least, have referred to them. He might smooth or slur over a defeat, but not circumstances of this kind. See Alfi's account of the expedition against the Khokars in note 1, page 481, which I think tends to disprove much of the improbable story under discussion, more particularly when the Tāj-ul-Maṣūrī says not one word about either Iład-giz or Yal-dūz, nor about the Sultān's coming to Multān against I-bak-i-Nā-pāk, whose name is not again mentioned in the entire volume. The account given by our author farther on in his account of 'Alā'ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, at page 492, and of Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, page 496, also tends to disprove this story.

1 This description of troops has already been mentioned in note 2, page 168.

4 The Khitā-is he means.

5 In two of the best copies, I-bah or Aibah, and in one good old copy Abih or Abiyah, but in the oldest the name is plainly written as above. Jūkī in all probability is the name of his tribe. Some other authors style him a Khaljī, but it is one and the same thing—Turk and Khaljī.
khūd, and conducted him thither, and brought him within the walls of that fortress.

6 Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, with the few men remaining of the centre division of his army, as soon as the sun rose, succeeded, by stratagem, in throwing himself within the walls of the Hisār of Andkhūd [Guzdah says, Tālkhān]; but the Khīšī-i troops invested it, perforated the walls, and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn would have been captured, when Sultan 'Ugmān of Samarkand, who was now with the Khīšā-i forces, sent him a message saying: "For the honour of the true faith I do not desire that a Sultan of Islam should fall into the hands of those of another belief, and be put to death by them: therefore it is advisable that you should agree to sacrifice for your own safety what remains of your elephants and other animals, your valuables, treasures, arms and armour, and other war material, that I may make these things the means, with these people, of obtaining your escape in safety." This he agreed to do, and Sultan 'Ugmān, by a thousand efforts and contrivances, succeeded in securing the Sultan's escape, and he reached his own territory in safety. There can be no doubt whatever as to the Sultan's gallantry, but our author's statements are rather highly coloured. The Tabakat-i-Akbarī, contrary to others, states that the Sultan defended Andkhūd for some time, and then surrendered on terms, but it is not correct.

The following is another specimen of the translations from which Indian history is written, referring to this campaign:

Dow, vol. i. page 145.

"News was then brought to him [Mahommed] of the death of his brother Yassul dien, who retained nothing of the empire but the name [this is totally incorrect, and is the translator's own]. Mahommed, upon this, succeeded to the empire. He turned by the way of Budish, and subdued the country of Chorassan, recovering it out of the hand of the Sijjoki, and he divided it among the family of Sam, giving the government of Ferose Kō and Ghur to Mallek Zea, who was son-in-law to his brother, Yassul dien, the deceased Emperor, Bust, Ferra, and Ispharar he gave to Mamool, his brother's son; and the government of Herat and its districts to Nasir, his nephew by a sister.

"Mahommed, after these transactions, returned to Ghisny, where, according to the will of the deceased Emperor, he was crowned in form; and mounted the imperial throne. In the same year, he heard of the death of Zirok, prince of Murve, and, in the beginning of the next, marched to the conquest of that country, ad-


"On hearing of the death of his brother, he [Mahommed Ghory] now returned towards Ghisny, by the route of Budghos, and, subduing part of the country of Khwārizm, recovered it out of the hands of the Suljooks. He divided this new conquest [!] among several members of his own family [see our author, page 472], giving the government of Ferrookkā and Ghoor [Are these in Khwārizm recovered from the Suljooks?] to his nephew Zora-ood-Đem, son-in-law of his late brother, Gejas-ood-Đem. He also gave Boost, Farrīk, and Isfūrār [All in Khwārizm perhaps?] to the Prince Mahommed, his brother's son, and the government of Hirat and its dependencies to Nasir-ood-Đem, his nephew by a sister.

"On his arrival at Ghisny, according to the will of his deceased brother, he was crowned in form [Student's Manual of Indian History—"he was crowned Sultan without opposition"]; and ascended the throne. In the same year he heard of the death of Mahommed Zeruk, Prince of
The following day, Sultan 'Usmān of Samarkand, who

vanishing by way of Charizm [111],
and Tnas, the King of that country,
not able to oppose him in the field,
shut himself up in the city. The King
pitched his camp on the banks of the
great canal, which the Chilliqes had
formerly dug to the westward of that
city. He forthwith attacked the place,
and in a few days lost many brave
nobles in the pursuit of glory. In
the meantime, news arrived, that
Abdekk, the general of the King of
Chitta, in Tartary, and Osman, King
of Samarcand, were advancing with
great armies, to the relief of Charizm.
Mahommed was so unwilling to
abandon his hopes of taking the city,
that he delayed till the allied armies advanced so near, that he
was under the necessity of burning all
his baggage, and to retreat with the
utmost expedition to Chorassan [111].
But an army from the city pressed so
close upon his heels, that he was
obliged to give them battle. He was
totally defeated, losing all his ele-
phants and treasure.

"In the meantime the confederate
Kings, who had taken a circuit, to
cut off Mahommed's retreat, met him
full in the face, as he was flying from
the King of Charizm."

Muru, and in the beginning of the
next year marched to complete the
conquest of Khwarizm [111] [This is
what is styled "his western campaign
against the King of Khwarzm" in
THE STUDENT'S MANUAL, but I
think Khwarzm lies north of Ghaz-
nin]. Mahomed Ghoory, having en-
camped on the banks of the great
canal, which had formerly been dug
to the westward of the city, forthwith
attacked the place, but lost many brave
officers and men in an AT-
TEMP TO ESCA LADE IT [111].
Meanwhile news arrived that Kurra Beg,
the general of Ghorkhan, King of
Khuttia, and Othman Khan Samar-
kandy, were advancing with armies
to the relief of Khwarzm Shah. Ma-
hemed Ghoory, unwilling to abandon
his hopes of taking the city, delayed
his retreat till the allied armies ad-
vanced so near, that he was compelled
to burn his baggage, and to retire
with the utmost precipitation towards
Khorassan. His army was pressed
so closely by troops from that province,
that he was compelled to give battle,
and was wholly defeated, losing all
his elephants and treasure, while the
confederate Kings [see page 473, and
note 9] who had taken a circuit to
cut off his retreat towards Ghuzny,
intercepted him."

This may truly be called the Romance of History. Deceived, apparently,
by this translation, ELPHINSTONE [page 316] has fallen into great error.
He says: "He [Shahab ul din] gained a great victory over the king of that
country [Khwarzm], besieged him in his capital, and soon reduced him to such
strait as to constrain him to sue [1] for aid to the Khitan Tartars," &c. Never
was a statement more erroneous. MARSIMAN too, possibly quoting from the
same, says "Mahomed led his troops against Takash," as he styles Sultan
'Ali ud-Din, Muhammad, the son of Sultan Takish.

The following is FIRISHTAH's account:— "Sultan Shihab ud-Din was
between Tus and Sarakhsh when in the account of the decease of his brother,
Ghiyas ud-Din, reached him, and in whose name the kingdom was [i.e. in whom
the sovereignty rested. This is the passage misinterpreted by Dow—"who
retained nothing of the empire but the name." The original is
[1] or [2]."
From thence he set out for Badghis, performed the mourning ceremonies
there, and, in this year, he divided the whole of the states of Khurasan
[Firishthah here shows that he is himself no authority as to the geography of
was a second Yusuf [in beauty], and the Afrasiyab Malik of Turkistan, who were Musalmans', interposed and

these parts, any more than he is an authority as to the history] among the family of Sam [i.e. the descendants of Sam, his father, only Ziya-ud-Din now to be mentioned was not of the family of Sam except as a son-in-law—the revised text of Briggs has—Al-i-Samān—in this manner. He gave the throne of Firuz-Koh and Gühr to his uncle's son, Malik Ziya-ud-Din, who was Sultan Ghiaq-ud-Din's son-in-law; Bust, Faraq, and Isfarain [Isfizar?] to Sultan Mahmud, son of Sultan Ghiaq-ud-Din; and Hirat and its dependencies to his sister's son, Nasir-ud-Din. He himself returned from Badghais to Ghaznī, and, in accordance with the will of his brother, having placed the crown of empire upon his head, he became established on the exalted throne of sovereignty. [This is the literal translation of the sentence which has been twisted into crowned in form, &c.] At this time intimation reached him of the slaying of Muhammed-i-Khair-nak [in the revised text Khair Beg—خیر بن], governor of Marw; and, in the year 600 H., he set out, with numerous forces to subdue Khwārazm. Khwārazm Shāh, unable to oppose him [in the field], entered the fortress of Khwārazm.

"When the Sultan reached Khwārazm, he took up a position on the water [canal, river, and the like] which they have (sic) dug and set flowing from the Jihun to the east of the city [the word جح here used with reference to this water-cut has been mistaken by Dow for the Turkish tribe, Khalj, which he styles Chilligier]. For some days fighting went on, and several of the Ghufran Amirs were killed. At this juncture news arrived that Karrā Beg, the general of Gur Khān, Baddahā of Khiṭā [this is enough to show of what value Firashthah's authority is for these matters. See page 261, for the name of the general of the Khiṭā-i forces on this occasion. Hitherto, Firashthah has copied our author, whom he quotes as one of his authorities, tolerably correct], and Sultan Usmān, sovereign of Samarkand, were marching to the aid of Khwārazm Shāh. On receiving this information, such alarm was felt by the Sultan that he set fire to the surplus baggage and equipage, and set out towards Khurāsān [he means Ghaznī]. Khwārazm Shāh followed in pursuit, and Sultan Shihāb-ud-Din faced about and gave battle, and was defeated, and lost his treasure, his horses, and elephants. Having proceeded on his way, unexpectedly, the army of Karrā Beg, Khiṭā-i, and Sultan 'Usmān seized the route in advance," &c. The rest agrees with our author; and there is not a word, in the whole account, about escalade or anything approaching it, and, moreover, the canal, which he had not crossed, was some miles from the city. Sultan Muhammed, Khwārazm Shāh, in order to celebrate the flight of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, bestowed the nick-name "Ghuri Breaker" upon a son born to him the night before the enemy retired. See page 281.

The Tāj-ul-Ma'āshr, which pours out page after page of rhapsodical nonsense upon the most trivial matters, merely mentions, with respect to this disaster, that the Sultan sustained "a slight misfortune and reverse [یادا خشم زخمی و ناکسبی]" gives the year 600 H. as the date, and does not mention [in the three MSS. I have read] anything whatever about the Sultan having been wounded. The word رمی mentioned above may have been mistaken for such meaning. I should be sorry to place implicit faith on any statements in the above work, unless corroborated by some other work by a contemporary writer.

7 Our author calls the whole of those opposed to Mu'izz-ud-Din, "infidels"
brought about an accommodation, and the infidel forces drew back again, and the Sultan returned to Ghazniv, and commanded that forces should be organized for a three years' campaign in Turkistan, and determined to march into Khiţā.

At that period, an assemblage of contumacious persons, [consisting] of Khokhars, and other rebels of the tribes of the hills of Lohor and Jūd hills had broken out into revolt,

several times before this; but the fact is all are infidels who are opposed to Ghūrīs. Mu'izz-ud-Dīn was saved from captivity or death through the good offices of Sultan 'Uṣmān, a Musalmān like himself.

When Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, overcome with grief and chagrin, reached his own territory in safety, Sultan Muhammad despatched one of his Chamberlains to him, saying: "You are aware that you yourself are the cause of this hostility and distrust. Perhaps you may now be inclined to give up your hostile intentions against my dominions and be desirous of peace." Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn was agreeable, and he bound himself by the most solemn promises to abide by the terms, and, further, to aid and assist Sultan Muhammad whenever requested. Perhaps the latter may, in doing this, have had a foreboding, that he might want support against Chingiz Khān, who had acquired vast power at that time, and whose doings caused anxiety to the Khwārzmī Sultan.

After this accommodation had been concluded, a body of insurgents assembled together at Tāl-kān, and Tāj-ud-Dīn, Zangī [brother of Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, of Tūkhāristān], who was Wālī of Balkh at that time, was the chief mover in this outbreak. He made a raid upon Marv-ar-Rūd, and slew the intendant stationed there, and sought to plunder the place. Sultan Muḥammad, on becoming aware of this raid, nominated Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Khiṣr [probably Khazar-jargh] from Marv, and Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Allī, from Ablward, with their troops, to march against him. After coming up with them, Zangī, together with ten Amīrs, were taken in the encounter which ensued, and were sent off prisoners to Khwārzm, where they met with their deserts, and their heads were struck off. Notwithstanding this affair, the peace was faithfully observed between the two Sulṭāns and their Amīrs. Still, the remembrance of past events rankled in the heart of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn; and, in order to prepare for any eventuality that might offer to enable him to avenge his defeat, "under pretence of holy war, he was in the habit of organizing his troops, and manufactured arms in great quantities, until, in 602 H., he became bent on undertaking an expedition into Hindūstān against the infidels, in order to improve the finances of himself and officers, and also of his men, all of whom, during the last few years, and, in the Khwārzm expedition, had sustained great losses."

9 "Of the hills of Lohor" is contained in two copies only. The hills to the north of Lāhor, of course, are meant.

1 The following is the description of this affair contained in the Tārīkh-i-Alfi, which compare with Elliot's extract from the original in his Index, page 4*, and his translation, pages 158—160:

Transactions of the year 592 of the Riḥlat.

"In trustworthy histories it is stated, that, at the time that Shihāb-ud-Dīn
and, in the cold season of that year, the Sulṭān came into Hindūstān, and sent that refractory race to hell, and

[see remarks as to his correct title and name, as shown by his coins, note 9, page 446] was defeated by the Turks and Khīṭā-īs, as already noticed, it became noised abroad throughout his territories that the Sulṭān, Shihāb-ud-Dīn, had disappeared in that battle, and it was unknown what had happened to him—whether he had been killed, or whether he was still living, and had gone into any foreign part. Consequently, the seditious in his territory—in all parts—raised their heads, and each stretched forth his hand towards some tract of the territory. Among the seditious was one, Rāe Sāl by name, who was [dwelling] in the hilly country, between the city of Luhāwar [لهاوار] and Ghaznah; and, in concert with a body of Kokars, in the [same] tract [of country], and who always used to pay revenue to the treasury of Shihāb-ud-Dīn, having revolted from authority and obedience, he commenced plundering and harrying that district, and completely closed the route between Luhāwar and Ghaznah [غزنی], and in such wise that not a soul could pass along it. [He is called "Re-bāl" [ربال] and "Ran-bāl" [رنبال] in Jāmī'-ut-Tawārīkh; but both names are doubtful, and are, probably, meant for Rāe-Sāl, "the ruler of the Koh-i-Jūd [the Salt Range], at which the frontier of Hind commences, who had turned Musalmān, and subsequently relapsed; and the Khokhars, who also used to pay tribute to the Sulṭān, in consequence of these reports, also rose." Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir, after stating that the proceedings of Līk-Tāl [لیک تال], and the rumoured death of the Sulṭān, was the cause of great confusion and disturbance, says, "the Kokar tribe, rising in rebellion, entertained the idea of becoming independent, and obtaining dominion. The sons of Kokar, Bakān and Sarkāh [Firishthah has but one, whom he calls 'the chief of the Khokhars, who bore the name of Sarkāh'], also entertained the desire of acquiring sovereign power." Then there is an account of their taking Lohor, and of their defeating the feudatories of the Multān province, Bahā-ud-Dīn and his brother, and others, that the Sipah-Sālār, Sulīmān; had to fly before them.] Alī continues:— "When Shihāb-ud-Dīn reached Ghaznah in safety, in the manner previously described, and this matter came to his knowledge, he determined to proceed into Hindūstān, and thoroughly chastise the rebels of that part. Therefore he first directed Amīr Muḥammad, son of Abī 'Alī [this must be his kinsman, the son-in-law of Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, the late Sulṭān], who was his lieutenant over Luhāwar and Multān [the Amīr-i-Dād, Ḥasan, was probably subordinate to him], to remit with all possible celerity the revenue of the year 601 h. [and yet the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir gives the year 600 h. as that of his return from Khwārazm, and his expedition against the Khokhars], as it was required in the preparations making for the invasion of Khīṭā. [Jāmī'-ut-Tawārīkh says, "after the Sulṭān had taken his slave Lek-Tāl [or Līk-Tāl], who had taken possession of Multān, and had put him to death, and disposed of that affair, he despatched Muḥammad, son of Abī 'Alī, to Lāhor and Multān as governor, in order that he should send the tribute of those territories, which for the last two years were in arrears, to provide him with funds for his campaign against Khīṭā."

Amīr Muḥammad wrote, in reply, that the revenue of the years (sic) mentioned was ready, but that the Kokars [Khokhars], and Rāe Sāl, the chief of the Jībāl-i-Jūdī [the Jūd Ifilī] [Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir does not make the distinction between two different tribes, but says the sons of Kokar, Bakān and Sarkāh—in another MS. چکر و وسواد], had so closed the lower route to Ghaznah [neither the
carried on holy war as prescribed by the canons of Islam, and set a river of the blood of those people flowing. When

Bolan nor the Khaibar, the two by some supposed sole routes into Afghanistan, are referred to, that not a person could proceed by it.

"On hearing this, Shihab-ud-Din wrote [he sent the Amir-i-Hajib, Saraj-ud-Din-i-Abi Birk] to his slave, Kutb-ud-Din, who was the commander of the forces of Hind, [to the effect] 'having despatched a person to the Kokars to forbid them against committing these odious acts, he should call upon them to repent of their doings and return to obedience, on which he would pass over their misconduct.' Kutb-ud-Din despatched a person to them, in conformity with this command, and urged them to submit. The son of Kokar [not mentioned before] replied: 'This is not your affair; it was necessary for Sultan Shihab-ud-Din to send a person of his own, if he were alive; wherefore, then, did he not send to us, that we also might have sent the taxes for him?' That emissary, in reply, said: 'Consider this great regard towards you, that he hath sent me, who am his slave, to you.' Again, the son of Kokar said, in answer: 'All this is mere talk; Shihab-ud-Din is not forthcoming.' The emissary replied: 'The verification of this matter is easy: send one of your own confidential people to Ghaznah, that he may, with his own eyes, see, and come and say whether Shihab-ud-Din is living or not.' In short, the son of Kokar did not give ear to the emissary's words, and still continued firm, as before, in his sedition and rebellion; and, when the person sent by Kutb-ud-Din related to him the state of affairs, he represented it to the Court of Shihab-ud-Din. The Sultan directed Kutb-ud-Din to assemble the [available] troops of Hindustan and march against the Kokars, and to annihilate and eradicate, beyond ought that could be conceived, that seditious and contumacious race.

"When the command reached Kutb-ud-Din, he assembled and made ready his forces, and was about to move against that tribe, when Sultan Shihab-ud-Din himself was on the point of marching his troops towards Khijja, but, successive complaints of the violence and outrages committed by the Kokars reached him, and his people represented to that Sultan such numbers of things [respecting them], that it became incumbent on him to quell them and restrain their sedition first; and then to proceed in the other direction. Consequent upon this he gave up his determination of invading Khijja, and pitched his [advanced] tent in the direction of Luhawar, and, on the 5th of Rabii-ul-Awwal, of this same year [602 H.], he set out from Ghaznah towards Hindustan. When Shihab-ud-Din reached Purahwar, he found that the Kokars, in large numbers, had taken up a position between the Jilam [Jhilam] and the Sudarah [Sudhara]. On hearing this news, Shihab-ud-Din made a forced march from Purahwar on Thursday, the 25th of the same month, and fell upon them unawares [Jami'-ut-Tawarikh says he attacked them on the 25th]; and from break of day till the time of afternoon prayers he kept up the flame of battle and conflict; and the Kokars fought in such wise that, with all that grandeur and power, the Sultan had nearly been forced back from his position, when, unexpectedly, at that juncture, Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, with the forces of Hindustan, arrived [upon the scene], and commenced slaughtering the Kokars. As Kutb-ud-Din's troops were fresh and vigorous, the Kokars were unable to resist them, and they took to flight. The soldiers of Islam, pursuing them, inflicted such havoc upon them as cannot be conceived. Those that escaped the sword fled to the dense depths of the jangal and the Musalmans set fire to
he set out on his return towards Ghaznī, in the year 602 H., at the halting-place of Dam-yak, he attained mar-

it on all sides. [Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh states that the Hindūs [the Khokhars] fled to the highest ranges of the Koh-i-Jūd, and, on being pursued, lighted a great fire, and threw themselves into it, and perished. Great plunder was taken and many captives, so that five Hindū [Khokhar] captives could be bought for a dinār. The son of Re-bāl, chief of the Koh-i-Jūd, sought the protection of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and made great supplication to him. Kuṭb-ud-Dīn made intercession for him with the Sultān, who pardoned him, while the Tāj-ul-Ma'aṣīr says one of Kokar’s sons was among the slain [Sar-kah], and the other, Balkan, made for a fortress in the Jūd Hills, in which he was invested; and, after holding out some time, being hard pressed, made intercession through Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, and surrendered the place, and was forgiven.] At that time those infidels agreed together not to surrender to the Musalmāns, and they threw themselves into the jangal, and were consumed.

“The Sultān, having disposed of that affair to his satisfaction, advanced to Luhāvar [Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh says he arrived there on the 15th of Rajab], and gave his troops permission to return to their own homes [quarters?], where, having rested some days [some time], they might set out on their invasion of Khūtā.”

The authors of the Tarīkh-i-Aṣfi availed themselves of the best authorities in the compilation of their great work, and there is scarcely any celebrated work, whether Arabic or Persian, that they did not use and quote from. They also appear to have often used such Hindū historical works as were available; and yet there is no mention of the story of the Yal-dūz or Iladd-gīs rebellion, nor of Lek-Tāl, nor of I-bak-i-Nā-pāk, nor I-bak-i-Bāk. It seems rather significant that the author or authors of this story should have selected names similar to those of the two most trusted, loyal, and favourite slaves of the Sultān, and who succeeded him in the sovereignty of Ghaznī and Hindūstān respectively—I-yak-dūz and I-bak—for their story; but it is certain that the Tāj-ul-Ma’aṣīr is accountable for the latter part of it, in which I-bak-i-Nā-pāk is mentioned.

The Khokhars were not annihilated in this affair by any means, and gave great trouble in after years, and gained possession of Lāhor.

Briggs says, page 201, vol. i.: “In the latter end of the King’s reign [Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s], their chieftain [of the Gukhurs] was converted to the true faith when a captive. After becoming a proselyte he procured his release from the King, who endeavoured to persuade him to convert his followers,” &c. This is totally contrary to the original. A Musalmān became captive to the Khokhars, and whilst among them he explained to them the tenets and usages of the Muḥammadan faith. The chieftain asked the Musalmān how the Sultān would treat him if he should embrace the Muḥammadan faith, to which the Musalmān replied that he would undertake to say that the Sultān would treat him with royal favour, and would confer on him the authority over those mountain tracts. This circumstance was duly represented to the Sultān in writing by the captive Musalmān, and the Sultān at once despatched a rich dress of honour for the chief of the Khokhars; and he came and presented himself before the Sultān, was treated with great honour, was made a Musalmān, returned home with a farman investing him with the government of those parts, and he made most of the Khokhars converts. Dow, in this instance, has translated the passage correctly; but, unfortunately for Firīdūth’s authority, this tale does not tally with the last events in the Sultān’s life, and it, in a measure, contradicts his own statements respecting them.
tyrdom at the hand of a disciple of the Mulāḥidah, and died. One of the learned men of that period has com-

2 The idiom differs here in one of the oldest copies, which has, "he was killed," &c.

3 Yāfa-i says that one successful expedition gained in Hindūstān at this time was sufficient to repair the Sultān's finances, and to set right the affairs of his troops; and, on his return to his capital, after having crossed the Jīlī [جیل] ferry—the ferry over the Jhilam probably—Jāmī'-ut-Tawārīkh has Hānil—حائیل—[Ben. As. Soc. MS. جیل] and Jahān-Kūshā-I Jīl, ford, and says he crossed over on the 1st of Shābān—his royal tent was pitched on the banks of the Jīlūn [of Hind?], i.e. the Sind or Indus, so that one-half of it reached near to the water, and hence it was not deemed necessary to guard that side; and that, at the time of taking his noon-day nap, two or three Fīḍā-īs [disciples] suddenly issued from the water and assassinated him, and in this most authors agree. Guzūdah, however, says he was then on his way to Turkistān to wreak vengeance on Sultān 'Uṣmān of Samarqand! The term Fīḍā-i is particularly applied to the disciples of the chief of the Mulāḥidah heretics, and our author plainly states that it was from the daggers of the disciples of this sect that Mu'izz-ud-Dīn met his death, and not from the Khokhar tribe; and, when we consider that he had undertaken an expedition against them only two or three years before [see note 4, page 381], it is by no means improbable that they caused him to be assassinated. The Jāmī'-ut-Tawārīkh says the assassins were Khokhars, but almost immediately contradicts the statement, and says that Imām Fakhr-ud-Dīn was suspected of having brought it about. "Some malignant Muḥammadah 'Ulamā, on account of the great friendship that existed between the Sultān of Khwārazm and the eminent Imām Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Rāz [see page 429, and page 492], accused him of having conspired against the life of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and asserted that Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, had sent some person, who, after consultation with the Imām, had assassinated the Sultān; but it is considered by some writers that these very people who had accused the Imām had themselves caused the deed to be done. The Imām, as the late Sultān's slaves were bent upon avenging him, threw himself on the protection of the Wazīr, Mu'ayyid-ul-Mulk, until such time as the Wazīr contrived to secure him from their vengeance, and sent him to a place of safety. Imām Fakhr-ud-Dīn used to accompany Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn in his expeditions, and he states that Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn invaded India nine times: twice he was defeated, and seven times victorious." The statement above mentioned is confirmed, with but slight variation, by the author of the Tāj-ul-Maẓūr, a contemporary writer, and corroborated by our author's very measure account. Tāj-ul-Maẓūr says, that the Sultān's tents were pitched in a delightfully verdant mead on the bank of a clear stream [water]. At this time some heretics [Mulāḥidahs—ملاصدح], who had been following him for some time, awaiting an opportunity to assassinate him, at the time of evening prayer, and whilst the Sultān was in the act of bowing his head to the ground in prayer, and was uttering the praises of his Creator, the impure and obscene seel chose for the execution of their design. They slew a Salāh-dār [armour-bearer] and two Farrāshes [carpet-spreaders] in attendance, and then went round towards the Sultān's Khargah [pavilion or tent], and occupied it [to "surround" it would have required a large number. The words used are فرکرتب—فرکرتب seized, took possession. Compare Elliot, INDIA, vol. ii. page 236]; and one or two among those three or four assassins rushed upon the Sultān, and inflicted five or six.
posed a verse on this occurrence. It is here recorded that it may come under the observation of the sovereign of the Musalmāns, and that verse is as follows:—

"The martyrdom of the sovereign of sea and land, Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn,
From the beginning of the world the like of whom no monarch arose,
On the third 4 of the month Sha‘bān in the year six hundred and two,
Happened on the road to Ghaznīn at the halting-place of Dam-yak 8."

deep wounds, of which he immediately died." I have merely given an abstract of the author’s rhapsodical narration.

Alīf says they were Khokhars who had lost relatives killed in the late operations;—"One man among them came upon a door-keeper, and wounded him, on which the wounded man began to cry out. On this, the rest of the people about rushed up to the wounded man to see what was the matter, and were collected around him. The Khokhars seized this opportunity, and succeeded in reaching the Sulṭān, whom they despatched with many severe wounds."

Some other authors say it was one Khokhar only who murdered the Sulṭān, and that he had attached himself to him, and followed him for the purpose.

The Hindūs give a different account, which is also related by Abū-1-Faṣl and in the Jamūn History with a slight difference:—"Although the Persian Chroniclers state that Rāe Pithorā fell on the field of Talāwarī[Tarā‘īn], and that Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn fell at Dam-yak by the hand of a Khokhar who had devoted himself to the deed, and that such statement has been followed by the author of the Ṭabarāk-i-Akbarī and by Firīghtāh, nevertheless, from the mouth of the Hindī barīs, the depositaries of the traditions of every celebrated event, and which is handed down orally from generation to generation, it is stated that, after Rāe Pithorā was made captive and taken to Ghaznīn, one Chandā, some write Chāndā, the confidential follower and eulogist of Rāe Pithorā, styled by some authors his Court poet, proceeded to Ghaznīn to endeavour to gain information respecting his unfortunate master. By his good contrivances he managed to get entertained in Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn’s service, and succeeded in holding communication with Rāe Pithorā in his prison. They agreed together on a mode of procedure, and one day Chandā succeeded by his cunning in awakening the Sulṭān’s curiosity about Rāe Pithorā’s skill in archery, which Chandā extolled to such a degree that the Sulṭān could not restrain his desire to witness it, and the captive Rājah was brought out and requested to show his skill. A bow and arrows were put into his hands, and, as agreed upon, instead of discharging his arrow at the mark, he transfixed the Sulṭān, and he died on the spot, and Rāe Pithorā and Chandā were cut to pieces then and there by the Sulṭān’s attendants.

The Jamūn History states that Rāe Pithorā had been blinded [see note 1, page 466], and that, when brought forth, and his own bow and arrows given him, notwithstanding his blindness, having fitted an arrow, and tried the temper of the bow, guided by the sound of the Sulṭān’s voice, and the indications of Chandā, he discharged the arrow in the right direction, and transfixed him. The rest agrees.

4 Jahān-Ārā and some others say the 1st of Sha‘bān, 602 H.
5 As the second line of this quatrain ends in yak, it is wholly impossible that the last work can be Damik. Dam-yak is the correct name of the place. Authors differ considerably about its situation: some say it was a little west of the Jhilam, some on the Nīl-āb, and others that it was a village beyond the Indus, on the route to Ghaznīn; but the first seems most probable. To prove
May the Most High King encompass that Sultān-i-Ghāzī with his mercy and forgiveness, and preserve the sovereign of the age!

With respect to the equity and justice of this monarch in the world, the mention of them could not be contained in the capacity of writing; and the observance of the law of the Chosen One, and the preservation of the system of holy warfare likewise, according to the tenets of the Muḥammadan faith, was accomplished in that sovereign. According to the traditions which they have related concerning the Prophet—on whom be peace!—they say, that he, having been asked respecting the general resurrection, affirmed that it would take place six hundred and odd years after him; and the martyrdom of this sovereign occurred in the year 602 H., and, in this same year, likewise, indications of the last judgment appeared, and they were the irruption of Chingiz Khān, the Mughal, and the outbreak of the Turk. Therefore it is evident that that monarch was the strong barrier of Islām in the world, and, when he attained martyrdom, the gate of the final judgment opened.

The amount of wealth acquired in holy wars, accumulated in the treasury at Ghaznīn, was so great that the indication of the like has not been noticed with regard to the treasury of any sovereign, and Khwājah Ismā'īl, the Treasurer, stated at the Court of Firūz-koh, at the time of bringing an honorary robe to the Malikah-i-Jalālī, the daughter of the august Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām how little trust is to be placed in Firīštah's statements, as shown in Briggs's "Revised Text," the Persian scholar will there find this place styled Ramhek—کرمه—in the prose; and a few lines under, in his version of the same quatrain quoted by our author, translated above, it is turned into Rhutak—روتک—and Briggs translates it Rohtuk, which mistake is re-echoed by his copyists; and so the blunder gets handed down.

Other authors, too, fully appreciate the character of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and say that "he was a God-fearing and just sovereign, compassionate towards his people, liberal to his servants, honoured and revered as learned and good men, and treated them with distinction." His deeds prove that he was faithful to his brother; but if his "exploits" are not more substantial than the mythical relationship to his "great ancestor Sooltan Mahmood I." [who has been lately declared illegitimate in the "Student's Manual of Indian History"], they need not have been ever recorded.

Notwithstanding which, our author, who appears to have had as keen an appreciation of the mammon of unrighteousness as others who croak about the end of the world, took care to accept villages and money presents, and even slaves to send to his "dear sister" to sell in Khurāsān, not long after.
[Mu'izz-ud-Din's niece and Ziyā-ud-Din's betrothed wife], that of jewels contained in the Ghaznīn treasury, of diamonds alone, which are the most precious of gems, there were actually fifteen hundred maus⁸. The amount of other jewels and money may be judged of accordingly.

*Titles and names of the Sultān.*

**SULTĀN-UL-MU’AZZAM⁹,**

**MU’IZZ-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN,**

**ABŪ-L-MUZAFFAR, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SĀM.**

**NĀṢIR-I-AMĪR-UL-MŪMINĪN¹.**

---

⁸ It depends upon what maus is meant. Our author must refer to the maus of Tabrīz, which is much smaller than that of Hindūstān, the former being somewhat less than 2 lbs., whilst the latter varies from 40 to 80 lbs. The Tabrīz maus is thus described:—6 habbak [habbak signifies, a seed, a grain, &c., and is equal to a barley-corn] = 1 dāng, 6 dāngs = 1 miškāl 15 miškāls = 1 astār, 40 astārs = 1 maus.

I fear the Khwājah was as great an exaggerator as our author himself. Other authors however mention the quantity as 500 maus. Even the latter number is too incredible almost for belief.

⁹ After his brother's death, on becoming supreme ruler, he took the title of Sultān-ul-A’ẓam.

¹ How he obtained the title of Nāṣir-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn, and when, the chronicler does not say. It may have been conferred upon him by the Khalifah of Baghdād for being with his brother, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, a tool in the Khalifah's hands against the Sultān of Khwārazm. I imagine it is this title on his coins which Mr. E. Thomas reads as the name of the Khalifah. Un-Nāṣir-ud-Dīn 'Ullah was certainly Khalifah at this period. See Chronicles of Pathán Kings of Delhi, page 12.

The Sultān is styled "Us-Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l Muẓaffar," &c., on a coin said to have been struck at Dihlī, 589 H., in the year 4 [of his rule in Hind ?]
Length of his reign: Thirty-two years and eight months. Seat of government in the summer season:—Ghaznīn and Khurāsān.

Seat of government in the winter season:—Lohor and Hind.

Kāzīs of his Court.

Kāzī of the kingdom, the Ṣadr-i-Šahīd, Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, Abū Bikr, subsequently, the Ṣadr-i-Sa'īd, Shahrāf-ud-Dīn, Abū Bikr, son of the Ṣadr-i-Šahīd, Nizām [ud-Dīn?] at Ghaznīn.

Kāzī of the army* and other territory—Shams-ud-Dīn, Balkhī, and his son.

Wazīrs.


Standards.

On the right, Black, with the Turk Maliks and Amīrs.
On the left, Red, with the Maliks and Amīrs of Ghūr.

The Sultān’s august motto.

“Victory through God.”

The Sultān’s Dependents who attained unto Sovereignty.

Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, at Ghaznīn.

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah in Multān and Ṣchchah.

Sultān Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, at Lohor*.

Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, the Khalj, over the territory of Lakhanawati*.

* Three years and three months exactly as an independent sovereign, from the 27th of Jamād-ul-Awwal, 599 H., to 3rd of Sha'bān, 602 H. He was subordinate to his elder brother as shown by his coins; but as a dependent ruler he of course ruled over Ghaznīn from the time that sovereignty was bestowed upon him.

* Our author’s father does not figure here among the Kāzīs. See page 456, nor is mention made of the Ṣadr-i-Ḳabīr, Kiwām-ul-Mulk, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Ḥamzah, who was sent to offer terms to Rāe Piṭhorā.

* In one copy Durmasht, in a second Durmanght, and in a third Durghī or Dursī. See page 392, note 4.

* One good copy of the text has, simply لَامَد Justice, or Rectitude.

* Not Dihl! See the reign of Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, next Section.

* Fourth Khalj ruler of Lakhanawatī. It is strange that neither Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, nor his two immediate successors in the government of Lakhanawatī, are mentioned here. It was Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, the Khalj, who reduced Bihār and Lakhanawatī during Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn’s own lifetime, and their reduction is mentioned among the victories and successes of
The Sultan's Kinsmen and his Maliks.

Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Durr-i-Ghur [The Pearl of Ghūr], in Ghūr.
- Sultan Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, in Bāmiān.
- Sultan Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, in Flūrūz-koh.
- Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, of Kidān.
- Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Timrānī.
- Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Alb-ī-Ghāzī, son of Ẓāzil Arsalān Saljuḵī.
- Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab, of Sijistān.
- Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Zangī, of Bāmiān.
- Malik Mubāriz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad 'Alī-i-Utsuz.
- Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, [Ḥusain], Mādīnī.
- Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, of Timrān.
- Malik Mu-ayyid-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd.
- Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Mādīnī.
- Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Kidānī.
- Malik Shāh, of Wakhsh.
- Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz-ī-Ḥusain.
- Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Alī-i-Kār-māḵh.
- Malik Ẓāhir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Kar-māḵh.
- Malik Ẓāhir-ud-Dīn, Fath-i-Kar-māḵh.
- Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl.
- Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, son of Khar-mīl.
- Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, Amir-i-Shikār [Chief Huntsman].

the Sultan at page 491. Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāṣ, does not appear to have ever been in the immediate service of Mu'izz ud-Dīn, and did not acquire sovereignty until nearly ten years after Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's death, whilst Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, was assassinated towards the end of the same year in which the Sultan was himself assassinated. See the account of the Khalj rulers farther on.

Strange to say, some of the copies have Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh in this list also; but such is not correct. He was the slave of the Sultan's slave, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and did not acquire sovereignty until after I-bak's death, and long after the Sultan's decease.

* Here again the author puzzles his readers. After Ziyā-ud-Dīn became ruler of Ghūr, as our author himself says at page 393, his name was changed to 'Alā-ud-Dīn.

* Maternal grandfather of the two Sultan's.

* This is the person referred to in note 8, page 425, and note 9, page 481.

* See pages 344 and 497.

* He is the father of Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Mādīnī, and was surnamed Khar-nak.

* In some copies Naṣr.
Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Kharī-wār.
Malik Asad-ud-Dīn, Šer Malik, Wajīrī [of Wajīristān?].
Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Sūr, of Kīdānī.
Amīr Sulmān-i-Šiḥs, Amīr-i-Dād [Chief Justice ?].
Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Muḥammad Ālī, Ghāzi.
Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Khān Malik [?].
Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Ḥusain-i-Muḥammad Ḥasan[?].
Malik Mu-ayyid-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd.
Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Ḥusain-i-Surkh.

Victories, Successes, and Holy-wars.


* This name is doubtful. It might be Ḥaz-wār, but the above is most probable, and may be a nick-name. In modern copies of the text it is written Ḥorūl—Morūl—Morūl.

* In two copies, Āhmādī, and in one copy Aḥmārī.

* Very doubtful. The best and oldest copy has _steps which is unintelligible.

* In some Hābasht, and in others Ḥusainī.

* In one Surkhī or Sarkhī, and in another Surjī or Surjī, but these are doubtful. Only five copies of the text contain these names at all, and three of these are very defective. The Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Sarāj-ud-Dīn, Āḥī Bikr, and Bahā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, are likewise mentioned in Alīf.

* One copy has Bathindah.

* Very doubtful. It is written Īz-—ez—and even Ṣarābān in the best Paris copy.

* Probably  quietly, tranquilly, &c. See reign of Kutb-ud-Dīn, next Section.

* Also Rūd in one copy.

* It will be remarked that there is no reference made here to the expedition against Dīwal or Dībal, and the sea-coast of Sind. I have endeavoured to put these "victories, conquests, and holy-wars" in chronological order as near as possible; but many are mentioned with which Mu'llizz-ud-Dīn, personally, had nothing to do, three in which he was defeated, one a complete overthrow, the loss of everything, and a narrow escape from captivity, and the "holy-war" of Khītā was never undertaken. The successes in Awadh were gained by others, and A-dwand Bihār and Lakanawatī were acquired by Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Khalīj.
III. SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF BAHĀ-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SĀM, OF BĀMIĀN.

When the Sultan-i-Ghāzi, Muizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, was martyred at Dam-yak, and Sultan Bahā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sām, son of Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, died on his way to Ghaznīn, as has been previously recorded, the competitors for the dominion of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, Bāmiān, and Hind, of the race of the Shan-sabāns, consisted of two lines—one, the [descendants of the] Sultanāns of Ghūr, and the other, of the Sultanāns of Bāmiān.

When they despatched the bier of Sultan Muizz-ud-Dīn from the halting-place of Dam-yak towards Ghaznīn, the Turk Malik and Amirs, who were the slaves of that Sultan-i-Ghāzi, deprived the Amirs and Malik of Ghūr, by force, of the bier of the late Sultan, together with precious treasures, and took possession of them. When

6 Within two days' journey of the capital. See page 432.
7 One author says, that "the Malik and Chiefs, on finding the Sultan lifeless, rallied round the Wazir, Mu'ayyid-ul-Mulk, and pledged themselves to defend the treasure and dominions until such time as a successor should be nominated to succeed him. The Sultan's wounds were sewn up [after his death], and the body was placed in a sort of covered litter, and, pretending that he was ill, they escorted it to Ghaznai, and the fact of his death was kept a profound secret. The treasures, amounting to 2000 khar-wārs [lit. ass-loads, one kharwar = about 100 maunds of Tābriz] were conveyed to the capital at the same time."

The bier of the late Sultan having been taken up, and being conveyed towards Ghaznīn, on the way quarrels ensued between Mu'ayyid-ul-Mulk, the Wazir, and the Ghūrī ān Amirs. The Wazir wished to proceed by way of Kārnān, in order that, through the assistance of Taj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, who held the government of that district, the late Sultan's treasures might be conveyed to Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd, his nephew, who held the government of Bust and Zāmīn-i-Dāwar, to whose succession he was inclined, while the Amirs of Ghūr desired to proceed by the route of Gum-rahān [كَرَاح] which was nearer to Bāmiān, in order that the sister's son of the late monarch, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, Sultan of Bāmiān [who was advancing towards Ghaznīn when death overtook him] should obtain possession of these treasures. As the Wazir was supported by the Slaves of the late Sultan, he was more powerful, and he separated from the Ghūrī ān Amirs, and, taking along with him the bier of the late Sultan and his treasures, proceeded by way of Shaltūzān [in those days called sankhurān, and, subsequently, Shānūzān. See note 7, p. 498] towards Ghaznīn. When they reached Kārnān, Taj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, came forth to receive them, and, when he beheld the bier, he dismounted from his horse, and received it with the utmost veneration, and he wept to such degree, that the others were quite overcome and wept also. The bier was
they reached Karman, the Wazir, Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, Muhammed-i-'Abd-ullah, the Sanjari, with several other persons distinguished among the Turk Amirs, were appointed to escort the late Sulthan's bier to Ghaznin, in company with other Turk Malik; and Malik Taj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, who was the Mihtar [or chief] of the Turk Malik, and the greatest and most distinguished of the Sulthan's Slaves, held post in Karman.

When the Sulthan's bier reached Ghaznin, two days after, the Sulthans of Bamiyan, 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammed, and Jalal-ud-Din, 'Alfi, sons of Bahau-ud-Din, Sam, of Bamiyan, in conformity with the solicitations of the Ghurhi Amirs, such as the Sipah-salar the [Commander of Troops], Sulthan-i-Shi'ah, and the Sipah-salar, Kharoshi, and other

then conveyed to Ghaznin, and the corpse of the Sulthan was interred in the Madrasah [college] which he had founded in the name of his daughter, and his only child. Firuzi's account of this affair has not been correctly rendered by his translators.

After the funeral, Sulthan Bahau-ud-Din, Sam, set out from Bamiyan for Ghaznin, and on the road was seized with a violent headache which was the messenger of his death. There being no hopes of his recovery, he made his last request to his two sons, 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammed, and Jalal-ud-Din, 'Alfi, that they should proceed to Ghaznin, and endeavour, by conciliation, to gain over the Wazir, Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, the Slaves, and the Amirs of Ghur, and take possession of Ghaznin, after which, 'Ala-ud-Din, who was the eldest son, was to be sovereign of Ghaznin, and Jalal-ud-Din, the younger, sovereign of Bamiyan.

The Jami'-ut-Tawarikh confirms this generally, but states that Bahau-ud-Din requested them to come to an accommodation with Ghiyath-ud-Din, Mahmud, if he would agree to content himself with Ghur and Khurasan, and leave Ghaznah and Hind to 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammed, the eldest son.

They came to Ghaznin accordingly, and, although the Ghurani nobles were inclined to offer opposition to this, the Wazir persuaded them that as Ghiyath-ud-Din, Mahmud, was then wholly occupied in Khurasan, and had proceeded, at the head of an army, towards Hirat against 'Izz-ud-Din, Husain, son of Kharmil, to oppose 'Ala-ud-Din's intentions would be useless and uncalled for, since they required a ruler over them, and, that, whenever Mahmud should have gained possession of Hirat and subdued Khurasan, it would be easy to get rid of 'Ala-ud-Din. So he was allowed to assume the throne.

When Taj-ud-Din, I-yal-duz, became aware of this in Karman, in compliance with the request of Ghiyath-ud-Din, Mahmud, conveyed to him from Zamun-i-Dawar, he marched from Karman with a large army upon Ghaznin, wrested it by force of arms from 'Ala-ud-Din and his brother, Jalal-ud-Din, 'Alfi, who retired to Bamiyan. Taj-ud-Din, I-yal-duz, however proceeded to read the Khutbah for himself and to coin money in his own name; and, after some time, 'Ala-ud-Din, and his brother, Jalal-ud-Din, invaded Karman and Shaliukan, and devastated the whole of those districts. See page 398.

* Styled Amur-i-Daul in the list of Malik.
distinguished personages of the capital city of Ghaznin, arrived there from Bāmiān, and entered the city. 'Alā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, Bāmiānī, who was the eldest of the sons of [Sultan] Bahā-ud-Din, Sām, ascended the throne, and brought the Amīrs present there, both Ghūrī and Turk, under fealty to him; and the Ghaznin treasury, which, from the immensity of its wealth and precious treasures, would have [so to speak] considered the hoard of Kārūn but a tithe, was all divided into two equal portions. Trustworthy persons have related that the portion of Sultan Jalāl-ud-Din, 'Alī, Bāmiānī, who was the youngest of the two brothers, amounted to two hundred and fifty camel loads of pure red gold, jewel-studded articles, and vessels of gold and silver, which was removed to Bāmiān.

After a period of some days had elapsed, Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, the Wazīr, and the Turk Amīrs, who were at the capital, Ghaznin, wrote letters to Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Yalduz, soliciting him to come thither, and despatched them to Kārmān. He determined to proceed from Kārmān to Ghaznin; and, when he arrived in the vicinity of the city, Sultan 'Alā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, made ready to fight, and marched out to encounter him; and Jalāl-ud-Din [his brother], who also came out of the city, retired in the direction of Bāmiān.

When the ranks of 'Alā-ud-Din were marshalled against Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, the Turk Amīrs on either side united together, and Malik' 'Alā-ud-Din was vanquished, and he, along with all the Shānsabānī Maliks who sided with him, was taken prisoner. Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, entered Ghaznin, and gave permission to the Shānsabānī Maliks, so that they returned to Bāmiān again.

A second time Sultan Jalāl-ud-Din, in order to aid his brother, 'Alā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, assembled the forces of the territory of Bāmiān, and bodies of the troops of [the] Beghū from Wakhsh and Badakhshān, and brought them,

9 Styled Malik and Sultan indiscriminately.
1 Two copies of the text have "‘the forces of the kingdom of Ghūr and of Bāmiān," but I do not think such can possibly have been meant. The whole of the Shānsabānī Maliks were not subjects of the Bāmiān state. Ghıyāg-ud-Dīn, Muḥīmūl, the direct heir to the empire of his father and uncle, was still ruling over Ghūr, and he appears to have favoured Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, and not to have been particularly friendly towards his kinsmen of Bāmiān.
2 One copy of the text, and also the printed text, have رج instead of
and again appeared before Ghaznîn, and possessed himself of the Ghaznîn territory, and re-placed 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, upon the throne, after which, Jalâl-ud-Dîn returned again towards Bâmiân.

Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, a second time, advanced with his troops from Kârmân towards Ghaznîn; and 'Alâ-ud-Dîn deputed the Ghûrî Maliks and Amîrs from Ghaznîn to repel them. On the part of Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, Aetkin, the Tatâr, was nominated to proceed in advance to meet them. He came upon them at the Ribât of Sanûrân, and seized the whole of them drunk and out of their senses, and the Ghûrî Maliks and the great Amîrs were there put to death. From thence Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, appeared before the walls of Ghaznîn, and 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, was invested within the citadel. For a period of four months Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, continued to invest it, until Jalâl-ud-Dîn, 'Alî, arrived from the territory of Bâmiân to the assistance of his brother, Sultân 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, and to drive away the Turk forces.

When he reached the neighbourhood of Ghaznîn, the Turk Amîrs moved out to encounter him, and Jalâl-ud-Dîn, 'Alî, was overthrown, and was taken prisoner. He was brought to the foot of the walls of the fortress of Ghaznîn, and that fort was taken. When the two brothers fell into his hands, after a short time. Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, entered into a stipulation with them, and caused them to return to Bâmiân. After a little while, difference of interests arose between the two brothers. Jalâl-ud-Dîn, 'Alî, was a lion-hearted monarch, an ascetic, and a firm ruler; and 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, did not agree with him, and he left Bâmiân, and proceeded to the presence of Sultân Muhammad, Khwârazm Shâh. The assistance it was his object there to obtain was not advanced, and his good fortune did not again favour him, and luck did not aid

\*\*\* in eleven other copies. The latter is evidently the name of one of the Ghuzz tribes.

\* A Kârwan-Sarâe, also a station on an enemy's frontier.

\*\* This was done to induce 'Alâ-ud-Din, Muhammad, to give up Ghaznîn.

\*\* This evidently refers to the occasion when I-yal-duz gave one of his daughters in marriage to Jalâl-ud-Dîn, 'Alî. See para. second, note, page 433.

\*\* Our author says nothing of these disagreements in his account of Jalâl-ud-Dîn, 'Alî, at page 432.
him; and, after Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, took possession of the territory of Bāmlān, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, died.

He had the daughter of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, son of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain [Jahān-soz], to wife, and by that Princess he had a son. When the writer of these words, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in the year 621 H., had to undertake a journey into the Kūhistān from the territory of Ghūr, on an embassy, it was intimated to him that that Princess and her son were then in the district of Kūsh-āb, on the borders of Tābas, into which part they had come during the misfortunes attending the irruption of the accursed ones of Chīn.

IV. SULTĀN TĀJ-UD-DĪN, VAL-DUZ, AL-MU'IZZĪ US-SULTĀNĪ.

Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām, was a mighty monarch, just, a champion of the Faith, lion-hearted, and in valour a second 'Alī-i-Abū-Ṭalib—may God reward him!—but he was wanting in children, and one daughter was all he had by [his wife] the daughter of

7 See page 266—267.
8 See page 414.
9 So called from having been one of the Slaves of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and who, if the latter had been so "renowned in history" as "Shahāb-o-Deen Mahomel Ghooory," we might have expected to have been styled Shihābī instead. Kūsh-ud-Dīn, I-bal, and others are called Mu'izzī for the same reason. It would be difficult to decide what is the real meaning here of the word Yal-duz. In the different copies of the text it is written as above, and in the three oldest copies the vowel points are also given; but in other works, including Yāfā-i and Faṣīb-i, the word is written more correctly 1-yal-duz, the first word of which is the same as occurs in 1-yal-Arsalān, 1-yal-timṣīsh, &c. In one lexicographical work jāl without any vowels being mentioned, is said to be Türkī [of which there is no doubt], and to be the name of a man and a star, not a star only. I-yal [jā], among other meanings, signifies a mounta

bull; I-l [jāl], which is not the word here meant, means friendly, obedient, tame, familiar; and Yal [jāl], brave, valiant, intrepid. Dūz [jāl] means flat, level, smooth, even; and [jāl] diğr and dīz [jāl] mean a fort, a hill, and also rough, nustere; anger, fury, rage, and the like. Among the Turks, as with other Oriental people, the name of a child is often derived from some object or incident, trifling or otherwise, which may have struck the mother's fancy, or that of any of the women present at the child's birth; and the name I-yal-duz, Yal-duz, or Yal-diṣ is doubtless something of the same kind.

1 From the accounts given by some other authors, it would appear that Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn had had several children born to him, but only one daughter survived him. The others may have died in childhood. At page 344, which see, he is said to have married the daughter of Malik Sulf-ud-Dīn, Sūrī son of his paternal uncle, Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Khar-nak, whose other son was named Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Muḥamad [Husain].
his uncle, Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Mādīnī; and he had a great fancy for purchasing Turkish slaves, and he bought a great number of slaves of that race. Every one of them acquired renown throughout the whole of the countries of the East for activity, warlike accomplishments, and expertness; and the names of his slaves became published in the four quarters of the world, and during the Sultān’s lifetime every one of them became famous.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that one of the confidential favourites of the Sultān’s Court made bold to represent to him, saying: “To a monarch like unto thee, the like of whom in height of dignity and grandeur the whole expanse of the empire of Islām does not contain, sons were necessary to thy empire, in order that every one of them might be the inheritor of a kingdom of the empire of the universe, so that, after the expiration of the period of this [present] reign, the sovereignty might continue permanent in this family.” That victorious Sultān [in reply] uttered these august words:—“Other monarchs may have one son, or two sons: I have so many thousand sons, namely, my Turk slaves, who will be the heirs of my dominions, and who, after me, will take care to preserve my name in the Khuṭbah throughout those territories.” And so it happened as declared in the

3 And yet the very first Turk slave who acquired the sovereignty after the Sultān’s death is turned into a Pathān, i.e. an Afghān, and even the Sultān himself, and without any authority for such a statement.

3 This may explain [for our author’s statements, in different places, make the above one very doubtful] why Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, is supposed to have issued coins in the sole name of his deceased master and sovereign, and why he styles himself “the servant and slave” of the “martyred Sultān, Muḥammad-i-Sām.” See the notice of his coins in Thomas, “PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLI,” pages 25–31. It is quite a mistake to suppose that I-yal-dūz ever styled himself “Sultān-i-Mu’aggam”—he is styled, at the head of this Chapter, Mu’izz— and it is probable the titles on the different coins, especially those bearing “Sultān-ul-Maghrib,” from our author’s statement here, apply to the late Sultān, or, more probably, to his successor, Maḥmūd, who is styled by authors Sultān-i-Maghribin wa Shahanshāh-i-Maghribin:

سلطان مشروط و شهنشاه مغرب، سعورد بن محمد بن سام بن حسن

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn probably did the same, although we have no proof; but, whatever may have been done in our author’s time, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīgh, the Kuṭbī slave and son-in-law, does not appear to have followed the same example, from the evidence on the coins given by Thomas at pages 52 and 78. See however our author’s statement at page 398, where he says the Khuṭbah
hallowed words of that victorious Sulţān—on whom be the Almighty’s mercy!—which, throughout the whole dominion of Hindūstān⁴, up to the period when this book was written, namely, the year 657⁴ H., they observed, and are still observing; and it is to be sincerely implored that, by the grace of Almighty God, these dominions may continue, in this same manner, under their sway to the uttermost end of the existence of the race of Adam.

I now reach my own discourse, which is the account of Sulţān Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz.

He was a great monarch, of excellent faith, mild, beneficent, of good disposition, and very handsome. The Sulţān-i-Ghāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Din, purchased him when he was young in years, and, from the outset of his career, appointed him to an office, and subsequently, step by step, advanced him to a high position, and made him head and chief over the other Turkish slaves⁶. When he grew up he attained authority and power, and the Sulţān conferred upon him the government of the district of Sanḵurān and Kārmān⁷ in feudal fief; and every year that the Sulţān was read for Sulţān Māhmūd, and that the coin was stamped with his name throughout the whole of the territories of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, and Hindūstān.

⁴ That portion of Hindūstān which our author’s patron ruled over probably.
⁵ In three copies 568 H.
⁶ Jahān-Ārā, Munṭaḵhab-ut-Tawārīkh, and others, state that the Sulţān used to treat these Turkish Mamlūks like sons, and bestowed the government of provinces and countries upon them. He esteemed the most, and placed the greatest confidence in, Tāj-ud-Din, I-yal-duz, and showed him the greatest honour; and the Sulţān’s followers used to pay him great homage, and attention, and go in his train. During the lifetime of the Sulţān, Tāj-ud-Din became Wālī of Kārmān; and, from the great honour and respect in which he was held, he subsequently acquired dominion over the kingdom of Ghaznīn. Compare this with Fīrīshṭāḥ’s idle tales, both in his text and in Dow and Briggs.

⁷ The province which Tāj-ud-Din, I-yal-duz, held, included the tract of country, containing several durahs—long valleys with hills on two sides, and rivers running through them—extending from the southern slopes of Spīnhār, the White Mountain, in Puštīto, and the south-westerly slopes of the Salt Range, on the north; towards the Gumal on the south; from the range of hills separating the district of Gardaiz on the west; and to the Sind-Sāgar or Sind or Indus on the east;—a large tract of country watered by the Kurmah [vulg. Kurram] river and its tributaries, which province, in ancient times, must have been exceedingly populous and flourishing, to judge from the remains of several cities still to be seen in it, and which is still very fruitful. The upper portion of this tract is called the durah of Kurmah, and, lower down, towards the Sind, are Banū and Marwat.

The Kurmah durah is about 40 kuroh in length [each kuroh, in this part,
would make a halt in Karman, on his expeditions into Hindustan, Taj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, used to feast the whole
being 2000 paces], and having little level ground. On either side of this
great darah are smaller ones, running in nearly transverse directions; but
those I would more particularly refer to here, as forming an important portion
of I-yal-duz's sief, and giving name to the province, are those springing, so to
speak, from Spin-ghar.

One of these is the darah of Shaluzan [also written in the account of
Amir Timur, Shamnian], and which our author refers to [see page 450]
as Sanqurhan, which name appears to have been derived from a tribe of the
Ghuzz, so named, who held it before, and in the time of Sultan Ghiyas-ud-
Din, and his brother, Sultan Muizz-ud-Din. It is seven kuroh in length
from north to south, and through it flows a stream which issues from Spin-
ghar, and joins the river from the Paiwar valley. Its inhabitants are Torfs,
who are reckoned among the Afghans, but they claim other descent, and
some Awān-kārā, a tribe of Jats, which appears to have been, for the most
part, displaced by the easterly migrations of the Afghan tribes, and are now
chiefly located on the other side of the Sind-Sagar or Indus.

Karmān is another darah somewhat smaller, with a stream running through
it which also joins the Shaluzan and other streams which fall into the Kurmah.
I find no mention, in any author, of any ancient town of Karmān, but the
governor of the province was located in the darah, and there may have been
a considerable town so called, or, at least, a permanent encampment.

East of Shaluzan is the Zerān darah, running in a south-westerly
direction from Spin-ghar, and eight kuroh in length. A stream issuing
from Spin-ghar flows through it, which, having joined the Shaluzan river,
enters the Kurmah west of the town or large village of Uji Khel.
The people are Dzafs [turned to Jafees by travellers], who also are reckoned
among the Afghans but claim other descent, and some Awān-kārā.

Another large darah, and the most westerly one, is Irā-Ab [vulg. Hariaab],
twenty kuroh in length, running south-west from Spin-ghar, very mountainous,
but very fruitful. Out of this darah likewise a stream issues, which, flowing
east of Baghzan, the chief town of the Dzafs, enters the Kurmah district, and
receives the name of Kurmah.

Another darah is Paiwar [not Piwar], which also has its river, which joins
the others before mentioned, flowing from the northwards.

The chief towns and large villages of this tract, at present, are Astiyā
[this is not the place referred to at page 339], Paiwar, Balūt, Zūmīsh, Saidā,
Uji Khel, Buland Khel, Balīmīn [vulg. Balameen], Irā-Ab, Baghzan, and the
cluster of villages called by the name of the darah, Shaluzan, with many of
smaller size. Kurmah, called by travellers Kurram, where is a fort, and the
residence of the local governor, is not situated in the Karman darah, so is
not to be confounded with any place of that name. This name, Karman, which
is spelt as the natives spell it, has caused some absurd blunders among writers
and translators, who have supposed it referred to the Persian province of Kirmān.

The daraks south of the Kurmah darah include those of Khost, Dawar,
Maidān, and Bakh Khel, each with its stream which falls into the Kurmah; but
the whole of those mentioned, in the summer, decrease very much in volume.

* It was through this province of Karman—the government of which was a
most important post—that the lower route from Ghazni to Lahor lay, which
is referred to in note 1, page 481. The route by Karmān was the “lower
route” referred to in Alfī in the same note.
of the Amir, the Maliks, and the suite, and was in the
habit of presenting a thousand honorary head-dresses and
quilted tunics, and would command liberal largess to be
given to the whole retinue.

By command of the Sultan-i-Ghazi, a daughter of Tāj-
ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, was given in marriage to Sultan Kuṭb-ud-
Dīn, I-bak; and another daughter* was married to Malik
Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah. Sultan Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, had
likewise two sons, one of whom he had placed with a
preceptor. One day that preceptor, by way of chastise-
ment and discipline, struck the boy over the head with an
earthen water-flask². The decree of destiny had come,
and the water-flask struck him in a mortal place, and the
boy died. Information was conveyed to Sultan Tāj-ud-
Dīn, Yal-duz, who forthwith, out of his excessive clemency
and exemplary piety, sent funds to the preceptor for his
expenses, with directions that "he should get out of the
way, and undertake a journey, before the boy's mother
came aware of her son's fate, lest she might cause any
injury to be done him, in anguish for the loss of her son."
This anecdote is a proof of the goodness of disposition and
the purity of faith of that amiable Sultan.

In the last year of the reign of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, when
that monarch [on his last expedition into Hind] came into
Kārmān and halted there, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, presented
those yearly, stipulated thousand tunics and head-dresses.
The Sultan, out of the whole of them, selected one tunic
and one head-dress, and honoured his slave by presenting
him with his own princely robe; and the Sultan conferred
upon him a black banner, and it was the desire of his
august mind that Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, after himself,
should succeed to the throne of Ghazin². When the

---

* One daughter was given in marriage to Jalāl-ud-Dīn, 'Allī, of Bāmfān,
hence there must have been three, or more daughters. See note 7, page 433.

* Our author styles him Malik and Sultan indiscriminately.

* Firishtah has یک (yak), a whip; but all the copies of our author's
text have یک The Tabakat-i-Akbar too says: "he took up a gagglet
and struck him over the head with it," &c. A whipping was not likely to
cause death, but the other mode of chastisement was.

* Here again is a specimen of the manner in which Firishtah has been
translated, and whose translated work hitherto has furnished the sole materials
for writers of Indian Histories for our Colleges and Schools:

Dow says that "Mahomed, in his last expedition, favoured Eldoze so
Sultan-i-Ghazi attained martyrdom, it was the desire and disposition of the Turk Maliks and Amir that Sultan Ghiyāş-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd, son of [Ghiyāş-ud-Dīn] Muḥammad, son of Sām, should come from the confines of Garmsīr to Ghaznīn, and ascend his uncle's throne, and that they all should gird up their loins in his service. To this effect they wrote to the Court of Fīrūz-kōh, and represented, saying: "The Sulṭāns of Bāmiān are acting oppressively, and are ambitious of obtaining possession of Ghaznīn. Thou art the heir to the dominion, and we are thy slaves." much that he bestowed upon him the black standard of the kingdom of Ghiznī, by this intimating his will, that he should succeed to the throne," &c. BRIGGS has "Mahomed Ghooory, in his last expedition to India, conferred on Taj-ood-Deen the privilege of carrying the black standard of Ghizny, an honour which was usually confined to the heir-apparent." Any one reading this last version could only conclude that Tāj-ud-Dīn carried this "black standard" in the last expedition, but such was not the case. Fireūghtah copies almost the very words of our author: these are his words—"Sultan Muizz-ud-Dīn [he calls him Mu'izz and Shihāb indiscriminately] in the latter part of his reign, when he came into Kārmān, dignified him by presenting him with one of his own dresses, and specially conferred upon him a black banner [for his own use that is], and it was the Sultan's desire that, after his own decease, the Ghaznīn territory should be his."

4 He refers to Bāhā-ud-Dīn, Sām's, sons here.

5 Our author contradicts himself twice, and makes three different statements on this subject. At page 431 he says the general desire, both of the Turk and Ghūrīf Amir, was that Bāhā-ud-Dīn, Sām, of Bāmiān, should succeed to the sovereignty; and at page 432 he contradicts himself, and states that they were all inclined to his sons obtaining it. Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, was the chief of them, and the principal mover in this matter. From this statement of our author, and his accounts given elsewhere, as well as from the statements of other authors, it is clear that Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, up to this time, had not been removed from the government of this province, and therefore did not shut his sovereign and master out of Ghaznīn after his defeat at Andkhūd; and, further, that it was not until he and the other Mamlūks of the late Sultan had called upon his nephew, Ghiyāş-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd, to assume the sovereignty over Ghaznīn and Hind that he, I-yal-dūz, left Kārmān, on being nominated to the sovereignty of the kingdom of Ghaznīn, and receiving his freedom from Māhmūd himself.

Alīf says, however, that, "when Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, gained a firm hold of the authority at Ghaznīn, Ghiyāş-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd, sent him a message from Fīrūz-kōh, requesting him to coin the money in his name, and read the Khūṭbah for him. Tāj-ud-Dīn sent a reply, saying, that, when Māhmūd should send him a deed of manumission, he would do so; otherwise he would give his allegiance to whomsoever he chose. As Māhmūd was not safe from being assailed by Khwārzm Shāh, and fearing lest Tāj-ud-Dīn should go over to him [as 'Iss-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of Khar-Mīl, had done], he sent the required deed of manumission to Tāj-ud-Dīn, and another to Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, together with deeds of investiture for the governments of Ghaznīn and Hindūstān respectively. Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, at this time was at Purahor,
Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, replied, saying: “To me the throne of my father, which is the capital, Fīrūz-koh, and the kingdom of Ghūr, is the most desirable. I confer the territory [of Ghaznīn] on you;” and he despatched a robe of honour to Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and presented him with a letter of manumission, and assigned the throne of Ghaznīn unto him.

By virtue of this mandate Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, came to Ghaznīn, and seized the Maliks of Bāmīān, and ascended the throne of Ghaznīn, and brought that territory under his jurisdiction. After a time he was excluded from Ghaznīn, and again returned to it, and again brought it whither he had come to guard one of the routes into Hind, and was well pleased with what was conferred upon him.”

Other writers state that I-yal-duz sent an agent to Maḥmūd and tendered his allegiance, and confirm what our author states; but they probably copied their account from his.

* Called “Sultāns” in the preceding paragraph, and in his previous account of them. Alīf says I-yal-duz, subsequent to sending Jalāl-ud-Dīn, 'Alīf, back to Bāmīān, as stated in note 7, page 433, assembled his forces, and carried his inroads as far as Bust; and that, when Abī-Dakur [Zakur?] reached Kābul, after his desertion of Jalāl-ud-Dīn, 'Alīf, an emissary reached him on the part of Ḳūf-ud-Dīn, I-bak, which emissary he had first despatched to Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, reproaching him for his conduct towards his benefactor, Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, and exhorting him to discontinue it. This emissary was directed to ask Abī-Dakur to co-operate with him [I-bak]; and, in case I-yal-duz did not hold his hand and repent of his acts, that Abī-Dakur should assemble his troops and assail Ghaznīn, and wrest it from I-yal-duz, who appears to have been then absent in Bust; and, in case he [Abī-Dakur] did not find himself powerful enough for the purpose of taking it, not to be deterred, as he was following to support him. Abī-Dakur complied with the request, and invested Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, the Wazīr, whom I-yal-duz had left there as his lieutenant, and a portion of the suburbs of Ghaznīn was taken and occupied by his men. On becoming aware of this movement, I-yal-duz returned from Bust by forced marches, and reached Ghaznīn, on which Abī- Dakur precipitately withdrew, and joined Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, who gave him his manumission, and conferred upon him the title of Malik-ul-Umrā [Chief of Nobles].

At this time Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, advanced from Hirāt [on his way to Hirāt?], and took the town and fortress of Tāl-ḵān from the Ghūrs, and then marched to Kāl-yūsh [Kāl-yūn?] and Fīwār, and encountered several times Amīr Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, the governor of those parts, for Maḥmūd; but he did not succeed in his design, as they were very strong places, and Sultān Muḥammad retired to Hirāt again. Arrived there, he acquainted the ruler of Sijistān of it, and Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḫarab acknowledged his suzerainty, and read the Khwābah and coined money in Khwārazm Shāh’s name. These are the events of the year 594 from the Prophet’s death [604 H.]. The difference between the two eras H. and RIḤLAT is ten years less twenty or twenty-one days.
under his sway. A second time the same thing happened, until, after some time, a battle took place between him and Sultān Kūtb-ud-Din, I-bak, on the confines of the Panj-āb; and Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, was defeated, and Sultān Kūtb-ud-Din advanced to Ghaznīn, and remained there for a period of forty days, during which time he gave himself up to pleasure and revelry. A third time Sultān Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, marched from Kārmān towards Ghaznīn, and Sultān Kūtb-ud-Din, I-bak, retired again towards Hindūstān by the route of Sang-i-Surākh, and once more Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, brought Ghaznīn under his rule.

He sent armies upon several occasions towards Ghūr, Khurāsān, and Sijistān, and nominated Malikis [to command them]. On one occasion he despatched a force to aid Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din, Maḥmūd, as far as the gates of Hirāt, on account of the treason of 'Izz-ud-Din, Ḥusain, son of Khar-μil, who was the Malik of Hirāt, and who had conspired with Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and had gone over to him, and who fled before the forces of Ghūr and Ghaznīn.

On another occasion Sultān Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, led an army towards Sijistān, and remained away on that expedition for a considerable time, and advanced as far as

7 Some copies have "on the confines of the Panj-āb-i-Sind"—the five rivers of Sind.

8 "I-yal-duz having sent the Wazīr of Ghaznīn against Kābā-jah and ousted him from Lāhor [see reign of Kābā-jah, next Section], Kūtb-ud-Din, Ḥ-bak, advanced into the Panj-āb against I-yal-duz in 603 H., and, I-yal-duz having encountered him, was defeated, and retreated to Kārmān and Shalūzān, which districts had been his charge in Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's reign. Kūtb-ud-Dīn, Ḥ-bak, pushed on to Ghaznīn [by another route], and drove out the governor, on the part of Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh's son, and then gave himself up to wine and debauchery. The people of Ghaznīn sent to I-yal-duz and solicited him to return; and, when he arrived in the neighbourhood, at the head of a numerous force, Kūtb-ud-Dīn, Ḥ-bak, was quite unprepared to resist him, and he made the best of his way towards Hind by the route of Sang-i-Sūrākh, and reached Lohor." On this occasion 'Izz-ud-Dīn, 'Alī-Mardān, the Khalji, who assassinated Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yr, ruler of Lakhanaust, and afterwards obtained from Kūtb-ud-Dīn, Ḥ-bak, the government of that territory, was taken prisoner. See his reign, next Section. "As Kūtb-ud-Dīn did not consider himself safe from the designs of I-yal-duz, he continued at Lohor until 607 H., when he met with the accident which caused his death."

9 On the death of Kūtb-ud-Dīn, and dethronement of Arām Shāh, his adopted son, Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, sent a canopy of state and other insignia of royalty to Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīgh. See his reign, Section XXI.

1 See note 8, page 257; and note 9, page 400.
the gates of the city of Sistān. At length peace was concluded between him and Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab, who was the king of Sijistān. When Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, set out on his return [to Ghaznīn], on his way thither, Malik Naṣīr²-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, the Amir-i-Shikār [Chief Huntsman] showed disaffection towards him, and engagements took place between them. Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn was overthrown, and retired towards Khwārazm [the Khwārazm territory?], and after a time returned, until, on the expedition [of Tāj-ud-Dīn] into Hindūstān⁴, the Turkish Maliks and Amirs of

² Other authors do not mention any cause why I-yal-duz should have marched against Sistān, and do not give any details respecting this affair. It may have been caused through the ruler of Sijistān proposing to acknowledge the suzerainty of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh; but our author does not say a word about any expedition of this kind in his account of the rulers of Sijistān.

Here, again, is a specimen of history-writing. Dow says: "Eldoos, in conjunction with the Emperor Mamood of Ghor, sent an army to Hirat, which they conquered, as also a great part of Seistan; but, making a peace with the prince of that country, they returned." Then BRIGGS says: "At length, in conjunction with the King, Mahmood of Ghoor, he (Yeldoos) sent an army to Herat, which he reduced, as also great part of Seestan," &c. Firīṣṭah, however, says: "Once, to support Sultān Maḥmūd; he despatched an army against Hirat, and overcame the Malik of Hirat, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain-i-Khar-mfī. On another occasion he marched an army against Sistān, and invested it, and [then] made a peace with the Malik of Sistān, and returned." Firīṣṭah, however, is no authority whatever for Western affairs; and as to overcoming 'Izz-ud-Dīn, son of Ḥusain-i-Khar-mfī, see last para. to note 3, page 258. For further details respecting the reign of I-yal-duz not mentioned here, see pages 417 and 420.

³ Naṣīr-ud-Dīn in two copies, and Naṣr in another. He held the office of Chief Huntsman under the late Sultān.

⁴ Among the events of the year Rīḍāt 603, according to Alīf [Ḥijrah 613], Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, acquired possession of Ghaznīn. After that monarch had possessed himself of the territory of Bāmfān and Khurāsān from the Ghūrān nobles, he despatched an agent to Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, intimating that if he, Tāj-ud-Dīn, would acknowledge his suzerainty, and stamp the coin with his name, and pay him a yearly tribute, he should be left in quiet possession of Ghaznīn; otherwise he must be prepared to see his troops speedily appear before it. Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, called a council of his Amirs; and Kutlāgh Tigīn, his Amir-ul-Umrā [Jāmi'-ut-Tawārkīh says his Nāyab or Lieutenant at Ghaznīn], who was another of the late Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's slaves, advised that the Sultān's demands should be acceded to, as it was impossible for them to resist Khwārazm Shāh. Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, complied, and despatched befitting offerings and presents, and accepted the Sultān's terms.

Not long after these events, Tāj-ud-Dīn went out on a hunting excursion, and Kutlāgh Tigīn sent information to the Sultān [who was then on the northern frontier of I-yal-duz's territory], saying, that Ghaznīn was now freed from Tāj-ud-Dīn's presence, and urged him to come thither that he might deliver up the place to him. Khwārazm Shāh acceded to the request, and
Ghaznīn conspired together and put to death the Khwājah, Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad-i-'Abd-ullah, Sanjarī, who held the office of Wazīr, and likewise Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, the Amīr-i-Shikār.

After a period of forty days Sūltān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, marched an army from the side of Tukhāristān, and advanced towards Ghaznīn; and his troops suddenly and unexpectedly seized the frontier route leading into Hindūstān, towards Gardaiz and the Karāhah. Darah [Pass]. Sūltān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, took the route towards Hindūstān, by way of Sang-i-Surākh, and reached Lohor. An engagement took place between him [Sūltān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz] and the august Sūltān Shāms-ud-Dīn, I yal-timish, in the vicinity of Tarā’in, and Sūltān obtained possession of Ghaznīn; and Tāj-ud-Dīn, finding what had happened [Tāj-ul-Ma’āsir says in 612 H.], retired towards Hind. The Jāmi’ut-Tawārīkh states that this took place in 611 H., and that all the dominions of the Ghūrīs fell under his sway.

Sūltān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, having obtained possession of Ghaznīn, as above related, Tāj-ud-Dīn, I yal-duz, continued his retreat towards Hind. On reaching the neighbourhood of Lāhor, he fought a battle with Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah, who was governor of that province on the part of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, defeated him, took possession of Lāhor for himself, and soon appropriated the whole of the Panjāb. [See the account of Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah, page 532.]

Khwārazm Shāh, according to the statement of Asīf, on taking possession of Ghaznīn, put to death all the Ghūrīs nobles and chiefs [which is very improbable], made over the city and territory to his son, Jalāl-ud-Dīn [he nominated him to the rulership of those parts, but left an officer there as his son’s deputy], and returned to Khwārazm.

In some copies Karāsah [كاراس], but the best have kārās as above. It is one of the Passes on the route from Ghaznīn towards Lāhor, the name of which has been changed with the change in the inhabitants of those parts.

There are three or four places so called, signifying the “Perforated Stone.” The route here seems to refer to a more southerly route than that by the Pass above mentioned. It is a totally different route to that mentioned at page 441.

Four good copies, two of which are old ones, write this name here, and in some other places, with two ts—I yal-timish, and some other writers do the same.

The engagement between Sūltān Tāj-ud-Dīn, I yal-duz, and this “august Sūltān”—the slave of the slave, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, his own son-in-law—took place, by some accounts, on Saturday, the 20th of Shawwāl, 611 H., and, according to others, on Monday, the 3rd of Shawwāl, 612 H., at Tarā’in, now Tālāwarī, near Pānīpāt, in the neighbourhood of which the fate of India has so often been decided. Tāj-ud-Dīn was put to death soon after, in the citadel of Budātin, by his rival, I yal-timish, on whom he had himself conferred the insignia of royalty after I yal-timish’s usurpation of the sovereignty
Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, was [defeated and] taken prisoner, and sent to the district of Budā'ūn; and there he was martyred, and there his mausoleum is situated, and has become a place of pilgrimage, and is visited by suppliants. His reign extended over a period of nine years. The Almighty's mercy be upon him! God alone is immortal and eternal!

V. SULTĀN-UL-KARĪM [THE BENEFICENT], KUṬB-UD-DĪN, I-BAK, AL-MU'IZZĪ US-SULTĀNĪ.

The beneficent and just Sultan, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, who was a second Ḫātim, seized the throne of Ghaznīn, and took it out of the hands of Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, who was his father-in-law. He occupied the throne for a period of forty days, and, during this space of time, he was wholly engaged in revelry, and in bestowing largess; and the affairs of the country through this constant festivity were neglected. The Turks of Ghaznīn, and the Malikis of the Mu'izzī [dynasty], wrote letters secretly to Sultan Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and entreated him to return. Sultan Tāj-ud-Dīn determined to march thither from Karīmān, and, as the distance was short, he reached Ghaznīn unexpectedly. Sultan Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, when he became aware of this, retired from Ghaznīn towards Hindūstān again, by the way of Sang-i-Surākh; and, as both of them, in the position of father-in-law and son-in-law, were in the relation of father and son, they did not cause any injury to be done to each other. Subsequently to that, the territory of Ghaznīn came into the possession of Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and under the authority of the Khwārazmī Malik, as has been previously recorded.

This Section, on the Shahsābānis and their Slaves, is of Dihlī, and dethronement of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's son [according to our author, but his adopted son, according to others], and putting him to death.

* A very stable government, certainly—forty days! Our author has made Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, one of the Sultāns of Ghaznīn, as though he wanted to make up the number as much as possible, and he is introduced here without any cause whatever. Tāj-ud-Dīn, ʿI-yal-duz, took Lāhor, and ousted its governor, and held it a much longer time, and he, under the same system, should have been entered among the Sultāns of Hindūstān.
concluded; and, after this, I come to the Section on the Sultans of Hindustan, the first of whom to be mentioned is Sultan Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, and his illustrious actions¹, which, please God, will be recorded as fully as the limits of this book will permit.

¹ The more modern copies of the text differ here somewhat.