SECTION XVII.

THE SHANSABĀNĪAH SULTĀNS, AND THE MALIKS OF GHŪR.

MINHĀJ-I-SARĀJ, Jūrjānī, the servant hopeful of the Divine mercy—the Almighty guard him from negligence and inadvertency!—says, with respect to this account of the Shansabānīah Malikṣ of Ghūr, after this manner:—That the following pages are illumined with the sun of the illustrious race of the Sultāns of Ghūr, together with that of the offset of the fragrant tree of the Malikṣ of Ghūr—may the Almighty God render their dust fragrant, and assign to them a habitation in Paradise!—in the manner of a record, from the dawn of the morning of their dominion, and the noon-day splendour of their sovereignty, together with the genealogy of their family, until the expiration of the empire of that princely house, and the last of the Malikṣ of that kingly dynasty—the mercy of the Almighty be upon those among them who have passed away¹!—in such wise as masters have, in histories, made mention of them, in order that the robe of this chronicle may be adorned with an account of them, and also, in order that this [their] servant, and his priestly family, may acquit themselves of some portion of the debt of gratitude for benefits received, due unto those Sultāns—the light of the Almighty illumine their tombs!—and, in order that such as may inspect these pages may, please God, derive profit and instruction.

Be it known, that that master of eloquence, Maulānā Fākhr-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, of Marw-ar-rūd—the light of the Almighty illumine his tomb!—has strung the genealogical pearls of the Sultāns of this dynasty on the thread of poetry, and, having arranged those pearls in perfect

¹ When this flourish was penned they had ceased to hold any territory for nearly half a century.
order, has affixed the head pearl of that string to the oyster-shell of the illustrious dynasty of Zuḥāk, the Tāzī; and, from the time of those Sulṭāns up to the first commencement of the sovereignty of Zuḥāk, he has mentioned the whole of them, father by father.

This book² their servant, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, inspected in the year 602 Ḥ., before the exalted throne in the sacred haram [private dwelling] of that lady, the Princess of the Universe, and the most excellent of her day and of the age, the glory of the world and of the faith, the sovereign of all good qualities among the race of mankind, Māh Malik, daughter of the august Sulṭān, Ghiyās-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Din, Ābī-ul-Faṭḥ, Muḥammad, son of Sām, Ḍasim-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn—may the light of the Almighty illumine them! This Queen of the Universe used to bestow her fostering care and protection upon this frail creature [Minhāj-i-Sarāj], and, in her own princely hall, as though he had been a child of her own, he was brought up; and, in his younger years, he used, day and night, to dwell within her haram, and, under her blessed sight, he used to receive instruction.

That princess was possessed of many virtues and endowments. First: she departed from this transitory sphere, and passed to the eternal mansion, within the veil of maidenhood. Second: she knew the whole of God's word [the Kurʾān] by heart. Third: she was a depository of all the traditions of martyrdom. Fourth: she used, once a year, to devote a certain period to religious exercises, and would repeat the whole Kurʾān in two genuflexions of prayer. Fifth: when her father, Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sām, went to the mercy of the Almighty, for a period of seven years the light of the sun and of day never shone upon her, and she continued in constant and solitary prayer. The mercy of the Almighty be upon her, and may her happiness and her reward be ample in heaven!

In short, that master of eloquence, Maulānā Fakhr-ud-Din, Mubārak Shāh, has composed that genealogical list in verse, in the name of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Din, Ḫusain, Jahān-soz; and, at the outset, I heard from the sacred lips of that

² One historian quotes a portion of Fakhr-ud-Din's work, but it is too long for insertion here. He was a Saiyid, hence he is styled Shāh.
most excellent of her time, and Khadijah of the age, the Malika-i-Jalâli, that, when some portion of the book and chronicle in question had been composed in verse, through a change which had showed itself in the temperament of Fâkhr-ud-Din, Mubârak Shâh, this poem was neglected by him until the time when the throne of the kingdom became adorned and beautified with the majesty and august splendour of Sulṭân Ghiyâs-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sâm, when this chronicle became graced with his name and titles, and was brought to completion.

The Chronicler relates after this manner:—The Almighty knoweth the truth!—that this dynasty are called Shansabâniân with reference to their paternal ancestor [Shansab by name], who, after the removal of the sons of Zuḥâk, grew up in the country of Ghûr, and attained great authority, power, and superiority, and acquired a name. The great probability is, that this personage lived in the time of the Khilâfât of the Lord of the Faithful, 'Alî—may God reward him!—and that he received conversion to the faith at the hand of 'Alî himself, and that he took, from that Khalîfah, a mandate and a standard; and to every one of that family, who used to sit upon the throne, that covenant which the Lord of the Faithful, 'Alî, had written, used to be presented to him, and he would agree to abide by it, after which he would become [legally] king. The family likewise were among the clients of the Khalîfah 'Alî; and affection towards the High Priests of the family of the Chosen One used to be a firm tenet in their creed.

ACCOUNT OF THE FIRST [ANCESTORS] OF THE FAMILY, THEIR GENEALOGY, AND THEIR PROGENITORS, UP TO ZUḤĀK, SURNAMED TĀZĪ.

Zuḥâk has been mentioned in the section on the ancient kings of Irân; and the duration of his reign was a thousand years less one day and a half.

8 Muḥammad's first wife.
4 The same lady he previously referred to under the name of Mâh-Malik.
6 One of the oldest MSS. has Mu'izz-ud-Dîn, the younger of the two brothers.
6 Jahân-Ârâ, and some other histories distinctly state that Shansab, son of Kharnâk, was contemporary with the Khalîfah 'Alî, and that he was converted to the Muḥammadan faith by him. Compare our author's statement above with that at page 312.
The learned in chronology differ considerably with respect to his ancestry and his forefathers, from Mihtar Adam down to Mihtar Nūḥ, on account of the great lapse of time. The fraternity, who account Zuḥāk among the descendants of Sām, son of Mihtar Nūḥ, relate as follows:—Zuḥāk, son of 'Anwān ['Ulwān], son of 'Amlāk ['Amlāt and 'Alāḳ], son of 'Ād, son of 'Āṣ ['Awaṣ and 'Awaq], son of Iram, son of Sām, son of Nūḥ, son of Lamak; while others again have related that his [Zuḥāk’s] name was Biwar-āsp, son of Ārwand-āsp, son of Tūḥ, or Tawah [Tarih], son of Kābah [Kāyah ?], son of Nūḥ.

Some, on the other hand, have stated:—Biwar-āsp, or Biwar-asp, son of Ārwand-āsp, son of Zankabā [Ranbakā], son of Tāzi-o-barsed [Tāzi-o-barsid, Tāzi-o-barghed, Tāzi-

The Muḥammadan historians are at variance respecting the descent of Zuḥāk. Our author, in his account of him in Section V., says he was called Biwar-āsp, and that God sent Nūḥ to him to exhort him to repent of his misdeeds, and that Nūḥ continued for ages to do so. He would not repent, and the Flood followed. Our author then copies Tabarī [tolerably correct], and says that that author [the most trustworthy perhaps of any] states that Biwar-āsp lived before the Flood, in which he perished; and, one thousand years after the death of Nūḥ [compare with his statement here and at page 312], a king arose of the seed of Sām, son of Nūḥ, named Zuḥāk, who was a sorcerer.

Immediately after quoting Tabarī, our author again says that Pešk-dād, son of Hoḥāng, had a son, Tāzi-o by name, who is the father of all the 'Arabs. He had a son Zankabā, who had a son Ārwand-āsp, who was father of Zuḥāk. The Tārīḵ-i-Muḵaddas, there quoted by him, says Zuḥāk’s name is Biwar-āsp, son of Ārwand-āsp, son of Tārah, son of Kāyah, son of Nūḥ.

The Jami‘-ut-Tawarīḵ, Tārīḵ-i-Ībrahīm, and some others, say the 'Ajamīs call Zuḥāk, Biwar-āsp, and that the Patriarch Ībrahīm lived during his reign; but further state that great discrepancy exists among authors as to his descent. The 'Arabs say he was brother’s son of Shadād-i-Ād, and trace his descent to Ibrahim, son of Sām, brother of Arfakhshād, while the Ikānīs say his name is Ārwand-āsp, son of Rǐṅkāwar [Zankabā ?], son of Sāhīrah, son of Tūjī, son of Farāwal, and that Tūjī was Hoḥāng’s brother. Guzādah and others trace his descent from Jamāḥed, and say he was his sister’s son; but the greater number of chroniclers agree that he was sixth in descent from Kāimūr, also written Kaimūr. The people of Yaman, again, say Zuḥāk was of Yaman, of the tribe of Tūḥa‘ [the royal tribe of Arabia Felix, of whom Balkhi, Queen of Sheba [Salā], was one], and that he was the first of the Fire-aways of Misr.

It will be well to mention here that the first name given in the following pages is the one considered most trustworthy from comparison, and in which the greater number and best copies of the text agree; and that those within brackets are less so according to position.

Alwand-āsp and Ārwand-āsp are also the names of the father of Luḥr-āsp, also called Ārwand Shāh.
narsad, Tābūr, Tāzbū, and Tāzbūr], son of Farāwwal [Farāwawal, Kārāwawal?], son of Stā-mak, son of Mubshī [Mushbī], son of Kaīū-murs, son of Ādam—peace be unto him!—while others again say:—Kaīū-murs, son of Lāwad, son of Sām, son of Nūḥ.

The writers of chronicles [other than those above?] relate after this manner, that Ārwand-āsp was the father of Zuḥāk1, and son of the son of Tāzīo-barsed [Tāzīo, Tāzbū, and Tāzībūr]; and, with the concurrence of historians, Tāzīo-barsed, likewise, was the father of all the 'Arabs, and brother of Hoshang Malik2; and the 'Arabs are called Tāzi3 through affinity to him. He held dominion and sovereignty over the nomad tribes of 'Arabs, as did his descendants after him. From him the authority passed to his son, Zanbakā [Zankabā?], and from him to the latter's son, Ārwand-āsp [Ārwan-āsp], who was a just, wise, and God-fearing man. He had a son, Zuḥāk by name, who was exceedingly malicious and factious, a blood-shedder, and a great tyrant, and a cruel man, whom Shaitān [Satan] had led astray from the right way4. He dug a well in the

1 According to Tabarî he [Zuḥāk] was a descendant of Ḥām, son of Nūḥ, and after the Flood there was no king upon the earth for a thousand years, until Zuḥāk, the sorcerer, arose; but there are different accounts of him, and great discrepancies exist among authors concerning him. There are the remains of an immense fortress near Bamfān, still known as the castle of Zuḥāk-i-Mārān, or Zuḥāk of the Snakes.

2 Hoshang is considered the fourth in descent from Ādam, and was the son of Stā-mak, who was son of Kaīūmurt. Some consider him to be Arfakhshād, son of Sām, who composed the Jāwīdān-Khirad. He is said to have founded Istakhur—Istakhur is the 'Arab form of writing it—of Fārs, Bābal, and Sūs.

3 Called also Tājī by 'Ajamīs, and hence the name Tājī [t added to 'Ajamī names forms a diminutive], by which the descendants of 'Arabs were styled who were born in and had grown up in 'Ajam. At present the term is used with respect to Persian-speaking people who are neither Turks nor 'Arabs, and of which race the inhabitants generally of towns and cities in Afghānistān, and several districts likewise under Afghān sway, and also of several independent states to the north, consist. The Afghāns often style them “Tājī-Majīk.” Numbers of 'Arab tribes, or parts of tribes settled in different parts of 'Ajam, after its conquest by the first Musalmān invaders, and several tribes dwelling among the Afghāns, and often confounded with them, claim 'Arab descent. In my proposed history of the Afghān tribes, I shall be able to enter into more detail on this subject. Modern philosophers, however, are, as a matter of course, divided in opinion about the derivation of the name, and also as to the descent of the people; but why should we begrudge them the infinite pleasure of still speculating upon the matter, and trying to make every other account fit that of certain Greeks? See page 309.

A few copies have “from the right way, so that he dug a well,” &c.
path which his father was wont to pass, and Arwandāsp, who had become old and infirm, fell into it, and was killed.

Zuḥāk now became sovereign over the 'Arabs, and, after Jamshed [Jamshed's time?] conquered the whole world, and by sorcery and tyranny brought the whole of it under his sway. The author of the Tārīkh-i-Muḵaddasī states, that Zuḥāk possessed a cylinder, made of gold, in which were seven apertures, each of which was named after one of the seven climes of the four quarters of the earth. When the inhabitants of either of these climates happened to rebel against his authority, he would raise incantations in the aperture named after such climate, and breathe into it, and famine, pestilence, and calamity would arise in it.

After a thousand years of his sovereignty passed away, Almighty God was pleased to release the world from his tyranny and oppression, and the kingdom came to Faridūn. He seized Zuḥāk, and confined him in a pit on mount Dimāwand, in 'Irāk.

ACCOUNT OF BUSṬĀM, MALIK OF HIND AND OF SIND.

This Busṭām Malik held the dominion of Hindūstān at the hand of Zuḥāk, and he was one of Zuḥāk's descendants,

4 According to trustworthy authorities, this Bīwar-āsp became styled Zuḥāk, from the old Persian words ʿu ʿa daḥ-āk, signifying "ten vices and defects:" and the 'Arabs, in copying the name, used خ for ظ or ژ and transformed it into چ by changing the ژ also into چ. With this change of letters, the original meaning of the word became changed, for چ [Zuḥāk] signifies "a mocker," "laughing."

His vices and defects were hideousness, dwarfishness, excessive arrogance and pride, shamelessness, audacity, gluttony and voracity, a foul tongue, recklessness, lying, injustice, ferocity and tyranny, depravity of heart, and stolidity. These are rather more than ten however. Rauṣat-ṣaḥla says Bīwar is from the Pahlavī, and in Darī means ten thousand; and, therefore, Daḥ-āk received the name of Bīwar-āsp because he had always ten thousand 'Arab horses in his stables.

5 Tabarī says his age was a thousand years, while other writers state that he reigned for that period of time.

6 Nine copies of the text have "Malik of Hind and of Sind," and others have "Hind and Ghūr." In the map, if such may be so called, accompanying the account of Sijistān and adjacent parts, in the "Masālik-wa-Mamālik," the river of Hind and Sind adjoins Ghūr on the north-east.

7 Sic in all copies of the text.
namely:—Busţām, son of Mişhād [Mişhād, Mamşād, Shamād, Shād, Shīhād, and Shīhādan], son of Narīmān [also called Nadīmān], son of Afrīdūn [or Farīdūn], son of Šāhind [Sāmind and Sāmid], son of Sifand-āsp [or Isfand-āsp], son of Zuḥāk, son of Suhrāb, son of Shābard-āsp, son of Sīā-mak, son of Marnīās [Marsās and Marnās], son of Zuḥāk the Malik.

When Zuḥāk was made captive, Afrīdūn despatched an army to take possession of Hindūstān; and Busţām, who did not possess the power to oppose the forces of Afrīdūn, retired towards the mountain tracts of Shākhrān [Shaghānān] and Bāmīān, and therein took up his residence. On a second occasion the forces of Afrīdūn were directed to proceed in search of him; and Busţām had several times, for the purpose of hunting and in his rambles, come from the mountains of Shākhrān and Tūkhāristān into the mountain tracts of Ghūr. That district was called Hazār-Chashmāh [the thousand springs] on account of the number of rivulets in it; and Busţām, at this time, retiring before the army of Afrīdūn, came into Ghūr, and at the foot of the mountain of Zār-i-Margh [the place where Margh grows] he fixed his residence.

Other writers say that Busţām was one of the descendants, not sons, of Zuḥāk, and that his progeny increased in Ghūr up to the time of Shansāb, who was contemporary with the Khalīsh, 'Abb. Shansāb was the son of Kharēsh, and from him descended Busţām, as well as Fūlād. See page 311.

1 Jahān-Ārā has Shāhrān.
2 The letters ʃ and gh are interchangeable. A few copies have ʃanā for ʃanā.
3 Not Hwēn Thsang's "Tōkhāristān," extending "ten days' journey by thirty," but a much smaller Tōkhāristān is meant here.
4 Zār signifies a place of growth, and "margh" is the name of a species of verdure called also faren, which any browsing animals feed on with great avidity. It is odoriferous, the reed scormanthemum.

Other authorities state that when Farīdūn overcame Zuḥāk, a number of his descendants fled, and took shelter in the mountains of Ghūr; and that Busţām, who was one of his progeny, and who held Hindūstān, being unable to cope with the forces of Farīdūn, he [Busţām] also took shelter in Ghūr. The place he took up his residence at was, from the number of its springs and rivulets, called Hazār-Chashmāh, and was an exceedingly pleasant and strong spot, and therefore he chose it, saying to himself "baro; ma-andēsh!"—"Go to; don't be concerned!" and that spot was subsequently called Mandēsh. Busţām prospered there, and his descendants multiplied, and they were rulers, one generation after the other. Other writers say he first fled for shelter "to the mountain tracts of Bāmīān, which lie between Balkh and Kābul, and from thence entered the difficult country of Ghūr, in which he founded several strong fortresses. He had wandered about in several parts previously before reaching
At this point in the account of Busṭām, the masters of history have two traditions, one of which is that just related. The other tradition is from the Muntakhab-i-Tārikh-i-Nāṣīrī, which one of the great men of Ghaznīn composed in the time of the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzi, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām—the Almighty illumine his tomb!—which is as follows:—

“When Afrīdūn overcame Zuḥāk, and took the dominion from him, two brothers, his sons, reached Nīhāwand. The elder brother bore the name of Sūz⁶, and the younger was called Sām. The elder brother, Sūz, became Amīr [chief or ruler], and the younger, who was named Sām, became the Sipah-sālār [leader or commander of his forces]⁷.

“Amīr Sūz had a daughter, and the Sipah-sālār, Sām, a son; and these two cousins had, in early childhood, been betrothed to each other, and they had fixed their hearts upon each other. The Sipah-sālār, Sām, died; and his son had become valiant and a great warrior, so much so, that in that day he had no equal in manliness and valour. After the decease of his father, certain envious and malicious persons arose, who slandered him to his uncle, Amīr Sūz, in consequence of which his uncle became irritated against him, and he determined to bestow his daughter upon the son of some one of the Malikās of the parts round about.

“When his daughter became aware of this, she made her cousin acquainted with it, so that, one night, he came and unfastened the gate of the fortress, and, having loosed and brought out ten chosen horses⁸ from the stables of Amīr Gḥūr; and, as soon as Afrīdūn became aware of his whereabouts, he despatched large forces against him; but, after protracted hostilities, the forces of Afrīdūn were glad to accept terms, on account of the difficult nature of the country, and the strength of Busṭām’s castles. Tribute and taxes were imposed upon him [Busṭām], and he had to content himself with Gḥūr, and not to molest other parts of the country. His descendants increased and multiplied up to the time of Shānsāb, who is said to have been converted by 'Ali. The Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh states that the Gḥūrs are styled Banī Rāsib, otherwise famous under the name of Ug-Zubāk.

⁶ Some copies have Sūr, but the oldest have as above. One has Sawār!  
⁷ Such being the case, wherefore any cause of dispute afterwards, and appeal to the Khaṇīfah, as to who should be ruler and who commander of the troops? See page 313.  
⁸ Two copies of the text, which are reliable, have “ten chosen horses of his father, from the stables of Amīr Sūz.”
Süz, he set the damsel and her servants upon them and made off, taking away as much coin as he was able to remove. With all diligence possible he made for the foot of the mountains of Ghûr, and there he took up his quarters. The girl and her cousin said [to each other], ‘Za-o [i. e. Az-o] ma-andexh’—be not afraid of him—and the name of that place became Mandesh⁹; and there their affairs assumed stability¹.”

According to the first tradition, however, when Amîr Buştâm, with his followers, took up his residence in that locality, information was conveyed to Afridûn. He was desirous of sending forces, for the third time, for the purpose of destroying and exterminating Buştâm and his followers, or to take him [alive] if possible. The sons of Afridûn, Tûjz and Salm, by means of treachery, killed their brother, İ-raj, who was on the throne of Irân³; and,

⁹ “Lamandesh” in most copies of the text, but impossible from what he has just stated. Some copies are very different here, in style as well as words, and have, “They said that the name of that place was Dî-mandesh, and at this time, on account of that great personage’s coming thereto, the name became Bulandesh.” The I. O. L. MS., and R. A. S. MS., both agree that the name was “Rox-mandesh, and the name became Bulandesh,” but omit the first clause of the last sentence. Mandesh is mentioned by some old writers as the name of a stronghold in Khurâsân. Desh must not be confounded with the Sanskrit word Des—a country, &c. See note ⁴, page 306.

¹ i. e. There they settled down permanently.

³ In his account of Faridûn in Section V., our author says İ-raj, the youngest son, held the countries of Irâk-i-'Aram, and Irâk-i-'Ajam, and Hindus and Sind. Salm signifies peace, Tûj [also Tûj], boldness, daring, and İ-raj, wisdom with tact. The Rausat-uş-Ťahirîn states that he held Khurâsân, and only a portion of Hind and Sind.

The Rausat-uş-Şafâ and some others say that a sept of the descendants of Zuhâk, not the sons of Zuhâk, finally took up their residence in the mountain tracts of Ghûr, and that they were hard pressed for some time by the forces of Faridûn, and became as desirous of accommodation as Faridûn’s general was of granting it; and the Zuhâkîs agreed to pay taxes and tribute, and not to encroach on other territory. See note ⁴, page 306-7.

In the account of the ancient kings of Asia, contained in the Rausat-uş-Ťahirîn, taken from the work compiled from ancient records in the Pahlavi language in 259 H., and which work, subsequently, was partly put into verse by the poet, Daḵistî, in Ismâ’îl Sâmâni’s reign, and afterwards resumed by Anşârif, and completed by Firdausî, in Maḥmûd of Ghazî’s time, but of course greatly embellished by the poets; and also in Taḫarî, and Jami’-uš-Ťawârîkh, there are detailed accounts of the reign of Faridûn; but although the death of İ-raj is given therein, and agrees with what our author says [he doubtless took his short notice from Taḫarî], of course, nothing whatever is mentioned about Buştâm. Karâh-asp, ancestor of Rustam, held Kabul,
on that account, Shâh Afridûn was greatly afflicted in heart, and distressed in mind, and he did not obtain his revenge upon Busṭâm. The latter, having found time and opportunity, turned his attention to peopling and rendering habitable the mountain districts of Ghûr, and parts adjacent.

He despatched trustworthy agents to the presence of Shâh Afridûn, and sought for peace. Afridûn complied with the request of Busṭâm, and, as he had now obtained security and safety, the followers, dependents, and parties, and the 'Arab tribes akin or related to Zuḥâk, from all parts around, turned their faces towards the mountain district of Ghûr, and took up their residence in that country, and the number of those tribes became very great.

As Almighty God had willed that from that race pious kings and potent sovereigns should arise, He prospered and blessed those tribes so that they attained unto the faith and covenant of Islâm; and from the mine of the seed of Zâbul, and Sijistân for Farīdûn, and any petty chief would naturally have been tributary to the former. The nephew of Kargh-asp, Narîmân, had a son named Sâm, who was father of Zâl, father of Rustam. Sâm is said to have held Zâbul, and Kâbul, as far as Hind, in feudal sovereignty from the rulers of Irân. What I wish here to draw attention to, however, is the following: "Zâl, having succeeded to his father's sief, went to Kâbul [Zâbul] from Zaranj [founded by Kargh-asp], and Mîhrâb Shâh, of the race of Zuḥâk, the Tâzî, the tributary ruler, came forth to receive him, and acknowledged his supremacy. Mîhrâb Shâh gave his daughter to Zâl, and she was Rustam's mother." Subsequently, this same Mîhrâb Shâh is said to have led the right wing of the army of Kai-Kubâd, the first of the Kaiânfân dynasty, in the expedition against Afrâsiyâb, the Turk. The Jâmi'-ut-Tawârîkh also states that, when Afrâsiyâb crossed the Jîhûn into Khurâsân, he detached a force to intercept Sâm, or keep him in check; and, when the force reached the Hîrmand, Mîhrâb Shâh, who held the city and fortress of Zâbul, as deputy of Zâl, sent a message, as a ruse only, to its commander, saying, "I am neither Zâbul nor Irân, but of the race of Zuḥâk; and am loyally inclined to Afrâsiyâb." These accounts are, at least, equally as trustworthy as the legends of Greeks about themselves, and perhaps more so. I hope very shortly to give them in detail. I am one of those [weak-minded persons perhaps] who consider the historians of a country best qualified to write its history—its early history at least—and prefer the accounts of ancient Persia, given by the old Irânî and 'Arab writers after the time of its conquest, to those of Greeks who do not even know the names correctly, just as I should esteem the history of England, from the pen of a Hume or a Lingard, superior to one written by a native of India who had sojourned three months in London, or by a Chinaman who had never visited it.

8 One copy has, "and he did not give his mind to taking revenge on Busṭâm."
them the gems of sovereignty were arranged upon the thread of dominion. Some thousands of mosques were founded in place of ancient idol-temples; and the laws and canons of Islām were promulgated to the very extremity of the region of Hindūstān which adjoins that of Chīn—the mercy of the Almighty be upon them! These Sulṭāns likewise acquired slaves, every one of whom spread the carpet of justice upon the surface of the world, and raised palaces of beneficence and munificence; and, up to this present time, the heir of that sovereignty and successor to the functions of that empire, is the pearl of the oyster-shell of ascendency, out of the ocean of dominion, the Great Sulṭān, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Abī-l-Muẓaffar, Maḥmūd, son of the Sulṭān, Kasīm-ī-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn⁴—the Almighty perpetuate his sovereignty and dominion, and may he long reign!

The Sulṭāns of the Shānsabī dynasty have been divided into four groups:—I., that class, the mention of which will now be recorded, of which Sulṭāns Fīrūz-koh was the seat of government; II., the dynasty of the Sulṭāns of Bāmtān, who were a branch from this great tree of sovereignty; III., the dynasty of the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn, which was the capital of Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-ī-Ghāzī, son of Sām, and his own particular slaves, every one of whom, after him, ascended the throne; and IV., the dynasty of the Sulṭāns of Hindūstān, the heritage of which dominion, and the sovereignty of which monarchy passed to them, and after whom the race of Shamsī⁵ became established upon the throne of royalty. May the Almighty purify the tombs of those who have passed away, and prolong the sovereignty of those remaining to the judgment day!

As much as was discoverable respecting this race in chronicles has been recorded [here], although, in the com-

⁴ Some of the best copies of the text have, "son of the Sulṭān of Sulṭāns," and omit the Kasīm altogether. If the Shānsabāf Sulṭāns had any right to assume such a title [explained farther on], neither the slave, nor the slave's son, this "pearl of the oyster-shell of ascendency," the poor puppet to whom our author dedicated his work, had the most remote right to assume it.

⁵ Only a single copy has this passage correct. The slaves here referred to were not relatives nor kinsmen of each other. Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīgh, however, married a daughter of Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, his owner, who ruled in Hindūstān; and the dynasty of the former, from his name, Shams-ud-Dīn, is styled the Shamsī or Shamsfah dynasty.
pilation of it, there was not an uninterrupted succession to be set forth.

I. AMIR PÜLÄD [OR PÜLÄD], GHÜRĪ, SHANSABI.

Amir Pūlād, Ghūrī, was one of the sons of Malik Shansabī, son of Kharnak; and he brought under his jurisdiction the districts of the mountain tracts of Ghūr. He rendered the names of his fathers immortal; and, when the advocate [of the cause] of the house of 'Abbās, Abū-Muslim-i-Marwazi, arose, and considered it expedient to oust and to expel the Amir of the family of 'Ummīyah from the territory of Khürasān, Amir Pūlād led the forces of Ghūr to the aid of Abū-Muslim-i-Marwazi, and greatly distinguished himself in supporting and assisting the house of 'Abbās and the family of the Prophet.

For a long period the dominion over Mandesh, and the authority over the mountain tracts of Ghūr was exercised by him. He died; and his dominions remained in the possession of the sons of his brother, and, subsequently, their affairs [and proceedings] were not to be discovered, up to the time of Amir Banjī, the son of Nahārān.

II. AMIR BANJĪ, SON OF NAHĀRĀN, SHANSABI.

Amir Banjī, son of Nahārān, was a great lord, and, in Ghūr, his memory is undying; and he is accounted among the greatest and most famous of the Maliks of that country.

* At this place, in some copies, a totally distinct idiom is used to express the same sense.

7 See note 9, page 306.

8 Some copies have "came" under his jurisdiction, and others "were" under, &c.

9 It is something new, certainly, to find that "Sāhib-i-Da'wat" means "a founder."

1 That is, a native of Marw.

2 In the accounts of Abū-Muslim, the quondam "founder" of this house of 'Abbās, and in the accounts of those transactions in the history of the Khalifahs, there is no mention, of course, of the great support they received from Pūlād the Ghūrī. Some writers say that the sheif of Ghūr was conferred upon Amir Pūlād and his descendants on account of the services rendered by him, and that he added to it by annexing other tracts of country.

3 All the copies of the text here, with few exceptions, write this name differently as well as incorrectly. There is no doubt that Mandesh is the correct name. See note 8, page 306, and note 9, page 308.

4 Which brother is, of course, nameless.
THE ṬABAḴĀT-I-NAṢIRĪ.

The whole of the Sulṭāns were descended from his sons۴; and his genealogy has been thus made out:—Banji, son of Nahārān, son of War-mesh۶, son of War-meshān, Dar-manshān, War-mashān, and War-heshān, son of Parwez, son of Parwez', son of Shansab, son of Khárnak۸, son of Bain or Bayyin, son of Munshī۹, son of Wazān [Wazn, Wazan, and Warat, or Darrat, or Dirat?], son of Hain [Hin, or Hunain ?], son of Bahram, son of Hájash, or Khájash, [Jahs, or Jabšh ?], son of Ibrāhīm, son of Mu’dāl [Ma’add, or Ma’id], son of Asad [Nāsad ?], son of Shadād, son of Zuhāk.

Amīr Banji was excessively handsome, and of excellent disposition, and endowed with all good qualities and natural gifts. When the dominion of the house of 'Abbās acquired stability ۱, and the empire of Islām came under the sway of the Khalīfahs of that family, he presented himself at the Court of the 'Abbāsī Khalīfahs; and the first person of the Ghūrīān race who proceeded to the Khalīfah's Court, and brought [back] a covenant and a standard, was Amīr Banji, son of Nahārān.

The cause of his proceeding to the presence of the Lord of the Faithful, Hārūn-ar-Rashīd, was this:—In the territory of Ghūr there was a tribe who are called Shīšānīān،

۶ And from him, too, we may suppose.
۸ Jahān Āra has Nahāwān [and Nahadān], son of Wdr-mesh [and Wbr-mesh], son of War-manshān; and Muntakhab-ut-Tawārkā has Nahāwān, son of War-mesh, son of War-mashān. Firāstah [Muḥammad Ḵāsim, not “Briggs,” who turns Shansābī into Shisty!], to judge from three or four copies of the text, has made a terrible hash of these names; and, of course, Dow scarcely ventures to meddle with them, but those he does interfere with he succeeds, as with others in every place in his volumes, in making so ridiculous that their own mothers could not distinguish them. But what can be expected of a translator who does not appear to have known what مورخ [mu’arrikhān, signifying “annalists, historians”] meant, which he, in his innocence, styles “Mor Chan, the historian” [vol. i. p. 131], and yet his work is the great cabbage-garden for modern historians of India for the million!

۷ One copy alone of the text has “Parwez, son of Parwez,” but it is one of the best copies I have.

۹ Respecting this name there is not the least doubt: “Ḫarnak” is not correct.
۰ Another name for Ḫumar [Mercury] is Munshī.
۱ Hārūn-ar-Rashīd, to whose court Amīr Banjī went, was the fifteenth 'Abbāsī Khalīfah.

See page 302, where Shansab is said to have been converted by the Khalīfah, 'Ali, and to have brought back with him a covenant and a standard.

That is to say, the name of the tribe was Shīs, and, when speaking of its people, Shīsān or Shīšānīān.
and they assert that, in the first place, their ancestor embraced the true faith, and then the Shansabānīān did; and Mūḥammad, in the dialect of Ghūr, they call Ḥamad [Aḥmad?], and, after they had embraced Islām, they became styled Ḥamadī [Aḥmadī], that is to say, Mūḥammadī⁴. In the time of Amir Banjī, the Mihtar [chief] of the tribe of Shiṣānīān was an Amir named Shiṣ, son of Bahrām; and, in the language of the Ghūrīs, Shiṣ they call Shiṣ⁵, and this tribe they call Shiṣānīān, after the name of this Amir. Now between Amir Shiṣ and Amir Banjī, son of Nahārān, dissension arose about the lordship of Ghūr; and [in consequence] disturbance ensued among the people of that territory. The whole agreed together, on either side, that both the Amirs, Banjī and Shiṣ, should proceed to the presence of the Khalīfah, and whichever should bring back from the Court of the Khilāfah a covenant and a standard should be accounted Amir. Both disputants made their arrangements with the determination of undertaking their journey, and setting out towards the Dār-ul-Khilāfah. The throne of the Khilāfah, at this time, was adorned by the radiance of the Lord of the Faithful, Hārūn-ar-Raḥīm.

The chronicler relates that, in that country [Ghūr] there was a merchant, a Yahūdī [Jew], [a follower] of the religion

⁴ By nearly every other writer of authority they are said not to have embraced Islām up to the time of Ḥusain, son of Sām, son of Ḥasan, who was made ruler of Ghūr by Mas‘ūd-i-Karīm, Sulṭān of Ghāzmīn. See page 321 and note ¹.

I have several times mentioned that the various copies of the text collated may be divided into two sets, which, in many places, differ considerably in idiom. At this place, the oldest and best copies have Khamad [خمد], Khamādī [خمدی], and Akhamādī [خمدی], and also at page 369, whilst the more modern copies have Ḥamad, and Ḥamādī, with the exception of the I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, which, at page 369, has Khamādī also. The points of letters are often omitted in writing, and ₪ might be written for ₪, but that ₪ should be written for ₪, although possible, is not so probable. Still I do not consider myself quite justified in adopting the reading of the older copies, although the Ghūrfān tribes may have given ₪ the harsher sound of ₪. I certainly have never met with a similar instance of the kind. We may suppose, with some certainty, that the Ghūrfāns merely adopted the other name of Mūḥammad, derived from the same root, namely Aḥmad, by which the prophet is mentioned in the Kur’ān [a matter which has been much discussed], and hence they used Aḥmadī in preference to Mūḥammadī. See page 369.

⁵ That is to say, the Ghūrīs did not correctly pronounce the ⟨⟩, lispèd of the 'Arabs, but pronounced it as common ⟨⟩.
of Mihtar Mūṣā [Moses], on whom be peace! This merchant entertained a friendship for Amīr Banjī. He had travelled a great deal, and had acquired great experience in the ways of the world, and had frequented the capitals of the rulers of the countries around, and had become acquainted with the usages and forms of etiquette of the Courts of Sultāns and Princes; and he set out in company with Amīr Banjī.

He was acquainted with the objects and intentions of Amīr Banjī, and he said to him:—“If I should instruct thee in etiquette, and make thee acquainted with the usages of decorum and politeness, and give thee proper knowledge of the forms and ceremonies observed at the Court of the Khilāfāt, and in the presence of sovereigns, so that on that account the authority and government of the territory of Ghūr shall be conferred upon thee, do thou enter into a covenant with me, that, in every tract that I may desire, throughout the whole of thy territory, thou shalt assign a locality to, and cause to settle therein, a number of the Banī-Isrā‘īl [children of Israel], followers of the faith of Mihtar Mūṣā, in order that under the shadow of thy protection, and beneath the guardianship of thy Malikīs and thy offspring, they may dwell in peace and tranquillity.” Amīr Banjī, son of Nahārān, entered into a covenant with that merchant of the Banī-Isrā‘īl, and said:—“When thou teachest me the usages of politeness, and instructest me in the rules of conduct and demeanour necessary to be observed before princes, and in paying homage at the Court of the Khilāfāt, I will fulfil the whole of thy requests, and fully satisfy thy desires.”

This covenant having been duly settled on both sides, the merchant of the Banī-Isrā‘īl commenced to instruct Amīr Banjī in the polite usages necessary to be observed before princes, and at the Courts of sovereigns, and the requisite forms of respect and reverence needed at the

* I would here call the reader’s particular attention to the universal tradition of the Afghāns, recorded in all histories of them, respecting their claim to Israelitish descent. But they consider it an insult to be called Yahūdīs or Jews, and declare that they are Banī-Isrā‘īl. Many European writers declare most energetically that such a descent is impossible. Perhaps if it had been recorded in Greek or merely mentioned by one of that nation, they would have been equally energetic in the other way.
Khalifah's Court. The merchant likewise began to put in order and make ready a dress for him, consisting of a tunic, a cap, boots, and breeches, and to perfect him in riding and in the mode of wearing his arms, in such wise, that his rival, Shis, son of Bahrám, knew nothing whatever of all this preparation until they arrived at the Khalifah's capital.

Shis, son of Bahrám, proceeded thither just as he was, in the short Ghürlän garments which he was accustomed to wear at home, whilst Amir Banji, son of Nahrân, entered the Khalifah's capital in a dress befitting an Amir, and becoming a great personage.

After they had been permitted to make their obeisances before the Khalifah's Court, when a convenient opportunity arose, each of the disputants represented what were his objects and wishes, in a respectful manner, and with many expressions of his devotion and loyalty, and stated to the Wazîr and the Ustâd-ur-Râz-bân the matter of the dispute between them, and made fully known what were their desires and requirements. The Lord of the Faithful, Harun-ar-Rashid, after he had been pleased to peruse their statements, and his august consideration and attention had been drawn to their case, was pleased to regard Amir Banji, son of Nahrân, with favour.

As Amir Banji was blessed with great good fortune, combined with a most felicitous destiny, and his good nature was adorned with gracefulness of manners, the Lord of the Faithful was pleased to remark:—"Haça Kasim," that is to say, "This Banji is good looking, has a noble bearing, and appears endowed with the necessary qualifications of government and sovereignty, combined with good looks and artlessness of nature. Let the whole of the territory of Ghür be made over to him, and let the championship of the forces of the country of Ghür be entrusted to Shis, son of Bahrám." Both of them were invested with a robe of honour of the Dar-ul-Khilafat, and these titles were bestowed upon them, and they took their departure, and returned to Ghür again, according to the command of the Khalifah's Court.

7 The Ustâd-i-Râz-bân was an officer who represented to sovereigns the statements of persons who desired that their cases should be investigated by the monarch himself.
8 Another author, who says nothing whatever about any Jew merchant,
From that time forward, the title of the Shansabānīn Sultāns, according to the august words of the Lord of the Faithful, Hārūn-ar-Rashīd⁹, became Kāsim-i-Amīr-ul-Mu-minīn—the Lord of the Faithful’s handsome [one].

When these two personages returned to Ghūr again, the government of the territory [was assumed] by the Shansabānīs, and the championship of the forces by the Shīsānīs, and that arrangement continued up to the present age according to this settlement. The Sultāns were all Shansabānis, and the Champions, such as Mu-ayyid-ud-Dīn, Fath-i-Karmākh¹, Abū-l-‘Abbās-i-Shīs, and Sulīmān-i-Shīs, were all Shīsānīs—the mercy of the Almighty be upon the whole of them!

III. Sūrī, Son of MUḤAMMAD.

From the time of the government of Amīr Banji up to the present period⁹ [of Sūrī’s rule], nothing was found in relates that Amīr Banji, having added considerably to his previous territory by seizing other tracts, became one of the most powerful of the Malikis around. He was famed for his noble qualities and disposition; and, during the Khilāfat of Hārūn-ar-Rashīd, he proceeded to the Dār-ul-Khilāfat. He was treated with great favour on account of the successes which had been gained, by his efforts, in the arrangement of the important affairs of the house of ‘Abbās; and, on beholding him, the Khalīfah uttered these words: “Hāzī-Kāsim,” which is to say “good looking;” and, consequently, he obtained the title of Kāsim-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn. He returned to Ghūr again, with a robe of honour and a patent of investiture. The dominion over those parts continued in the possession of himself and his descendants until the time of Sūrī, the son of Muḥammad, who was one of Banji’s descendants, and lived in the time of Maḥmūd of Ghāzin.

⁹ No other Khalīfah confirmed it, I fancy, if Hārūn bestowed it. By our author’s own account, they did not even assume the title of Sultān up to Saffūd-Dīn, Sūrī’s time. He was seventh after this Sūrī.

¹ Some copies have ʿAbd al-ʿAbbās, and one has ʿAbd al-ʿAbbās but Karmākh is correct.

⁹ Jahān-Ārā and Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh differ from our author considerably here [he certainly acknowledges his want of materials]:—Sūrī, son of Muḥammad, was the grandson [farzand-īdah] of Amīr Banji, and he flourished, not in the time of Maḥmūd of Ghāzin, but in the time of the Saffūd-Dīn. Sūrī’s son, Muḥammad, was a contemporary of Maḥmūd’s. The Raṣṣat-al-Safā, Fasih-i, and others also, state that Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, was a contemporary of Maḥmūd; but that, when Sultān Maḥmūd got rid of Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, ruler of Ghūr, his grandson, ʿHasan by name, through fear of the Sultān, retired into Hindūstān, with his family, and took up his residence in that country. What reason there could have been for this, when the father could stay, is not given. Some others, again, say that sometimes Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, would be obedient to Sultān Maḥmūd, and, at others, in open revolt, as circumstances permitted, until, after some years,
chronicles respecting the state of the country of Ghūr that could be particularly enlarged upon; and, as the compilation of this Tābakāt was completed at the sublime capital, Dihlī—may its pre-eminence never decline!—and the kingdoms of Islām were thrown into convulsion through the irruption of the Mughal infidels—the Almighty confuse them!—and the country had become isolated, and the extreme parts disturbed and unsettled, it was impossible to copy from the history which the author had examined in the territory of Ghūr. As a matter of necessity that which has been obtained from the Tārikh-i-Nāṣiri, and the Tārikh of Ibn-Haiṣam-i-Ṣānī, together with some traditions from the priesthood of Ghūr, have been [therefore] recorded; and the author hopes that he may be forgiven by those who look into the work [for any errors or shortcoming that may be found in it].

They thus state, that Amir Sūrī was a great Malik, and that most part of the territory of Ghūr was under his jurisdiction; and, as in some parts of that country, such as Zāwulistān, the people, both high and low, noble and ignoble, were not [yet] exalted to the excellence of Islām, they were, at that time, at continual feud one with another. When the Ṣuffārīān came out of the territory of Nimroz, and advanced to Bust and the district of Dāwar, and Ya'kūb, son of Laiṣ, attacked Lakan the Lak, Amir of partly by stratagem and partly by peaceful means, the Sulṭān succeeded in securing Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, whom he took along with him towards Ghazmīn, but that he died by the way, at Kfān. The Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmīf gives a more trustworthy account, and which, if dates are examined, certainly seems correct. For further particulars see note 7, page 321.

* The history in verse composed by Fakhru-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, mentioned at page 300.

* Great discrepancy exists in most of the copies of the text with respect to this name. Some have Wālīshān, Waṣṭān, and Wālīshān; but two good copies have Zāwulistān very plainly written, and that may be considered the correct reading.

* Ya'kūb-i-Laiṣ reduced Bust, Zamīn-i-Dāwar, Ghazmīn, Tukhāristān, and other tracts in 256 H., and, in the previous year, fought an action with Tūk, son of Muṣla, in Kirmān; but who Lakan the Lak [some copies have Lak-Lak] was it difficult to say. There is no mention of this matter in any author with whom I am acquainted; but Lakan is the name of a sept of nomad Kurds, of which people there seems to have been a considerable number in those parts at that time. There are some tribes dwelling among the Afghāns to this day, erroneously supposed by Englishmen to be Afghāns, who claim to be Kurds.
Aytkin-ābād, which is the district of Rukhāj, the tribes of the Ghūrīs fortified themselves on the summits of the rocks, and remained in safety; but they used to be at constant enmity with each other—the followers of Islām and the unbelievers—so that they were in the habit of keeping up a war from kūshk to kūshk, and lived in a constant state of contention and strife.

Through the natural impregnability of the strong mountains which are in Ghūr, others [foreigners] used not to subject them to their power; and the head of the whole of the Shansabānīs of Mandesh was Amir Sūrī.

There are five great and lofty mountains in Ghūr, respecting which the people of Ghūr are agreed that they are the strongest mountains in the world. One of these is Zār-i-Margh of Mandesh, at the foot of which mountain is the kūshk and capital of the Shansabānīs, and they [the people of Ghūr] contend that the Simurgh nourished Zāl-i-Zar [Zāl, the ruddy-faced], who was the father of Rustam, in that mountain. Some of the dwellers at the skirt thereof maintain, that it was in one of the years between 500 H. and 600 H., when the sound of lamentation and regret issued from that mountain, “Zāl-i-Zar hath passed away.” The second mountain [range] has the name of Surkh-Ghar, and that also is in the Mandesh district,

---

6 Some copies have Lātkin-ābād, but the above is the correct reading; but Rukhāj—which is said to have been a district of the territory of Bust, might be read Zaranj—and I am almost inclined to consider the last reading correct. All the copies of the text are more or less imperfect here. One copy also says plainly that “the tribes of Ghūrīs sought shelter on the borders of Sind,” and this seems the preferable reading, but the majority of copies are as above.

7 That is, those not yet converted to the Muhammadan faith, and, probably, some of the Banī-Isrā’īl before referred to, and such tribes as have since retired northwards towards Hindū-Kūsh, or have now nearly disappeared.

8 A kūshk here means a fortified village, and also a castle, &c. See note 2, page 331.

9 There would be considerable difficulty in finding “the mountains of Rāsāt,” which are in Ghör,” for a very good reason—that they do not exist. The word “rāsāt” is not a proper name, but the plural of “rāsāh,” which means “strong mountains.” See Elliot’s INDIA, vol. ii. p. 284.

1 From this statement it is plain, as in Baihaqī’s account farther on, that Ghūr was under several petty chiefs. Sūrī was chief of Mandesh only.

2 The word koh, here used, may signify a mountain range, or a single mountain.

3 It is impossible to fix the names of two of these five ranges with any degree of certainty, for there are scarcely two copies alike out of the twelve
in the limits of Tajir-Koh⁴. The third mountain is Ashuk, in the district of Timran, the size and altitude of which is greater than that of any other part of the territory of Ghūr; and the district of Timran is [situated] in its hollows and [on] its sides. The fourth is the mountain range of Warani, in the valleys and on the skirts of which are the territories of Dāwar and Wālisht⁵, and the kaṣr⁶ of Kajurān. The fifth is the mountain of Ro'en, in the central part of Ghūr, of immense strength and altitude; and they have stated⁷ that the fifth mountain [range] is the Faj [defile, pass] of Khaesār⁸, the length, extent, and loftiness of which is beyond the bounds of conjecture, conception, and understanding. In the year 590 H., one half⁹ of the trunk of an ebony tree was found at the summit of it, more than one thousand mans¹ in weight; and no one was able to conceive how, or in what manner, it could have been brought, or have fallen there.

collated. One, the very old copy I have often referred to, has Surkh-Ghar, as above, which means the red mountain, and the next oldest copy between which two words there is but a very slight difference. The remaining copies have and the like.

⁴ As many other copies have

⁵ It is impossible to fix some of these names satisfactorily. Some copies of the text have Dāwar and Wālisht, while others again leave out the and altogether. The very old copy I have often referred to has as written above; but another very old copy, one of the St. Petersburg MSS., has "Ghūr and Wālisht." This is somewhat remarkable, as Baha ḫ ṫ mentions a Gūr-i-Wālisht, as lying in the route between Ghaznī and the fortress of Māndesh, in which stronghold Mas'ud of Ghaznī confined his brother Muhammad; and he also mentions Wālisān, in connexion with Bust and Kusdār. One of the Paris copies here has "the district of Zāristān," and leaves out Dāwar. Although so many copies have Wālisht, I am half inclined to read this part of the sentence thus—"which are the territories of Dāwar and Zawul."

⁶ kaṣr and Kūshk have both one meaning: the first is 'Arabic and the last Persian. See note ⁸, page 331.

⁷ From this remark it is evident our author does not describe these mountain ranges from his own knowledge.

⁸ Faj is not a proper name: it means a wide and open route or road between two mountain ranges; a pass. Khaesār is a well-known place, and is mentioned in a number of places throughout the work, and therefore the "Faj Hanisār" is as much a myth as the "mountains of Rāsār." The printed text, the I. O. L. MS. and the R. A. S. MS., have "a kaṣr [see meaning of kaṣr, note ⁶, page 331] of the trunk of an ebony tree"!!

¹ The mans varies from forty to eighty pounds in different parts. The former probably is meant here.
THE TABAḴAT-I-NĀṢIRĪ.

IV. MALIK MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SŪRĪ.

Abū-al-Ḥasan-ul-Haiṣam, son of Muḥammad-i-Nābī², the historian, relates in this wise:—that, after the sovereignty of Khurāsān and Zāwulistān passed from the Sāmānīs and Ṣuffārīs, and devolved upon Amīr Sabuk-Tigīn⁴, he had, upon several occasions, marched forces from Bust towards the mountain [tracts] of Ghūr, and had put numbers to the sword; and, when the throne fell to Amīr Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tigīn, the sovereignty of Ghūr had passed into the hands of Amīr Muḥammad, son of Sūrī⁴, and he, having brought the territories of Ghūr under his sway, sometimes would pay obedience to the Court of Sulṭān Maḥmūd-i-Ghāzī, and at other times would act in a rebellious manner, and manifest a refractory spirit, and would withhold the amount of tribute and arms⁴ stipulated; and, relying on the faith of his strong fortresses, his power, and the ample number [of his people], he used continually to show hostility.

The heart of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, for this reason, was ever

² Every copy of the text, with one exception, says “Nābī” here, instead of Sānī, and therefore, as I previously conjectured, the correct name of the history so often quoted must be the Tārīḵh of Ibn Haiṣam-i-Nābī, entitled the Kiṣṇaš-i-Sānī.

³ See page 74, where our author says that Sabuk-Tigīn took possession of Ghūr, together with Bust, Zamīn-i-Dāwar, Bāmīān, and all Ẓūkhrūstān. Here we might have expected to have heard something of Alb-Tīghn, Balkā-Tigīn, Abū ʿAlī-i-Lawīk, and Pīray. See note ⁴, page 71.

⁴ Our author is quite correct here [and Ārā and some others agree] with regard to Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, having been contemporary with Maḥmūd. The reason why the great blunder has arisen that it was Sūrī who lived in Maḥmūd’s time, is, that some authors and translators, in their simplicity, thought the words “Muḥammad-i-Sūrī” signified one man, instead of which they mean Muḥammad, son of Sūrī. Another matter which I would also remark upon:—Sulṭān Maḥmūd made raids upon the Afghāns in 411 H., and again in 416 H., but they are never mentioned in connexion with the Ghūrīs by Bāhāḵī and such like trustworthy authors, a pretty good proof, were any wanting, that, although the Afghāns are Paṭāns, the Ghūrīs are not, and never were so accounted by any historian, nor by the Afghāns nor Ghūrīs themselves. It does not follow that, because a Tājīk is called Sūrī, he should be of the Afghān clan of Sūr, of the tribe of Lūdī, so styled from their progenitor named Sūr, but not Sūrī. It is a curious fact that the Afghāns are not mentioned by our author but once, towards the end of the work.

⁵ Ghūr appears to have been famous in those days for the manufacture of warlike weapons.
on the watch, and, on account of his [Muḥammad's, son of Sūrī] numbers, his power and dignity, and the fact of the great [natural] strength and altitude of the mountains of Ghūr, the Sultān used well to consider in his mind, until, with a large army, he came into Ghūr, and he [Muḥammad, son of Sūrī] was invested within the fortress of Āhangarān⁶. Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, held out the fortress for a considerable period, and defended it energetically; but, after some time, the stronghold was gained possession of by his descending from it, on terms of accommodation, and presenting himself before Sultān Maḥmūd.

The Sultān took him, together with his youngest son, who was named Shīs, away to Ghaznīn, because Amir Muḥammad-i-Sūrī entertained the greatest affection for his youngest son, Shīs. When they reached the precincts of Kidān, Amir Muḥammad-i-Sūrī died. Some relate after this manner:—that, when he became a prisoner, through the proud spirit within him, he was unable to brook disgrace. He had a signet-ring, beneath the stone of which some poison had been set; and, at this time, he availed himself of it, and died⁷.

⁶ Not mentioned in his account of the strong fortresses of Ghūr, but there was a place called Dīh [village] of Āhangarān [Āhangarān is the plural of Āhangar, a blacksmith], near Ghaznīn, and the river of Āhang, which flowed past that city. 'Uṭba' also mentions it. See following note.
⁷ Before giving the accounts of other authors, I will first give an extract from the Kitāb-i-Yāmūn of 'Uṭba', as he was a contemporary of Maḥmūd, but he seldom mentions dates.

He says, Maḥmūd became greatly incensed against the tribes of Ghūr, who were unbelievers, on account of their waylaying caravans and levying blackmail, thinking their hills and defiles impregnable. An army, consisting of horse and foot, was assembled to punish them, and Altūn-Tāsh, the Hājib, and Arsalān-i-Jāshib [called a Maltān], but it appears he had only held the government of Maltān] were appointed to the command. They set out, but had such hard fighting with the Ghūrs that Maḥmūd, finding they made little progress, resolved to proceed in person, attended by a body of his Ghulāms. He succeeded in defeating them, and, after penetrating narrow passes and defiles, made a road which enabled him to reach Āhangarān, the stronghold of their Malik, who was called Ibn-i-Sūrī [i. e. "Sūrī's son" and thus he agrees with our author, and others I have quoted, to the effect that the correct name of this chief is Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, son of Muḥammad. See also Baihākī's account farther on]. Sūrī's son, with a force of 10,000 men, came out of his stronghold, and, being intrenched behind walls [breastworks?], and availing himself of the ravines, hills, and broken ground, succeeded for half a day in resisting all efforts to dislodge him. Maḥmūd had recourse to
Sultan Mahmud sent his [Muhammad's] son, Shish, back

stratagem. He directed his troops to face about, as though about to give up
the contest and retire. This had the desired effect; and Suri's son, the Hindu
[as 'Utba' calls him], came forth from his strong position to follow in pursuit.
The Sultan faced about, and defeated him. Suri's son was taken, together
with great booty, consisting of arms and other war material. Suri's son
subsequently poisoned himself by means of his ring, which contained poison.

'Utba' also makes a difference, as do all writers of any knowledge of their
subject, between Ghurs and Afghans, and never confounds them.

Other writers contend that Muhammad and his son, Hassan by name, not
Shish, were made captive by Mahmud, and imprisoned. Their place of con-
finement was the upper story of a tower, thirty ells from the ground, an aperture
of which faced the open country. Muhammad gave himself up for lost, but,
not wishing that his family should be ruined, desired Hassan to make for
Ghur. He contrived to effect the escape of his son by tearing up the blanket
given him to lie upon, to make it into a rope, by means of which he lowered
Hassan to the ground, who escaped to Ghur. As soon as the Sultan became
aware of Hassan's escape, he put Muhammad, the father, to death. Hassan
obtained the rule over Ghur, and had a son, Husain by name, who had seven
sons. This is the 'Izz-ud-Din, Husain, the IXth chief of our author.

Jahan Ara, Muntakhab-ut-Tawariih, and some others agree as to Muhammad,
Suri's son, having been made captive by Mahmud, but, like our author,
contend that he [Muhammad] was succeeded by his son Abu-'Alif, who had
always been obedient to Mahmud, and that he was appointed to the chieftain-
ship of Ghur by that Sultan; and that afterwards Abu-'Alif was ousted by his
nephew, 'Abbas, son of Shish [who had been taken captive with his father].
The chieftainship then passed into the hands of Muhammad, son of 'Abbas,
then to Kutb-ud-Din, Hassan, his son, and then to the latter's son, Husain,
the 'Izz-ud-Din, Husain of our author. He, as well as other writers, does not
make any remark whatever upon Abu-'Alif's having been deprived of the chieftain-
ship by 'Abbas, son of Shish. In this case the line terminated in Abu-'Alif's
family, and passed to the younger branch, and thus the Ghurfian Sultans are
not descended from him at all, but from Shish.

The Rauqat-ug-Safâ considers this statement weak, and quotes, as does also
the Habib-us-Siyar and the Mir'at-i-Jahan-Numâ, another tradition to the
effect that when Mahmud marched an army into Ghur, and took Suri
[Muhammad, son of Suri—Rauqat-ug-Safâ makes this blunder here, after
having previously called him by his correct name] captive, and put him to
death, his grandson [if such be correct, what became of the son?] Hassan, with
his family, through fear of Mahmud, fled into Hind; and, as they had not yet
been converted to the Muhammadan faith, they took up their residence in an
idol temple [in a Dharm-sala perhaps]. This Hassan had a son named Sam,
who, after his father's decease, was converted to Islam. He proceeded to
Dhilf, and followed the occupation of a trader [and, according to the Rauqat-
ug-Safâ only, used to carry goods from Hindustan to Ghur, and bring other
commodities back from thence. This seems strange however, since, if he could
have gone back to Ghur in this way, his father surely need not have left it,
unless he liked]. He had a son named Husain, who was endowed with many
excellent qualities. After some years had passed away, and Sam had acquired
considerable wealth, the desire of returning to his native mountains induced
him to set out for Ghur. He embarked on one of the seas [the word used also
signifies a large river, which is probably meant here] of Hind, together with his
to Ghür again. He had [already] conferred the govern-

family and effects, on board a vessel which met with a contrary wind, which raised a violent storm. The vessel and all on board, with the exception of Husain, son of Sām, went to the bottom. Husain, when the ship was sinking, succeeded in getting upon a plank or log of wood, and, at the very same time, a lion [Dow calls the lion "his father," mistaking ल for ल or ल], which was being conveyed upon the vessel's deck, also sprang upon it, and for three days and nights Husain and his strange companion remained in this state upon the log, at the end of which period they were wafted to the shore. The lion made for a neighbouring forest, and Husain for a town near by. Being a stranger and not knowing any one, and the time night, he went and lay down upon one of the benches or platforms, which are to be found in front of almost all shops in India, and fell fast asleep. The watch on going their rounds perceiving him there, and, not knowing who he was, took him for a thief, and dragged him away to prison, where he remained for about seven years. The governor of that place having been attacked with a dangerous disorder, by way of atone-

ment, ordered all the prisoners to be set at liberty. Husain, son of Sām, by this means obtained his freedom, and set out for Ghaznī. On the road thither he fell in with a band of robbers, who, finding him a powerful and intelligent youth, induced him to join them, and he was provided with a horse and arms. It so happened, however, not long after, that a band of troops in the service of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm of Ghaznī, which had been for some time on the look out for the robbers, came upon them unawares, and made the whole gang captive. They were brought bound into the presence of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, who directed that they should suffer death. One after the other several under-

went their sentence, until it came to the turn of Husain, son of Sām. While the executioner was blindfolding him, he exclaimed, "O God! I know that error is not agreeable to Thee, why then is it that I, although innocent, am thus to suffer death?" These words affected the executioner, and the matter was represented, through one of the Court, to the Sulṭān, who directed that Husain should be brought before him. He stated his pitiful case to Ibrāhīm, who, on hearing it, took compassion on him, pardoned him, and enrolled him, in a subordinate office at first, among his chamberlains. When Sulṭān Mas’ūd, surnamed the Beneficent, succeeded 'his father, Ibrāhīm, he conferred upon Husain, son of Sām, son of Muḥammad, [grand(?)]son of Sūrf, the government of the district of Ghür, and the title of 'Izz-ud-Dīn. Some say Ibrāhīm gave Husain akinswoman of his own in marriage [our author states, at page 105, that one of his own ancestors married a daughter of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm]. After Husain's death, enmity arose between his descendants and Bahrām Shāh, Mas’ūd’s son, as mentioned by our author farther on, and as will be hereafter noticed. Many authors very properly consider 'Alā-ud-Dīn to be the first of the dynasty, and the dynasty to consist of five persons only, whose dominion lasted sixty-four years, the others being merely accounted petty chieftains.

There can be no doubt whatever that the Ghūris were merely petty mountain-chiefs up to the time of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, and the extent of country they dwelt in proves it; but, as the Ghaznavīd dynasty declined, the Ghūris waxed stronger and more independent after the decease of Mas’ūd-i-Karīm [the Beneficent], who gave the government of his native country to Husain, son of Sām, when the Ghaznavīd empire began rapidly to decay. Our author's desire at all times appears to be to glorify the Ghūris, and, therefore, the fact of their having been merely petty tributary chiefs did not chime in with his wishes. We find Maḥmūd and his son Mas’ūd continually passing
ment of Ghūr upon Muḥammad-i-Sūrī's eldest son, Amīr Abū-'Ali, as will, subsequently, be recorded.

from Ghaznīn to Balkh and Kābul, Ghaznīn to Hindūstān, Ghaznīn to Sijistān, and from Ghaznīn to Hirāt, and thence up the valley of the Murghāb; and Mas'ūd appears to have passed through Ghūr to Ghaznīn, when he had to fly, after his defeat by the Saljūqs, and yet we hear not a word about these powerful rulers of our author, although the Sultāns must have passed through the mountain tracts of Ghūr constantly—in fact the Sultāns of Ghaznīn held several fortresses in Ghūr; and Tīgīn-ābād was in that very part, and Muḥammad, brother of Mas'ūd, was confined in the fortress of Nāe in Wajīristān, one of the very districts mentioned by our author as forming part of the Ghūrfān dominions. I think 'Uṭba' and Baihaḵī were more than likely to have had thorough knowledge of these potent Malikis and sovereigns so called, yet Baihaḵī and 'Uṭba' treat them as very petty chieftains, although they held some strong fortresses. Our author quotes Baihaḵī constantly about other matters, but not here in regard to what happened under his [Baihaḵī's] own observation as it were; and this looks suspicious. I will now give an abridged account of what he says respecting Sultān Maḥmūd's proceedings with respect to Ghūr, and of the expedition undertaken by his gallant son, Mas'ūd, against some of its petty chiefs, during the time he held the government of Khorāsān, before he succeeded to the throne of Ghaznīn.

"In the year 401 H., Sultān Maḥmūd went on an expedition into Ghūr against the infidels of that part, by way of Zamīn-i-Dāwār, taking along with him his two sons, Mas'ūd and Muḥammad, both at that time in their fourteenth year [they were not twins], and also their uncle [Maḥmūd's youngest brother], Yūsuf, then seventeen.

"These three young Princes were left in Zamīn-i-Dāwār, with the heavy matériel and baggage, and Maḥmūd left them there because he considered that district auspicious, it having been the first territory entrusted to him by his father, Amīr Sabuk-Tīgīn. The narrator of the preceding and following events, 'Abd-ul-Ghaffār, says, 'my grandfather, who related this, was at that time in the service of Bātīkīn, the Zamīn-Dāwar [i. e. of Zamīn-i-Dāwār], who was governor of that district on the part of Sultān Maḥmūd, and he [my grandfather] was directed to remain in attendance on the Princes.' [There is not the slightest allusion either to Sūrī or his son here, although it is the year in which his son Muḥammad is said to have been made captive by Maḥmūd] * * * * In 405 H., Maḥmūd began to make raids upon Khawānīn, which is a tract of Ghūr, adjoining Bust and Zamīn-i-Dāwār, in which were infidels exceedingly tall and strong, and they held many passes and strong fortresses. On this occasion the Sultān had taken along with him his son Mas'ūd, and he then greatly distinguished himself, and showed many proofs of his manhood and valour. When a body of them [the infidels] retired for refuge to their stronghold, one of their chiefs was standing on a tower of the fort, and was acting with great insolence and audacity, and calling the Musalmāns, when Mas'ūd, who was fighting on horseback, hit him in the throat with an arrow, and he fell dead from the tower. The chief's companions became heart-broken at this, and surrendered the fortress; and all this was accomplished by one man. Amīr Maḥmūd was delighted with his lion-like son, and, whilst he was yet in his youth, made him his heir, for he knew that after his own death there was no one able to maintain the dynasty but he. [See note * , page 92.] * * * * In 411 H., Mas'ūd [he had been declared heir-apparent, and appointed governor of Khorāsān, with Hirāt as the seat of
V. MALIK ABÛ-'ALÎ, SON OF MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SÛRÎ.

Amîr Abû-'Alî, son of Muḥammad-i-Sûrî, was a man of

government] proceeded to Hirat, and determined to undertake an expedition
into Ghûr.

"He set out from Hirat, in Jamādl-ul-Awwal, with a strong force of horse
and foot, and five light elephants. The first march was to Badghân [one MS.
has Badghâhân], and the next to Khusân [one MS. Chashân or Chushân; but
several of these names cannot be considered certain, although all available
MSS. have been compared, and the printed text of Morley, which has been
carefully edited], and then to Barfân [MS. Parâyân]. There a halt took
place to allow all the troops to come up, after which Prince Mas'ûd marched
to Pâr [MS. Bâr], and from thence, after two days, to Nakshab [MS.
Nâshâb or Nihshâb], and then to Bâgh-i-Wâzir, outside; and that Rîhât
[public edifice, a kârâwânârâ] is the commencement of the frontier of
Ghûr.

"When the Ghûrs became aware of this movement of Amîr Mas'ûd, they
retired to their strongholds and deliberated about making resistance. Before
he set out on this expedition, Mas'ûd had conciliated Bûl-Ḥasan-i-Khalâf [Bû
or Abû-l-Ḥasan-i-Khalâf would signify the father of Ḥasan, and son of Khalâf.
According to some authors already quoted the son of Muḥammad, son of Sûrî,
was named Ḥasan. See para. 2, page 321], one of the most notable of the chieftains
of Ghûr, and had induced him [Bûl-Ḥasan] to submit to his authority;
and it had been agreed, that, on the Amîr's troops reaching that Rîhât, Bûl-
Ḥasan should present himself there with his forces fully equipped. On the
day Mas'ûd reached that place, Bûl-Ḥasan joined him with a considerable
force, amounting to 3000 horse and foot, and brought along with him numerous
offerings and contributions in the shape of shields, armour, and whatever
was most esteemed of the produce of Ghûr. Mas'ûd treated him with favour,
and he was followed by Sher-wân. This was another of the chiefs on the
frontier of Ghûr and Gûzgânân [pronounced and written Gûzgânân by 'Arabs],
and he too came attended by numerous forces, horse and foot. He likewise
had been conciliated by Amîr Mas'ûd, and he brought along with him offerings
beyond compute. Amîr Muḥammad [Mas'ûd's brother] had used the utmost
endeavours and contrivances to induce this chieftain to come and attach himself
to him, because his territory adjoined Muḥammad's appanage, which was Gûz-
gânân, but he had declined because people were more inclined towards
Mas'ûd.

"Having been joined by these chiefs, Mas'ûd resumed his march, but went
on in advance himself, slightly attended by about fifty or sixty ghulâmâs, and
200 foot, selected from each dastak or band. He reached a fortress which
they called Bar-tar, an exceedingly strong place, and garrisoned by a numer-
ous and well-armed force. He prepared to attack it, his party not being
patient enough to wait for the arrival of the army. He led the way himself,
followed by his ghulâmâs and the foot, and they shouted the takbir, on which
the accursed unbelievers [these Ghûrs were not Muḥammadans] of this for-
tress of Ghûr sprung up infuriated, and set up a yell sufficient to rend the
ground. Mas'ûd ordered his ghulâmâs to take to their bows; and they kept
up such an effectual fire of arrows, that not a Ghûr dared show his head above
the walls, and this enabled the foot, by means of lassos [used up to a recent
good disposition and excellent qualities, and was highly commended for the excellency of his faith.

period] to assault one of the bastions. They effected an entrance, and drove the Ghürifs before them, and, being joined by the ghulāms, completely cleared the walls and bastions, making great slaughter among the unbelievers, and taking a great number of captives and a considerable amount of booty of all descriptions. After the fortress had been captured, the main body of the troops arrived, and many were their praises and congratulations, that such a strong fortress had been taken by such a mere handful of men.

"From thence Masʿūd marched towards the tract of zarān [in one copy of the original, Razān, but the first is the most probable], the people of which agreed to pay taxes and tribute, and presented contributions in gold, silver, and arms. From that part to the district called Jarūs [also Kharūs and Ḥarūs] where War-mesh-i-Bat dwelt, was a distance of ten farsakhs [leagues]. The Amīr did not commence hostilities against this chief, War-mesh-i-Bat, because he had sent an agent to the young Amīr tendering submission and allegiance, and had promised that, when Masʿūd should return to Hirât, he would present himself before him, and enter into stipulations respecting tribute. That district, and the place where this chieftain dwelt, were excessively strong, and the most difficult portion of the whole territory of Ghūr, its people the most warlike and the strongest men in that part. It had been the capital of the Ghūrīs in bygone times; and, whatever ruler held that tract, the whole of the rest of the territory used to submit to him, up to the time that Amīr Masʿūd marched into that part of the country."

[There can be no doubt but that Baihaḵī, who was a native of the Ghaznī district, and who wrote his work at Ghaznī upwards of a century before our author composed his history, must have had a much greater knowledge of Ghūr and its people; yet this extract makes the accounts of Ghūr and of the Ghūrīs more puzzling than ever. That the latter were not all converted—if any were—to the Muḥammadan faith is clear, and it is also clear that up to this time they were under several petty chiefs, independent of each other, though perhaps nominally acknowledging the supremacy of the chief of Zarān, whose place of residence had been the capital of Ghūr in bygone times. But the name of this chief is the most perplexing. In Morley's edition of the text of Baihaḵī, he is called Raʿīs-i-Bat, or Tab [راہس پہ], and, in a note, Ramūgh [رمونگ], and in another place War-mesh [وَارْمِش]. A MS. in my possession has War-mesh [وَارْمِش], but, the passage being so important, I sent it to Professor Rice, of the British Museum, who has been so very kind as to compare my translation with another copy of Baihaḵī in the British Museum, and, from what the Professor says, there is no doubt that the first name is War-mesh, and this is remarkable, because this very name occurs among the names of the ancestors of Amīr Banjī [see page 312], and occurs again at page 366. What Bat or Tab may mean it is impossible to say. It might be part of but-parast [بَعْتِ-پَارَسَ] idol-worshipper, infidel; but that all the known copies of the original should have left part of the name out [Morley collated his edition of the text with four or five copies] is improbable. The word is not Pashto, and there is no Afghān tribe or clan of this name. Had the Ghūrīs been Hindūs instead of Tājiks, we might suppose it was a corruption of Sanskrit Bhāṭ, a hero, a warrior. I dare say, however, that some one will be able to account for, and perhaps show to his own satisfaction that this chief must have been one of the Bhāṭ tribe of Jās now in the Panjāb. We might as well have Bhāṭīs in Ghūr as "a fugitive band of Crusaders" from Palestine
THE SHANSABĀNĪAH DYNASTY OF GHŪR.

At the time when his father held the sovereignty of
in the army of Ghūrīs who conquered the upper provinces of India, according to
the interpreters of the poem of the Bard Chand—but I have forgotten myself. Pat might be Pat, and that will be surely founded upon and shown to be part
of the word Paṭan, and can be made "Paṭhan," "Paṭan," or "Pahtan," with
the greatest ease. If it were not a dangerous practice to tamper with proper
names, I should be inclined to read, Ṣῆfī.

"The Amīr now despatched an intelligent person to this chief, and two
men of Ghūr of the followers of Bū-ḥasan-i-Khālafl and Sher-wān were sent
along with him to act as interpreters, with a message combining threats and
hopes, as is usual on such occasions. The agent departed, and the Amīr
followed in his steps. The former, and the others with him, reached the place
in question, and he delivered his message to those arrogant fellows [sic], who
manifested great fierceness and defiance, and said that the Amīr had made a
great mistake in imagining that either the people of that part or that district
were similar to those he had met with and had passed through; that he had
better come there, and he would find sword, spear, and stone [rock] ready for
him. This insolent message roused the ire of Masʿūd. He halted his troops
for the night at the foot of the mountain, arms were distributed, and, at dawn,
the force moved forward. The drums and trumpets sounded, and the soldiers
began to ascend the heights, on which the Ghūrīs showed themselves like so
many ants or locusts on the tracts above them, horse and foot, all well armed,
and occupying all the paths and defiles leading to it, who raised shouts and
yells, and began casting stones with their slings, at Masʿūd's force.

"The best of it was, that that mountain was somewhat depressed, and partly
composed of earth [not very rocky?] and accessible in every direction. The
troops were told off in parties, to advance by the different practicable paths,
and Masʿūd himself kept parallel to them, for the fighting there was likely to
be severe. Bū-ḥasan-i-Khālafl, and his men, were sent to the right, and
Sher-wān, with his contingent, to the left. The accursed ones evinced the
utmost daring, and pressed forward with impetuosity, particularly in front of
the Amīr, and they disputed the greater part of the ground with determination.
The troops were hard pressed, and the enemy crowded towards the standards
of the Amīr, and the fighting became desperate. [This reads something like
an Umeylah expedition.] Three mounted warriors of the enemy succeeded
in getting close up to the Amīr, who, perceiving them, smote one of them full
on the breast with his mace of twenty mams in weight [the man varies from
forty to eighty pounds], which laid him sprawling on his back, and prevented
his rising again; and the ghulāms attacked the other two, and hurled them
from their horses. This was enough for the Ghūrīs, who gave way; but they
continued, now and again, to face about and dispute the ground, until a village
[town] was reached at the foot of the mountain [on the other side], and, on the
way thither, numbers were slain and made captive. The fugitives threw
themselves into this place, which was of vast strength, and contained
numerous kūshks [here kūshk seems to mean a castle or fortified house],
after the manner of the Ghūrīs, and sent away to a stronghold, at a
distance in the rear, their women, children, and everything they could remove.
The unbelievers resisted obstinately up to the time of evening prayer, and
great numbers of them were killed, and numbers of Musalmāns were martyred
[Masʿūd's troops are referred to here]. When the night closed in, the un-
believers decamped, and the village [or town] was taken possession of by
the troops, who occupied themselves, throughout the night, in plundering it.

["At
Ghūr, and the mountain tracts of Mandesh*, the whole of

* This tends to show that Ghūr and Mandesh were separate tracts.

"At dawn next day, the Amīr again moved forward towards their [other] stronghold, two leagues distant. He had to pass through a constant succession of defiles and passes, and did not reach it till the time of afternoon prayer. They found a fortress, as they had been informed, stronger than any other in the whole of Ghūr, and no one recollected hearing that it had ever been taken by force of arms. Mas‘ūd, having reached it, disposed his forces around this stronghold, and, during the whole night, preparations were made for attacking it, and the battering rams were placed in favourable positions."

I must here still further curtail this interesting account of the expedition for want of space. Suffice it to say that breaches were made and bravely assaulted and as bravely defended, the Amīr being ever in front, and thereby inspiring his men with strong hearts. After four days’ very severe fighting, each day increasing in severity, it was carried, at last, sword in hand, the Ghūrīs defending every inch of the breach. Great numbers of them were slain and taken prisoners, but the latter were protected on making their submission, while slaves and booty to a vast amount were captured. Mas‘ūd had it proclaimed that he gave up all gold, silver, slaves, and other booty to the troops, but that all arms and war matériel taken was to be brought to him. A great quantity was accordingly brought and laid before his tent, and such as was most valuable or rare he selected, and divided the rest among his soldiers. Of the prisoners, one half was made over to Bū-l-Hasan-i-Khalaf, and the other half to Sher-wān, for them to take to their own territories. Orders were also given to raze that stronghold, so that, from thenceforth, no rebel might take shelter therein. When the rest of the Ghūrīs found what had happened to the fortified town and the other stronghold, they began to fear, and became submissive and willing to pay tribute and obedience; and even War-mesh-i-Bat began to quake. He made intercession through Bū-l-Hasan-i-Khalaf and Sher-wān, and sent an envoy, tendered his submission, and increased the amount of tribute and contributions. His offers were accepted on the stipulation that every castle he [War-mesh] had taken on the side of Gharijstān should be given up. Although War-mesh ground his teeth at this, he could do nothing else than agree, and those fortresses were given up to governors of the Amīr. Whilst the latter was still in Ghūr, that chief sent in his contributions and offerings; and, subsequently, when Mas‘ūd reached Hirāt, War-mesh-i-Bat presented himself at the Court, was well received, had a dress of honour conferred upon him, and returned to his country along with the two other friendly chieftains.

After the capture and destruction of the fortress above referred to, Amīr Mas‘ūd advanced against another, a famous place, and of vast strength, named Tūr [this name is doubtful, the variants are Būr and Nūr]. It was carried by storm after a week’s fighting and great slaughter, and the two friendly chiefs took part in it. Mas‘ūd placed a governor of his own in the place, after which he set out on his return to Hirāt. At Mār-ābād, ten faraḵhs [leagues] from that city, large quantities of arms and war matériel, as stipulated for by others of the Ghūrīs to avert molestation, were found already collected, together with what War-mesh-i-Bat had despatched.

The narrator, ‘Abd-ul-Ghaftār, then adds, that "no sovereign ever acquired such power over Ghūr as the martyr, Mas‘ūd, did; for, although the first
the people had their eyes upon him, and affection towards him was instilled into their minds. Notwithstanding that his father used to act in a rebellious and contumacious manner towards Amir Sabuk-Tigin, and his son, Sultan Mahmud, Amir Abu-'Ali at all times used to manifest his fidelity and allegiance towards the Sultan; and he was in the habit of writing letters containing the expression of his fealty and his affection, and despatching them to Ghaznin, the capital.

When the contumacy and defection of his father went beyond the bounds of forbearance, Sultan Mahmud brought an army against him from Ghaznin; and, after considerable effort, the Sultan succeeded in securing the person of Amir Muhammad-i-Suri; and took him away along with him towards Ghaznin, and bestowed the government of Ghur upon Amir Abu-'Ali, his son.

As soon as Amir Abu-'Ali became installed in the government of Ghur, he conferred great benefits upon the people, and directed the erection of many buildings of public utility. Masjids and colleges were founded in Ghur, and he also built a Jami' Masjid, and liberally endowed the whole of them. He held priests and ecclesiastics in great respect, and considered it incumbent on himself to venerate hermits and recluses.

During his time, the people of the territories of Ghur dwelt in tranquillity and repose, and his brother, Shis, son of Muhammad, passed his days under his protection.

When the appointed period of Amir Abu-'Ali's dominion came to an end, and the empire of Ghaznin [also] reverted from Mahmud to his son, [Sultan] Mas'ud, a son of Amir Shis, 'Abbâs by name, having attained great dignity and power, broke out into rebellion, seized his uncle, Amir Abu-'Ali, and reduced the whole of the country of Ghur under his own sway; and the reign of Amir Abu-'Ali came to a termination, and he died.

Musalman [the 'Arabs] conquered 'Ajam and Khurassân, they found it impossible to enter Ghur; and, although Sultan Mahmud, on three separate occasions, by the same route of Zamân-i-Dâwar, attacked different frontier tracts of Ghur, yet he did not penetrate into the defiles and more difficult parts; still, it was not through inability to do so, for his designs and objects were different to those of his successor."
VI. MALIK 'ABBĀS, SON OF SHĪS, SON OF MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SŪRĪ.

Amīr 'Abbās was a warlike, intrepid, and pitiless man, and endowed with great manliness, strength, and activity. When he attained the full vigour of youth, and his whole strength, he entered secretly into a compact with a party of adherents and young men, and gained them over to his own rebellious views. He then suddenly rose, and seized his uncle, Amīr Abū-'Alī, ruler of Ghūr, and imprisoned him, and appropriated the whole of his uncle’s property, his treasures and his hoards, to himself. He was exceedingly determined, cruel, and tyrannical; and lawlessness and injustice were engrafted in his nature.

He commenced to act illegally, and began to seize people's possessions and property, so much so that the commonalty, and his own immediate followers, were quite miserable, and became perfectly helpless in his hands, and to such degree, that, for a period of seven years during his reign, no animal—such as the horse, camel, cow, or sheep—brought forth young, and the rain from the heavens ceased to fall; and, according to one story, women also did not bear children, through the ill-luck consequent on his tyranny.

The chronicler thus states, that he possessed two fine [and powerful] dogs, which were constantly kept fastened by heavy chains, and iron collars round their necks. One of these dogs had been named Ibrāhīm of Ghaznīn, and the other, 'Abbās of Ghūr. These animals used constantly to be brought before him, and the chains to be removed from them, and they were set to fight together. Whenever the dog bearing his own name overcame the other, that day Amīr 'Abbās would make great rejoicings, and bestow liberal presents; but, on days when the dog named Ibrāhīm of Ghaznīn gained the advantage [over his antagonist], he would become infuriated, and greatly ill-treat and torment people, and not a single person among his favourites and attendants dared to say anything to him.

With all this tyranny and oppression, however, he was

* Two copies of the text style him Amīr-ul-Kāmil—the perfect or thorough Amīr.
gifted with a profound knowledge of astrology. He had taken great pains with respect to that science, and had shown vast perseverance and assiduity in its acquirement, and had gained a deep knowledge of it. In the country of Mandesh, in the Khittah [district] of Sangah, the original fortress which Busṭām-i-Zaḥāk had founded, he [Amīr 'Abbās] directed should be entirely reconstructed; and skilful artisans were obtained from parts around [for the purpose]. The walls, after the manner of a parapet, were carried from that castle, on two sides, to the strong ground on the summit of the mountain of Zār-i-Margh; and, at the foot of that mountain, on a knoll, a lofty Kašr [castle] was directed to be raised, with twelve towers; and in every tower, in likeness to the zodiacal circles in the firmament, there were thirty openings—there were six towers towards the east and north, and six others towards the west and south—marked out; and these were so arranged that, every day, the sun would shine through one of those openings approximate to the position of its rise. By this means he used to know in what degree of what sign of the zodiac the sun was on that particular day; and this performance indicates the proficiency and knowledge which Amīr 'Abbās had attained in the science of astrology.

During his reign, likewise, the Kašrs of Ghūr were constructed, and plenty reigned throughout the country; but, as people now abominated him for his excessive tyranny,

1 See the view of the Castle of Zuḥāk in Sale's "Defence of Jalālābād," and also in Hart's "Character and Costume of Afgānistān." The view in the first-mentioned work answers tolerably well to this description. It is much to be regretted that no effort was made to explore Ghūr, even by means of natives, or gain some information about it, during our occupation of Afgānistān. What a field it must be for archaeological research!

2 The Persian word "kūshk," and its 'Arabic equivalent, "kašr," signify a palace, a large and lofty stone or brick building, a castle; but here "kašr" means one of those fort-like villages, many of which, though on a smaller scale than in past ages, probably, may still be seen in scores in the tracts west of Kandahār and Ghaznī, as well as in other parts of Afgānistān. Our author says above, that these structures "were constructed" in the time of 'Abbās, but of course many must have existed before, and his own statements confirm it. He must mean that many more were constructed during the chieftainship of 'Abbās. Sometimes he uses the 'Arabic, at others the Persian word. There are several places which were once fortified after the above fashion still remaining in Afgānistān, such as Kūshk-i-Safed, Kūshk-i-Nākhūd, and others, but not "Khushk," as written by recent travellers. Khushk signifies "dry."
oppression, and injustice, and the empire of Ghaznin, and
throne of sovereignty, had passed to Sultan Rażżi-ud-Din,
Ibrāhim, son of Mas'ūd, a party of the most powerful and
eminent men, and the nobles of Ghūr, despatched letters to
Ghaznin, imploring the Sultan's assistance.

In conformity with these solicitations, Sultan Ibrahim
marched a large army into Ghūr; and, when he reached
it, the whole of the forces of Ghūr went over to that
monarch, and they delivered Amir 'Abbās into the Sultan's
hands. He commanded that Amir 'Abbās should be
placed in confinement, and he took him away to Ghaznin,
and conferred the territory of Ghūr upon his [Amir 'Abbās']
son, Amir Muḥammad.

VII. AMIR MUḤAMMAD, SON OF 'ARBĀS.

When Sultan Ibrahim, son of Mas'ūd, seized Amir
'Abbās, and sent him away to Ghaznin, at the solicitations
of the chief personages and eminent men of Ghūr, he made
over the country to Amir Muḥammad-i-'Abbās.

He was endowed with great good nature, was of ex-
ceeding amiability of heart, and of excellent disposition,
most just, conscientious, and merciful, a patron of the
learned, an impartial judge, and a cherisher of the weak
and helpless. In the place of every one of the odious and
hateful proclivities towards inhumanity and tyranny which
were in his father, the disposition of the son was implanted
with a thousand amiable and admirable qualities.

8 These operations are not mentioned by other authors; but a few notice,
very briefly, that Amir 'Abbās carried on hostilities with Sultan Ibrahim.

4 This too is pretty good proof, by our author's own account, that the Ghūris
were subject to the Sultan of Ghaznin; but, as the power of the latter
decreased, consequent on the rise of the Saljūqs, and after Mas'ūd-i-Karīm's
death, the Ghūris acquired more power. See top of next page.

8 Which is impossible, if what other writers state as to Husain, son of Sām,
having been saved from shipwreck, and Ibrahīm's son, Mas'ūd-i-Karīm,
having conferred the chieftainship on him, be taken into consideration. Mu-
ḥammad, son of Sūrī, was taken prisoner in 400 H., or, according to some
accounts, in 401 H. From that time, up to 493 H., when Mas'ūd-i-Karīm
conferred the fief of the tributary province of Ghūr upon Husain, son of Sām,
son of Hasan, son of Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, none of this family held inde-
pendent sway over Ghūr. As already shown from the account of Mas'ūd the
Martyr's expedition into it, it was held by several petty chiefs independent of
each other. See note 7, page 321.
When the territory of Ghūr was assigned to Amir Muḥammad, the whole of the grandees, the chiefs, and most distinguished personages of the country, submitted to his authority; and, to the best of his ability and power, he began to labour and study to revive and restore the observances of goodness and utility, and the laws and usages of benevolence, beneficence, and justice. He used to render homage to the Sultāns of Ghaznīn with heartiness and loyalty, and pay them submission and vassalage, and used to despatch the fixed tribute regularly.

During his reign the gates of repose and tranquillity were opened to the people of Ghūr, and they all passed their days in the enjoyment of peace and security; happiness and plenty reigned; and his country, his people, and his retainers dwelt for a long while in the enjoyment of competency and affluence, up to the period when he passed away and was received into the mercy of God.

VIII. MALIK ḲUTṬ-B.UD-DĪN, AL-ḤASAN, SON OF MUḤAMMAD, SON OF 'ABBĀS.

Malik Ḳutṭ-b-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan, the grandfather of the great Sultāns of Ghūr, was a just Amir, high-principled, and of handsome countenance. The proofs of his goodness, equity, clemency, and beneficence were sufficiently obvious and manifest to the inhabitants of Ghūr.

Such factions as were in the habit of acting contumaciously he used to occupy himself in chastizing and overthrowing, and considered it incumbent on himself to punish severely the disaffected and seditious. The tribes of the territory of Ghūr, having sprung from families of 'Arabs, and having been nurtured, and grown up, in a

---

6 According to the statements of other authors given in note 7, page 321, the grandfather of the Sultāns of Ghūr, that is to say, of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, and his brothers, was Ḥasan, son of Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, who was let down from the tower by his father, and who had a son, Ḥusain, the IXth chief mentioned by our author. But, according to the other tradition quoted by Rauṣat-uss-Safā, Ḥabib-uss-Siyar, and other histories, in the same note, their grandfather would be Sām, son of Ḥasan, grandson of Sūrī, who was drowned. See note 4, page 335, in which it is stated that "Ḥusain, son of Sām, of the race of Sūrī," was taken captive by Sultān Sanjar in 501 H.

7 See note 4, page 330. The Afghāns have, certainly, as well as other mountain tribes, behaved at all times in the manner mentioned here, but so
mountainous tract of country, obstinacy, turbulence, and contumacy were implanted in the constitutions and characters of the whole of the Ghūrīān tribes. Feuds and contentions would continually arise of one tribe against another, and conflicts constantly ensue. Every year one district or another of the territory of Ghūr would manifest antagonism [to the constituted authority] and withhold the payment of the regulated amount of revenue; and up to [near] this present time, when the dominion of the Ghūrīān Sulṭāns came to its termination, the state of these peoples continued to be seen and witnessed [after the same fashion].

Upon one occasion, during the time of Malik Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn, Hasan, a tribe who dwelt in Tak-āb of the territory of Wajristān, rose in rebellion. Malik Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn, with his followers and the chiefs of Ghūr, appeared at the foot of that Kūshk and the stronghold of that faction, and summoned them to surrender. They refused to submit, and commenced hostilities. Unexpectedly, by destiny’s decree, an arrow from the bow of fate came from the rebels and struck Malik Ḥuṭb-ud-Dīn in the eye, and, as it had wounded a mortal part, he died from the injury. His retainers and followers, immediately on seeing the effect of that arrow’s wound, with the utmost daring, and putting forth all their energy, attacked and carried the Kūshk and stronghold by storm, and put the whole of the rebels to the sword, and that place was completely destroyed. Up

have the people styled Kohistānīs, who inhabit the valleys immediately north of Kābul, and also the Balūghīs, and they [the latter] have not yet, I believe, been quite made Paṭāns of, although some progress has been made towards it. Such conduct seems inherent in all mountain races, whether in the east or in the west.

* There is a river and valley of Tag-āo, or Tag-āb, in Afghānīstān, but to them cannot possibly be referred the locality indicated here, for they are some sixty miles to the eastward of Kābul. I think the translation of this compound word may throw some light on its whereabouts. The word “Tag-āb,” or “Tag-āb,” both of which forms are correct, also the forms in use among natives of those parts—Tak-āo and Tag-āo, and Āb-i-Tang—are described by an old author as “ground furrowed by water [a ravine or series of ravines], a defile, a valley between two mountains, and ground, whether in a valley or not, in which, here and there, water collects and remains, and in some places flows, and in which there is pasture and much verdure. They are also used for the name of a territory, and there is a small district so named.” I think the place alluded to by our author is not far from Āb-Iṣīdah, but more to the west. Wajristān has been often mentioned in the account of the Ghaznawīs.
to the time of the last of the Sultāns of Ghūr, and the termination of the sovereignty of the Shansabānīs, no king would grant permission for the restoration of that Kūshk, its equipments, and the suburbs of that place, with the exception of the Kūshk of Amir Kharnak, which was in that Āb-i-Tang, for his ancestors had always been obedient.

When Kūtb-ud-Din, Ḥasan, departed this life, his son, Amir Ḥusain, succeeded him.

IX. MALIK 'IZZ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN, ABŪ-UṢ-ṢALĀṬAIN, SON OF KUṬB-UD-DĪN AL-ḤASAN.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, was a sovereign upright, of handsome countenance, devout, and endowed with all good qualities, and distinguished for his many virtues. During the period of his rule, the territory of Ghūr and the Bilād-i-Jibāl [mountain country] were populous and prosperous; and the tribes and inhabitants of those tracts enjoyed ease and content, and, under his protection, lived in safety and security. Priests, recluses, and holy men, and the whole of the people, without interruption, attained the fulfilment of their requirements and desires in an abundant degree.

The Almighty God blessed his devoutness and good disposition by bestowing upon him seven sons, the fame of whose sovereignty and dominion became published throughout the seven climates of the world. Of these sons four attained unto empire and dominion; and from them descended sons of renown in the world, who became

---

9 Discrepancy more or less exists among all the copies of the original here. The oldest and most trustworthy are as above. The Paris copies too are defective, and in one copy the last part of this sentence runs:—"No sovereign set about the restoration of that Kūshk, except Amir Kharnak, who was in the neighbourhood of that Āb-i-Tang, and those parts were obedient to him."

1 One of the oldest copies has "Abū-1-Mulāk" here, instead of Abū-uṣ-Ṣalāṭain.

2 See note 4, page 320, and note 5, page 332. 'Izz-ud-Dīn, the title, signifies "Glory, &c., of the Faith," but "'A'īs-ud-Dīn" nothing, for it is meaningless. Ḥusain also is his correct name, confirmed by numerous other authors, and Ḥasan was his father's name, as our author states.

3 Ghūr is mountainous enough, surely, as well as the Bilād-i-Jibāl. From our author's statement, however, they are separate tracts of country.
sovereign princes, as will be subsequently narrated and recorded.

This Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, was firmly attached to and in amity with, the Sanjarī dynasty and the Saljuqī sovereignty; and every year he used to despatch to the court of Sulṭān Sanjar such things as had been customary and established, such as armour, coats of mail, steel caps, and other equipments, and war material. There is also

His "attachment to the Sanjarī dynasty" may also easily be accounted for. In 501 H., Sulṭān Sanjar, whilst in charge of Khurāsān, nine years before he became supreme ruler of the Saljuq empire, fought a battle with the Malikīs [here a further proof that there were several petty chiefs] of Ghūr, who were of the race of Sūrī, and Ḥusain ['Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, of our author], son of Sām, was made prisoner. Sulṭān Sanjar ordered him to be put to death; but, at the intercession of the celebrated Shaikh Ahmad, Ghazzālī, the Sulṭān of Māshā'īkhw, as he is styled, he was spared, and set free. For two years he used to light the fires of the cooks of the Sulṭān's army, until, one day, the Amīr of the troops of Khurāsān, 'Imād-ud-Daulah, Kīmāj, chanced to meet with him. He took compassion on Ḥusain, and represented his case to the Sulṭān, who directed that Ḥusain should be brought to his presence. When he was admitted, he kissed the ground of the Sulṭān's court. Sanjar said to him:—"I understand that thou hast neither wealth nor power left to thee, notwithstanding thou wast a chief and leader. Has neither kindliness nor sympathy been left to thee?" Ḥusain replied:—"When this head was my own head, I had the good fortune to be attended by a thousand servants, but now that it belongs to thee, thou keepest me thus wretched and abject."

Rasīd-ud-Dīn, who also relates this anecdote [but, strange to say, under the account of his son, 'Alī-ud-Dīn, although he calls him Ḥusain too, and leaves out all mention of the first part of the name, 'Alī-ud-Dīn], says that Ḥusain wandered about the Sulṭān's camp for two years as a mendicant [our author would scorn to relate this, as it did not tend to the glorification of the Ghūrs, and their slaves, his patrons], when "one day Amīr Kīmāj was passing the shop of a cook, he chanced to notice Ḥusain, who was attending the fire, and watching the cook's pot." When admitted to the presence of the Sulṭān, Rasīd-ud-Dīn says the Sulṭān thus addressed Ḥusain:—"I gather that thou hast neither wealth nor power left to thee: hast thou not the means and the power of keeping one head and face clean?" The rest of the anecdote agrees with Faṣīḥ-ī, related above.

Sulṭān Sanjar was touched, took pity on him, pardoned him, and sent him back to his native country attended by a large following; and to the end of his days Ḥusain paid obedience to that monarch.

Faṣīḥ-ī further states that "Ḥusain, son of Sām, who escaped drowning, and the sword of the executioner," only died in 545 H. He ruled that territory justly; and, up to his time even, great numbers of the inhabitants of the mountain tracts of Ghūr had not been converted to Islām, but were made converts of by him. This Ḥusain, the same chronicler states, was succeeded by his son, 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, in that same year. For further particulars, see under 'Alī-ud-Dīn, note 2, pages 347 to 350.

Ghūr, and mountain tracts around, appear to have been famous for the manufacture of arms and armour; and iron mines must have been worked therein.
THE SHANSABĂNĪAH DYNASTY OF GHŪR. 337

a remarkably fine breed of dogs in Ghūr, so powerful that, in frame and strength, every one of them is a match for a lion⁶. A number of this breed of dogs, with valuable collars round their necks, Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Ḥusain, was in the habit of sending to the Sulṭān's [Sanjar's] presence; and he used to receive in return dresses of honour and many valuable presents.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Din likewise was wont to keep on terms of amity and friendship with the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn⁷; and for a considerable length of time the government of the territory of Ghūr was held by him up to the period when he died.

He had [as before stated] seven sons, the eldest of whom was Malik Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas'ūd, of Bāmīān, but an account of whom will be contained in another chapter on the Sulṭāns of Bāmīān, which will commence with a mention of him, and be therein recorded.

The names of his sons are as follow:—Malik Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas'ūd, Amir of Bāmīān and Ṭukhāristan; Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Din, Sām, Amir of Ghūr and Firūz-koh; Malik-ul-Jībāl, Ḥuṭb-ud-Din, Muḥammad, Amir of Ghūr, and Firūz-koh; Sulṭān Saif-ud-Din, Sūrī, sovereign of Ghūr and Ghaznīn; Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Din, Ḥusain⁸, sovereign of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, and Bāmīān; Malik Shihāb-ud-Din,

⁶ This fine breed of dogs, or rather one very similar, still exists among the Ghalzī tribe of Afghāns, who trace their descent on the father's side only from the son of a chief of Ghūr, whom their traditions style Shāh Ḥusain; but he fled from Ghūr, and took shelter among the Afghāns at a much earlier period, in the time of the Khalfah, 'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Mirwān, who reigned from 66 H. to 86 H. He was adopted by an Afghān Shaikh; but the names of his ancestry, as mentioned by the Afghān historians, do not agree with those mentioned by our author. This Shāh Ḥusain's grandfather, according to them, was forty-ninth in descent from Zuhāk. Had not the names and the dates been so very different, I should have been inclined to consider Shāh Ḥusain of the Ghalzīs, and the Ḥusain of others, who was saved from shipwreck, and received the fief of Ghūr from Mas'ūd-i-Karīm, as one and the same person.

⁷ Sulṭān Mas'ūd conferred the sovereignty upon [Izz-ud-Din] Ḥusain in 493 H., the year after the decease of his own father, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm. It is no wonder he kept on good terms with his suzerains. Faṣīḥ-i says he died in 545 H., and that this was the same Ḥusain, son of Sām, and one of the kindred of Muḥammad, son of Sūrī. See preceding page, note ⁶. It is strange, but several of the best copies of the text have "Sulṭāns of Ghūr and Ghaznīn" here.

⁸ In two copies he is here styled Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Din-i-Sām.
Muḥammad, Kharnak, Malik of Mādin of Ghūr; and Malik Shujāʿ-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Amir of Jarmās of Ghūr.

X. MALIK-UL-JIBĀL, ҚUṬB-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF [IZZ-UD-DĪN] AL-ḤUSAIN.

Of the seven sons of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, the eldest among them all was Malik Faḵr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, of Bāmīān, mention of whom will be made in the other chapter [referred to previously], the foundation of the dynasty of the Sulṭāns of Bāmīān dating from the rise of his power¹. His mother was a Turki handmaid; and after him, in succession [in age], came the Malik-ul-Jibāl [the Lord of the Mountains], Қuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad². His mother was a woman who was of no high descent, and was the Ḥājībah [Chamberlain] and attendant of the mother of the other

---

¹ Some copies have Ḥarmās, and some Barmās.
² This was the proper place to have separated these dynasties, as this chief was the first of the rulers of Ghūr and Fīruz-koh after the patrimony had been divided. This has been done by other writers, but they make Қuṭb-ud-Dīn the first of the dynasty of Ghūr and Ghaznīn, and his brother, Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, second. Had our author given an account of Saif-ud-Dīn second, as in the order of the events, instead of last, he would have saved his readers some perplexity and trouble.
³ So far, other writers agree pretty well with our author, but here considerable difference arises. The Muntaḵhab-ut-Tawārikh, quoting other authors, says, that Қuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, who is known as the Malik-ul-Jibāl [Lord of the Mountains], was sent for by Bahram Shāh of Ghaznīn—after he had made an accommodation with the sons of Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain—and that he made him his son-in-law; but, through his having being suspected of a crime, he was removed by poison. This is said to have been the first enmity that arose between the Ghaznawīds and the Ghūrs, but such is not correct, as already shown. Jahān-Ārā agrees with the above, however, with this exception, that, in the latter, it is stated that he, the Malik-ul-Jibāl, came from Ghūr and presented himself at the Court of Bahram Shāh. The Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmī, and some others, however, agree more with our author's statement, and say, that Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, on the death of his father, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, succeeded to the dominion of Ghūr, and divided the patrimony among his brothers, one of whom [Қuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad] became irritated with his brothers, and went to the Court of Bahram Shāh, who put him to death for some reason; and this caused enmity between the two houses. The Raṣṭat-ṣaḥrah and some others, however, consider this statement very weak, and quote the tradition which I have already given at page 321, note 7, and state, that, after the death of Ḥusain, enmity arose between his descendants and Bahram Shāh of Ghaznīn, and hostilities took place between them upon several occasions, which will be subsequently referred to.
sons, the Sulṭāns, namely, Sulṭān Sūrī; Sulṭān * Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām; Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain; Amir [Shiḥāb-ud-Dīn] Muḥammad; and Amir [Shuṭa'-ud-Dīn] 'Alī *, the other sons of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain.

When Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, who was the father of the Sulṭāns, departed this life, Sulṭān [Saif-ud-Dīn] Sūrī, in succession to his father, ascended the throne * and divided his father's dominions among his brothers. An account of Sulṭān Sūrī will, please God, be given in the chapter on the Sulṭāns of Ghaznī.

In this division, the territory of Warṣhādah * was assigned to the Malik-ul-Jībāl, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and there he fixed his seat of government. Subsequently, it so happened, that he had to seek for a [suitable] place in which to found a strong fortress and a handsome city, such as would be suitable to his dignity. He despatched persons on whom he could depend into the parts adjacent, until [at length] his opinion led him to fix upon the position of Firūz-koh, and he founded the fortress and city of Firūz-koh *.

Sulṭān Sūrī made the fortress and town of Istīḥā * his capital, and to Malik Nāṣir *-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Mādīn

---

* Styled Sulṭān without reason: Malik is his correct title, as given at the head of this notice in the copies of the text.

* These two last, here styled Amīrs, are the sixth and seventh sons mentioned over leaf, viz. Malik Shiḥāb-ud-Dīn [called Nāṣir-ud-Dīn subsequently], Muḥammad, and Malik Shuṭa'-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, the XIth and XIIth of the family.

* See note *, page 336.

* Some few copies have Warṣhād, and Warṣhār.

* In several other places our author mentions "the territory of Ghūr and the Bilād-ul-Jībāl," thus indicating that they were separate; and yet Firūz-koh was the capital of the Bilād-ul-Jībāl, and in his account of the division of their father, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain's, territory, and the names of the districts, the whole appeared included in Ghūr, of which Firūz-koh was the capital! The mention of the places shows the extent of the territory held by these chiefs—the mighty monarchs of our author. It is a curious fact, and a very important one, that the name of Kandahār never once occurs in our author's work. It is not strange, however, because Kandahār is a comparatively modern place, and is not mentioned by contemporary writers, under that name at least, until very many years after our author's time. Tradition says that Kandahār stands a few miles east of an ancient city named Waibind; and Masson also refers to it, but calls it Vaihund. Can this be the place the idol-temple of which fell on the night of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī's birth?

* Other old writers call this place "Istīḥā, which is the name of one of the mountains of the range between Ghaznī and Hīāāt," and give the vowel points. The Burhān-i-Kāṭ * also confirms it.

* There is no son of this name among those previously mentioned. Pro-
was given. Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, had the district of Sangah, which was the capital of Mandesh, assigned to him; and the district and castle of Wajlay were made over to Sulțān 'Alā-ud-Dīn; and the probability is that the territory of Kashi [or Kashā] was fixed upon for Malik Fakhruddīn.

By heaven's decree, however, contention arose between the Malik-ul-Jibāl [Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad], who was at Firūz-koh, and the other brothers; and the Malik-ul-Jibāl became indignant with his brothers, and withdrew to Ghaznin; and it was [at this time] the reign of Bahrām Shāh. This Malik-ul-Jibāl was endowed with great beauty and comeliness, and urbanity to perfection. When he reached Ghaznin he opened the hand of munificence and liberality; and affection for him, according to the saying, "Man is the servant of kindliness," began to take root in people's hearts, and became firmly established. The inhabitants of Ghaznin entertained a great liking for him, but a number of envious persons set upon him, and had it represented to Bahrām Shāh that he [the Malik-ul-Jibāl] was, with treacherous eyes, regarding that sovereign's haram [some female or females of his family], and was expending his property liberally, with the object of rising against him [Bahrām Shāh]. The latter issued commands to administer to him, secretly, poisoned sharbat [which was done], and he died; and they, moreover, buried him at Ghaznin. On this account, enmity and hatred arose between the Mahmūdi family, and the family of Shansabi, and the race of Zuḥāk.

When the account of what had befallen Kuṭb-ud-Dīn reached Sulțān Sūri's hearing, he marched an army to Ghaznin and took that country, as will be hereafter recorded, since, although this was the place for mentioning

bably, Shihāb-ud-Dīn is meant, or, otherwise, Shihāb is a mistake for Naṣīr; but there is a Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusayn, son of Muḥammad, mentioned immediately after Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, at page 343, which see.

1 One of the Paris copies has ٤٠٤٧ — the Maiden's Castle—but the majority, including the oldest copies, have ٤٠٤٧, and some have ٤٠٤٧, which a copyist may have read ٤٠٤٧. One copy has ٤٠٤٧. Their enmity, according to other authors, appears to have had a different origin. See under 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusayn, page 347.

2 All the copies collated agree with regard to this part of the sentence—"the race of Shansabī and the race of Zuḥāk."

3 Four different verbs are used in the different copies of the text in this sentence, although the signification conveyed is much the same.
and recording the proceedings of Sulṭān Sūrī, still, as Sulṭān Sūrī was the first person of this family who assumed the name of Sulṭān, and the first to ascend the throne of Ghaznīn, an account of him will, please God, be given in another chapter, at the beginning of the history of the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn.

XI. SULṬĀN BAḤĀ-UD-DĪN, SĀM, SON OF IZZ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN.

When the Malik-ul-Jibāl retired to Ghaznīn [as previously related], and left the buildings of the city of Firūz-koh in an unfinished state, Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, came from [the territory of] Sangah to Firūz-koh, and went on with the building of the city and fortification, and brought to completion those edifices and the royal palaces. He also commanded the erection of the fortresses of Ghūr, and contracted alliance and entered into amity with the Shārs of Gharjistān. He ascended the throne of Firūz-koh in the year 544 H. When the construction of the capital of Firūz-koh was completed through his propitious auspices, he gave directions for the construction of four strong fortresses on the confines of the territory of Ghūr, Garmsīr, Gharjistān; and the mountain tract of Hirāt, and the Kaṣr

8 In some copies the names of his children follow immediately after his name and title.

6 The Shārs of Gharjistān, who had for many years acknowledged the suzerainty of the Sāmānfs, had submitted to the suzerainty of Sulṭān Maḥmūd as early as 389 H. The Shār, Abū Naṣr, son of the Shār, Rāshīd, and Abū Naṣr’s son, the Shār, Abū Muhammad, acknowledged the Sulṭān’s suzerainty in that year, and read the khaṭṭāb for him, and impressed his name and titles upon their coin. In 405 H. the Shār, Abū Naṣr, who had become dissatisfied, was seized and imprisoned by Maḥmūd’s command—his father, Rāshīd, is said to have solicited protection some time before, and it was granted [‘Utba’ agrees, and says ‘he went into retirement”]; and he had presented himself at Court. The Sulṭān purchased from him [the Shār] his possessions in Gharjistān, and had made over the price in money to him. This was one hundred and forty-six years before the time our author says Bahā ud-Dīn, Sām, became ruler. The Shār, Abū Naṣr, died in prison, at Hirāt, in 406 H., after which the Shārs are not mentioned by other writers.

7 Bahā-ud-Dīn died in 544 H., the same year in which he succeeded. His brother, Sūrī, had been put to death, and Bahām Shāh of Ghaznīn had died the previous year. Our author’s mode of arrangement here causes confusion. Bahā ud-Dīn is the third of the dynasty of Ghūr and Ghaznīn, and only succeeded after Saif-ud-Dīn had been put to death. See also the Kitāb-al-Yamīn of Al-‘Utba’.
of Kajūrān in the district of Garmsir and Ghūr, the fortress of Sher-Sang in the mountains of Hirāt, and that of Bindār [or Pindār], in the hills of Gharjistān, and Fīwār, between Gharjistān and Fāras [or Bāras].

After the martyrdom of [Saif-ud-Din], Sūrī [yet to be mentioned], as Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Dīn was the eldest of the five brothers [styled Sulṭāns], the sovereignty of the kingdom of Ghūr devolved upon him. The Malikah of Kidān, who was also of Shansabāṇī lineage, the daughter of Malik Badr-ud-Dīn of Kidān, was married to him, and Almighty God blessed him with two sons and three daughters by that Malikah of high descent. The sons were Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām—the Almighty illumine them!—the amplitude of whose dominions comprehended the eastern quarter of the world, and the fame of whose expeditions against infidels, whose holy wars, the energy and vigour of whose rule, justice, and beneficence will continue imperishable and manifest on the outspread world until the latest revolutions of time. Some of those glorious actions and annals in the account of each of them, by way of ensample, will, please God, be subsequendy recorded.

Of the daughters, one was the Malikah-i-Jahān, mother of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Zangī; the second, the Ḥurrah-i-Jalālī, mother of Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, son of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ud, of Bāmīān; and the third daughter was the Malikah-i-Khurāsān, the mother of Alb-Arsalān-i-Ghāzi, son of Malik Kaẓil-Arsalān, Saljūḵī, the brother's son of Sulṭān Sanjar.

When the account of the affliction and degradation which had befallen Sulṭān Sūrī at Ghaznīn, through the hostility and perfidy of the retainers of the Maḥmūdī dynasty, reached the hearing of Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, he came to the determination of wreaking vengeance upon the inhabitants of Ghaznīn, and, without occupying himself

---

* Sām was not his name, nor the name of his brother; neither does our author mean that such should be supposed; but some translators have supposed it was the son's name instead of the father's.

* Malikah-i-Jībāl in nearly every copy, but the above is correct.

* Other authors style him Alb-i-Ghāzi only. He held the fief of Hirāt subject to the Ghūrī Sulṭān upon one of the occasions when Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, invested it. See note 9, page 257.
in mourning ceremonies for his brothers, he assembled the forces of Ghür, and of the parts and tracts around, and on the confines of it, and of the hill-tracts of Jarūm and Ghar jistān; and, having arranged and ordered them, he turned his face towards Ghaznīn in order to accomplish that important matter. After great preparation, and being fully equipped, he moved forward, and a large army marched under his standards. When he reached the district of Kidān, excessive anxiety and grief for the death of his brothers, and the strength of his feelings, brought on an attack of illness, and there [at Kidān] he died.

In the same manner as Sulṭān Sūrl, at the time of his proceeding against and capturing Ghaznīn, had entrusted the capital of the kingdom of Ghür, and had made over the government of that territory to him, Sulṭān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, the latter, at this time, when about to march an army himself against Ghaznīn, assigned the capital of Ghür, and the rule over the territory of the Jībāl [mountain tracts] to Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain-i-Jahān-soz [his brother], and consigned to him his children, dependents, Amīrs, property, and effects.

When Bahā-ud-Dīn died at Kidān, and that circumstance came to the hearing of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥuṣain, he, likewise, without occupying himself in mourning ceremonies, assembled together the forces with all celerity, and set out towards Ghaznīn.

XII. MALIK SHIHĀB-UD-DĪN⁴, MUḤAMMAD, [KHARNAK,] SON OF AL-ḤUSAIN, MALIK OF MĀDĪN OF GHÜR.

Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Kharnak, was the brother of the Sulṭāns; and the district of Mādīn, which

---

² His two brothers, Kuṭḥ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and Saʿīd-ud-Dīn, Sūrl.
³ He is said to have died of small-pox, but the word used also signifies a tumour, and the like. Raʿṣat-us-Safā and some others say Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, died of phrensy, or inflammation of the brain, on the way back to Ghür, after the taking of Ghaznīn by 'Alā-ud-Dīn, and his brother, Saʿīd-ud-Dīn, Sūrl, who was left there as ruler! See note ³, page 347.
⁴ Here again some copies of the text use different verbs to express the same meaning.
⁵ He is called Naṣīr-ud-Dīn repeatedly in most of the copies of the text, and in some, although the heading is written Shihāb-ud-Dīn, he is styled
was his territory, and is a tract of country on one of the confines of Ghūr, had been assigned to him by the mutual consent of his brothers, after the decease of their father.

He had two sons, one of whom was Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, whom they placed upon the throne, at the capital, Firūz-koh, during the absence of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, in Khurāsān, and his attendance⁶ at the Court of Sultān Sanjar, an account of whom will be hereafter recorded. The second son was Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī⁷, who, after his father’s death, succeeded him in the possession of the district of Mādin. This Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, had three children, one a daughter, and two sons, and the daughter was older than the sons. She was married to the holy warrior and martyr, Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām; and by her that conquering Sultān likewise had a daughter who died a maid⁸, and whose tomb is at the capital city, Ghaznīn.

Of those two sons of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, one was Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, of Mādin, who was martyred by the Turks of Khwārazm⁹ during the period of their domination. The second son was Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr; and the writer of this book, in the year 618 H., waited upon him in the territory of Kazīw [or Gazīw]¹ and Timrān, and witnessed numerous marks of urbanity and generosity from him. At that period the author had espoused¹ a daughter of one of the great men and a kinsman of his own. That was in the period of his first manhood, and in that same year in which Chingiz Khān, the

Nāṣir-ud-Dīn in the account of him. As 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain, had no son of this name, and as all the copies agree in the list of the seven sons, as to Shihāb, I have adopted that reading here, which is certainly correct. This Shihāb-ud-Dīn had a son named Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, and hence the mistake may have arisen.

⁶ His captivity in fact, but this our author did not consider necessary to mention. See note ², page 358.

⁷ Not to be confounded with 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jahān-soz’s son, nor 'Alā-ud-Dīn’s brother. There are three of his title in all.

⁸ Several copies have "died in her infancy." This can scarcely be correct, as it may be doubted whether the tomb of an infant would have been mentioned.

⁹ See note ¹, page 274.

¹ A few copies have Ḳarīw [Karīw or Garīw], and others Ḳar and Ḳar

² "Was about to espouse" in a few copies; but if he had not espoused this wife he would not probably have required a horse.
accursed, crossed the Jihün into Khurâsân, and was bent upon marching to Ghazânî. In short, the author memorialized Malik Nâşir-ud-Dîn, Abû-Bikr, for a horse, and, in verse, represented the matter of his marriage with one of his own kinswomen for that Malik's information. In reply to that versified narrative, he composed this quatrain, and with his own august hand wrote it on the back of the story, and put it into the author's hands:—

"God willing, affliction will have departed from thy heart,
And that pearl of great price will have been by thee bored ³.
The horse thou hast solicited of me requires no apology.
With the horse, much more apology might be made ⁴."

Malik Nâşir-ud-Dîn, Abû-Bikr, sent his humble servant a dun-coloured horse of three years' old, ready saddled and caparisoned—the Almighty reward him for it!

That Malik-zâdah, after the calamities which befell Ghazânî and Ghûr⁵, came to the city of Dihlî, and presented himself at the Court of the august Sulţân, Shams-ud-Dunyâ wa ud-Dîn [I-yal-timîsh], and was received by him with honour and kindness, and, from the Malik's and other nobles, he received deference and respect.

Malik Nâşir-ud-Dîn, Abû-Bikr, died at the city of Dihlî in the year 620 H.

XIII. MALIK SHUJÂ'-UD-DÎN, ABÎ-'ALÎ, SON OF AL-HUSAIN,
[SON OF SÂM], SON OF AL-ḤASAN, SHANSÂBI.

Malik Shujâ'-ud-Dîn, Abî-'Ali, son of Al-Ḥusain, son of Al-Ḥasan, was removed from this world in his early manhood, and his existence terminated whilst he was yet in the flower of his youth⁶. A son survived him, Malik 'Alâ-ud-Dîn,

³ A virgin is styled an "unbored pearl."
⁴ This somewhat obscure line may imply that the donor might have made apologies because the present was not more valuable.
⁵ At the hands of the Mughals.
⁶ From the heading the reader would suppose this article to have contained an account of Shujâ'-ud-Dîn; but he is finished in two or three lines, and the article contains an account of his son and grandson. Neither of these two brothers, Shihâb-ud-Dîn, nor Shujâ'-ud-Dîn, can be considered as belonging to the dynasty any more than the whole of the race, as they never held sovereign power. They are not named even, separately, by other writers.
Abū-'Ali; and the brothers [of Shujā'-ud-Din, Abī 'Ali'] with one accord, when dividing the dominions of Ghūr, had invested him [Shujā'-ud-Din] with the district of Jarmās. When he died, they conferred the district of Jarmās upon his son, 'Alā-ud-Din, Abū-'Ali.

The Malik-ul-Jibāl, Ḷuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, who had been martyred at Ghaznīn, had left a daughter, and she was given to 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Abū-'Ali, in marriage⁷; and, after that noble lady was espoused by him, the Almighty blessed them with a son, who had the good fortune of becoming both a Ḥājī [a pilgrim] and a holy warrior⁸, namely, Malik Žiyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Pearl of Ghūr¹, and it happened in this wise:—When [his father] Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Abū-'Ali, died, and his son grew up, the Almighty bestowed such grace upon his mother that she decided upon undertaking a journey to the Kiblāh, and up to that period not one of the Maliks of Ghūr had attained that felicity.

Malik Žiyā-ud-Dīn, in attendance upon his mother, was proceeding on the journey to the holy places by way of Hirāt, Khurāsān, and Nīshāpūr. At that time Sultan Takish, Khwārazm Shāh, was at Nīshāpūr, and Malik Žiyā-ud-Dīn, in the habit of a Sayyid, with his hair twisted into two long ringlets, presented himself at the Court of that Sultan, and had the happiness of being permitted to kiss Sultan Takish's hand.

Malik Žiyā-ud-Dīn [in the company of his mother] had the happiness of performing the orthodox pilgrimage with great reverence, and with the observance of all the rites and ceremonies. He gave directions to build a Khān-kāh [chapel] at Makkah, and provided all the necessary funds for raising the structure, and left trustworthy persons of his own to see it carried out.

He also returned, along with his mother, to the territory

⁷ Abū, or Abī-'Ali: either is correct.
⁸ Our author's mode of narration tends to confuse. This 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Abū-'Ali, is the father of Žiyā-ud-Dīn, afterwards styled 'Alā-ud-Dīn. See note ², page 391, and note ⁸, page 394.
¹ He accompanied his second cousin, Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, on his campaign against Rajā Pathara of Ajmīr. See page 125.
¹ These words دُرَّ-ٰ غُهُر, occur again in the list of Maliks at the end of Sultan Ghīyās-ud-Dīn's reign, and in some other places.
of Ghūr; and she acquired the name of the Malikah-i-Hāji [the Pilgrim Princess], and founded a great number of masjids, pulpits, and colleges in the Ghūrtlān country. May they both become acceptable in the sight of Almighty God!

XIV. SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN, SON OF [IZZ-UD-DĪN,] AL-ḤUSAIN, SON OF SĀM, SON OF AL-ḤASAN. 2

When Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, son of [Izz-ud-Dīn,] Al-Ḥusain, who was marching an army against Ghaznīn,

2 Of all the persons mentioned in Oriental history, greater discrepancy occurs with respect to 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jahān-soz's name and proceedings, probably, than regarding any other man. Some authors call him Ḥasan, son of Ḥusain; some [but these authors are but two] Ḥusain, son of Ḥasan; some, Ḥusain, son of Ḥusain, son of Ḥasan, son of Sām; others copy our author, while others again, and they seem most correct—they certainly are as to his own and his father's name—style him 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of [Izz-ud-Dīn,] Al-Ḥusain, son of Sām, son of Ḥasan [Ṣūrī's grandson], son of Muḥammad, son of Sūrī.

With respect to his rise to power, the different accounts [I quote here from sixteen authors] may be classed under no less than five heads.

The first is, that, after Sultān Bahārām of Ghaznīn had been put in possession of the throne by his maternal uncle, Sultān Sanjar, distrust arose between them [Sanjar marched to Ghaznīn to bring Bahārām to submission in 530 H., according to Faṣīḥ-ī], and, on this, Bahārām began to enter into friendly negotiations with the sons of Izz-ud-Dīn, Al-Ḥusain, and invited one of them to his capital, and expressed a wish to take him into his service, in order to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the two families. Ḥusain [the Malik-ul-Jibāl of our author], the eldest of the sons, proceeded to Ghaznīn, and for some time he was treated with great distinction, but was subsequently guilty [or suspected?] of some crime, and was put to death by Bahārām Shāh's orders.

Enmity now arose between Bahārām and the sons of Al-Ḥusain, and they began to attack each other's territory, and several encounters took place between them [Faṣīḥ-ī says they fought about Tīgīn-ābād as early as 521 H., but this may be an error for 541 H.], and our author himself in his account of Sanjar's reign, page 149, says that hostilities arose in that reign "between the Sultāns of Ghaznīn and the Malikhs of Ghūr, and the latter were overcome," and, subsequently, refers to the time when "the territory of Ghūr came under the rule of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain," and, on the death of Al-Ḥusain, their father [in 545 H., according to Faṣīḥ-ī, but it must have been five years earlier, at least], hostility, which hitherto had been concealed, was openly shown by 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, and his brothers, and they rose against Bahārām Shāh, and he set out on an expedition against Ghaznīn, accompanied by Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, and Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām [Alā's full brothers]. They were opposed by Bahārām Shāh, who was defeated, and retired into Hind.

Having obtained possession of Ghaznīn, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, left his brother, Sūrī, as ruler there, and returned to Ghūr. [This event is said to
in order to take revenge for [the slaying of his brothers], Sultan Sürî and the Malik-ul-Jibāl, died on the way thither, have occurred in the fifth month of the year 543 H. [October, 1052 A.D.], and by Fâṣîḥ-ī in 542 H. [October, 1051 A.D.]. But, as the father only died it is said in 545 H., both cannot be correct.] On the way back his brother, Sâm, died of inflammation of the brain [phrensis, according to some, a tumour, or small-pox, according to others].

In the following winter Bahārām returned from Hind with a numerous army and several elephants, and appeared before Ghazmān. Sūrī came out with 300 Ghūrīs and 1000 Ghuzz Turks, and endeavoured to reach Ghūr, but the Ghuzz deserted to Bahārām, and Sūrī was taken, paraded on a bullock through the city, and hung along with his Wazīr. This occurred in 543 H. according to Fâṣîḥ-ī, but in 544 H. according to several other trustworthy authors. 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Husain, again marched to Ghazmān to avenge Sūrī, again took the city, plundered, and fired it, then abandoned it, and returned to Fīrūz-koh, destroying all the buildings raised by the Maḥmūdī family, on his way back. This is said to have taken place in 547 H., but such cannot have been the case: it must have been towards the end of 544 H., or early in 545 H., at the latest. Alī says in 547 of the "Riblat" [death of Muḥammad, not the Hijrah], which would make it as late as 558 H.!

Most of the authors from which the above is taken contend that 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Husain, was the first of the family who attained to independent sovereignty, that the dynasty consisted of five sovereigns, and continued for a period of sixty-four years. It terminated in 607 H., so must have commenced in 543 H.

'Alī, Jatīf, and 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Husain, were defeated by Sultan Sanjar in 545 H. [some say in 544 H.], but Fâṣîḥ-ī says in 547 H., just before he [Sanjar] marched against the Ghuzz, in 548 H., which will be referred to farther on.

Fanākāf says, and somewhat astonishing it is, that Husain, brother of Sām, was put to death by Bahārām Shāh's orders, and he [Husain] went to Sultan Sanjar and solicited aid. Sanjar assisted him with an army! and he then fought a battle with Bahārām Shāh, who was defeated and retreated into Hindūstān. After this, the same author states—and the Jāmī'-ut-Tawārikh agrees—that Husain ['Alā-ud-Dīn] left his brother Sām in charge of Ghazmān, and returned himself to Ghūr. He then agrees with the statements of other writers as to the hanging of 'Alā-ud-Dīn's brother, but says it was Sām [Bahā-ud-Dīn], not Sūrī, that Bahārām Shāh took and hung after his return from Hindūstān. Husain returned, made a general massacre, and devastated the place, and 70,000 persons were slain. On this Sultan Sanjar resolved to proceed against him, and, in a battle, Husain was taken prisoner. For further particulars regarding this see page 357, and notes 2 and 3 page 358.

The second account is, that Husain ['Izz-ud-Dīn], the father of the seven sons, raised to the rulership of Ghūr by Mas'ūd-i-Karīm, having died in 545 H. [540 H.?] was succeeded by the most prominent of his sons, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Husain, who rebelled against Bahārām Shāh, marched against Ghazmān, took it, during Bahārām's absence, and set his brother, Sūrī, upon the throne of the Maḥmūdī's. Soon after Bahārām returned, and hung Sūrī. The remainder of the account agrees pretty well with the first.

The third is, that Bahārām Shāh was dead before 'Alā-ud-Dīn reached Ghazmān the second time, and in this statement a number of the most trustworthy authorities agree, and further that Khusrāw Shāh, his son, had succeeded just before 'Alā-ud-Dīn's advance, and, on his approach, Khusrāw Shāh
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at Kidán, Sultán 'Alá-ud-Dín ascended the throne of the dominion of Ghúr, and assembled the forces of Ghúr, of

abandoned Ghazní and fled to Láhor [Baiśawí states that it happened in 550 H.]; but this is the only authority for that date, which cannot be correct; and if Súrf, according to the other statement, was put to death in 544 H., 'Alá-ud-Dín would scarcely allow six years to elapse before avenging him]. On 'Alá-ud-Dín's departure, Khusrau Sháh returned to his devastated and ruined capital, and continued there until the Ghuz Turk, who had defeated and made captive Sultán Sanjar, Khusrau's maternal great uncle, invaded Khurásán, and appeared before Hirát, and from thence advanced towards Ghazní.

Sanjar had marched against the Ghuz in 548 H.—some few authors say in 547 H.—and was taken prisoner in the first month of the former year [March, 1056 A.D.]. They had invested Hirát in 549 H., and gave up the attempt early in 550, and then appear to have advanced towards Ghazní, and this must have been the year in which Khusrau Sháh finally abandoned Ghazní, and not that in which 'Alá-ud-Dín, Husain, devastated it.

Some writers, who agree generally with this last account, say that Khusrau Sháh had reigned about a year when 'Alá-ud-Dín arrived in the neighbourhood of his capital, and that he [Khusrau Sháli] was taken, and confined within the walls of the citadel, and 'Alá-ud-Dín set up his two nephews, Ghiyás-ud-Dín, and Muizz-ud-Dín, at Ghazní. Most authors say Khusrau Sháh died in 555 H., but others again state that his death took place in 544 H., and according to our author, who says he succeeded in 552 H., and reigned seven years, it would be in 559 H. See note 8, page 112.

The fourth account is, that, on the death of the father, ['Izz-ud-Dín], Al-Husain, Saíd-ud-Dín, Súrf, succeeded him, and that he seized upon Ghazní, while his other brother, 'Alá-ud-Dín, Husain, seized upon Ghúr. This is said to have taken place in 543 H., and it is further said that, after Súrf had been hanged, Bahá-ud-Dín, Sálim, set out to avenge him, and died on the way [in 544 H.].

The fifth account agrees pretty well with our author, and may have been partly copied from his work, although such a fact is not mentioned. It is to the effect, that Súrf took Ghazní to avenge the death of his brother, Kuft-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, put to death by Bahram Sháh, and that, after Súrf's death along with his Wazr, Bahá-ud-Dín, Sálim, set out to avenge him, and died on the road. 'Alá-ud-Dín, Husain, followed, on which Bahram Sháh fled, and the city was taken. The date of the first capture of Ghazní is said to have been 542 H., or 543 H. [Our author says that Bahá-ud-Dín, Sálim, succeeded to the sovereignty of Fírúz-koh and Ghúr, when Saíd-ud-Dín, Súrf, his brother, set out on his expedition against Ghazní, in 544 H.—the first date he gives in the whole Section—and tends to show that Ghazní must have been taken in 543 H.]

It is absurd to suppose that Ghazní was taken by 'Alá-ud-Dín in 550 H., and still more so to suppose that 547 of the Riḥlat could be the possible date; and, although the exact date is not to be found in authors generally, it is quite clear that Saíd-ud-Dín, Súrf, took it first in the fifth month of 543 H. [middle of October, 1051 A.D.]. Bahram returned in the depth of winter [probably in January, 1052 A.D.], and hung him. Bahá-ud-Dín, Sálim, his brother, succeeded him as ruler of Ghúr in 544 H., and died soon after, in the same year; on which 'Alá-ud-Dín, Husain, who was not one to allow five or six years to elapse, at
the capital, Firúz-koh, and of Gharjistān, and determined to march against Ghaznīn.

When Sultān Yamin-ud-Dīn, Bahram Šāh, became aware of this matter, and of his [Alā-ud-Dīn's] intention, he caused the troops of Ghaznīn and of Hindūstān to be got ready and organized, and led them from Rukhāzān and Tigīn-ābād, in the district of Garmsīr, towards Zamīn-i-Dāwar. As Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, with his forces, had already reached Zamīn-i-Dāwar, Sultān Bahram Šāh despatched envoys to him, saying, "Return again to Ghur, and in thy ancestral possession remain in quietness, for thou wilt not be able to resist my forces, for I bring elephants [along with me]." The envoys having delivered the message with which they were entrusted to Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, he replied, saying, "If thou bringest elephants, I will bring the Kharmīl; but, God knows, indeed, thou fallest into error, that thou hast put my brothers to death, and I have not slain any person belonging to thee. But hast thou not heard what Almighty God says?—"Whosoever is once marched against Ghazmīn, and took it towards the close of the same year, 544 H., the same in which Guźdāh and a few others say Bahram died. What tends to prove all this is, that in 545 H. Alā-ud-Dīn was taken captive by Sultān Sanjar, after the former had sacked Ghazmīn, and was detained in captivity some two years, during which time another ruler was set up in Ghur, and Alā-ud-Dīn only obtained his release just before Sultān Sanjar set out on his unfortunate expedition against the Guuzz, which was in 547 H., for Sanjar was defeated by them and taken prisoner, on the first day of the first month, Muḩarram, 548 H. [20th March, 1056 A.D.]. See also page 358, and notes 2 and 3.

'Alā-ud-Dīn, Hussain, made no attempt to retain possession of Ghazmīn, and he abandoned it, and retired into Ghur, but destroyed every building pertaining to the Maḥmūd' sovereigns, on his way back. The reason why he abandoned it must have been his fear of Sultān Sanjar, or of Bahram’s or Khusrāw’s return, as the case may be, and of meeting a fate similar to his brother Šīrāz’s.

* In three copies of the text at this place he is called Yamin-ud-Daulah. In his account of Bahram Šāh’s reign our author styles him Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Šāh, and says Khusrāw Šāh’s title was Mu‘ayyān-ud-Dīn. See pages 109 and 111, and note 6.

* A small tract of country in the district of Bust.

* The word ḫūrāb an elephant, is used in most copies of the text, but to make sense of the passage I have been obliged to make it a plural. The context shows there must have been more than one elephant. Some other authors have ṭūli which certainly agrees better with ṭūlīl and might be translated the chief, head, or leader of the elephants, alluding to some famous war-elephant he may have had.

* On the Kur‘ān’s authority only. It is rather strange that in his account
slain unjustly, we have given his heir, or next of kin, power [to avenge him]; but let him not exceed bounds in putting the slayer to death, because he likewise will be assisted and avenged?.

When the envoys returned, both armies were marshalled in ranks and made ready for the conflict. Sultan 'Alá-ud-Din called unto him two Pahlawâns [champions] of his own, who were the leaders of the army, and famous warriors of the kingdom of Ghûr, and both of them were named Kharmil. One was Kharmil-i-Sâm, Husain, father of Nasir-ud-Din, Husain-i-Kharmil; and the other Kharmil-i-Sâm, Banji; and both of them were famed in their day for their valour and prowess. He said unto them:—

"Bahram Shâh has sent a message, saying, 'I bring elephants [against thee],' and I have sent a reply, 'If thou bringest elephants, I bring the Kharmil.' This day it behoveth that each one of you champions should overthrow and bring an elephant to the ground." They both kissed the ground and retired [to their posts]; and, at a place which they call Kotah-bâz, the two armies came to an encounter. When the battle commenced, both these champions dismounted, fastened up the skirts of their coats of mail, and entered the fight. When the elephants of Bahram Shâh made a charge, each of those champions attacked an elephant, and got beneath the armour of the animals, and, with their poniards, ripped open the bellies of the elephants. Kharmil-i-Sâm, Banji, remained under his elephant, and it fell upon him, and he and the elephant perished together. Kharmil-i-Sâm, Husain, brought his

of Bahram Shâh's reign, pages 109—111, our author does not even mention Sûrî's name, although he refers to 'Alá-ud-Din, Husain, the brother, and the capture of Ghaznîn.

7 Ku'rân: S. 17. 35.
8 One copy has Kûnah[or Günah]-wâz, and two copies have Kotah-bâz-bâb. This last appears incorrect, and bâb seems merely bâz repeated in error by the copyist. Katah-wâz cannot be meant, although w and b are interchangeable: Katah-wâz is much too far to the east. One copy has Goshâh-i-nâb. A place of this name, or Sih Goshâh-i-nâb, has been mentioned at page 149, but this again is too far to the west. See also page 358.
9 The word used signifies to fasten up or back. "Throwing off their coats of mail" would scarcely have been likely at a time like this, and the text contains the word "skirts" moreover. See Elliot, India, vol. ii. page 287.
1 Both the British Museum copies have, "when the elephants of Bahram Shâh charged the elephants, each of the champions," &c.
elephant to the ground, and got away in safety, and mounted [his horse] again.

When the battle was duly ordered, Sulțān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, after he had arrayed himself in all his panoply, commanded that a surcoat of crimson-coloured satin should be brought to him, and he put it on over all his armour. His kinsfolk and his intimates inquired:—"What device is this of the king's, that he covers his armour with a crimson surcoat?" He answered:—"For this reason, that, in case my body should be wounded by arrow, lance, or sword, the redness of my blood, by means of the crimson surcoat, will not show upon my armour, so that the hearts of my followers may not become dejected." The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

The troops of Ghūr have a method, in the practise of fighting on foot, of making a certain article of one fold of raw bullock-hide, over both sides of which they lay cotton, and over all draw figured coarse cotton cloth, after the form of a screen [or breast-work], and the name of that article of defence is kārwah. When the foot-soldiers of Ghūr place this [screen] upon their shoulders, they are completely covered from head to foot by it; and, when they close their ranks, they appear like unto a wall, and no missile or arms can take any effect on it, on account of the quantity of cotton with which it is stuffed.

When the engagement was fairly begun, Daulat Shāh, son of Bahrām Shāh, with a body of cavalry and an

---

3 Called kurbās.
4 Our author has described this instrument of defence tolerably well, but not exactly. The word kārwah is contained in Pus'hito, and this means of protection was used by some of the Afghāns in former times, before fire-arms came into use. The kārwah was made from a raw bullock, cow, or buffalo hide stuffed with straw or hay [cotton would be too expensive], and rolled along before troops on foot, when advancing, to defend them from the arrows of their opponents. In the battles between the Yūsufzād and Dilazāk tribes of Afghāns, in the fifteenth century, of which before long I hope to be able to give an account, the Utmān Khel, one of the lesser and of the many still independent Afghān tribes [who never paid allegiance to Durrāns or Bārakzā] who accompanied the Yūsufzāds when the latter first appeared east of the Khairbar Pass, on one occasion formed the advance of the allied forces, and used these stuffed hides above described. They are said to have been very expert in their construction; but I do not think this mode of fighting will be sufficient to prove that the Ghūrs were "Paṭāns," or Paṭāns Ghūrs. Compare Elliot, INDIA, vol. ii. pages 287-8. See my Afghan Dictionary, second edition, p. 1151. London: 1867.
elephant four, made a charge. Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din directed that the foot-soldiers should open their rank of karwahs, in order to allow Daulat Shâh to enter with his whole division. They opened their ranks accordingly. When Daulat Shâh, with his body of horse and the elephant, entered, the infantry closed the breach in their ranks again, and completely surrounded that Prince on all sides; and he, with the whole of that body of horse, were martyred, and the elephant was brought to the ground, and also killed.

When the troops of Bahrâm Shâh witnessed that disaster and slaughter, they fell into disorder and gave way. Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din followed in pursuit, from stage to stage, as far as a place which they call Josh-i-Ab-i-Garm [the jet of hot-water], near to Tigîn-ābād, where Sultan Bahrâm Shâh faced about, and a second time prepared to renew the engagement; and the whole of the forces then assembled under him again gave battle, but were defeated and put to the rout, and only stopped at the gate of Ghaznîn. Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din followed in fierce pursuit, so that Bahrâm Shâh, for the third time, assembled the troops of Ghaznîn, the men of the city, and a large levy of footmen, and gave battle for the third time; but he was unable to overcome [the enemy], and was again defeated. 'Ala-ud-Din took the city of Ghaznîn by storm, and, during seven nights and days, fired the place, and burnt it with obstinacy and wantonness.

The chronicler states that, during these seven days, the air, from the blackness of the smoke, continued as black as night; and those nights, from the flames raging in the burning city, were lighted up as light as day. During these seven days, likewise, rapine, plunder, and massacre were carried on with the utmost pertinacity and vindictiveness. All the men that were found were killed, and the women and children were made captive. 'Ala-ud-Din

\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\] One elephant only is mentioned, and it is not stated that Daulât Shâh was mounted on it. It appears to have been intended to break the rank of karwas with it.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\] Our author himself says that Saif-ud-Din, Sûrî, was the first of the brothers who came into contact with Bahrâm Shâh, and 'Alî-ud-Dîn, Husain, the last; but he has so arranged his work that his account of Sûrî comes last. The reader will perhaps find it less perplexing if he should read the account of Sûrî at Section XIX., first, then that of Bâhâ-ud-Dîn, Sâm, at page 341, and this notice of 'Alî-ud-Dîn last.
commanded that the whole of the [remains of the] Maḥmūdī Sulṭāns should be exhumed from their graves and burnt, except those of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, the Ghāzī, Sulṭān Mas'ūd, and Sulṭān Ibrāhīm; and, during the whole of these seven days, 'Alā-ud-Dīn gave himself up to wine and carousel within the palaces of the Sulṭāns of Ghaznīn. During this time he gave directions so that the tomb of Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, and the mausoleum of the Malik-ul-Jibāl [Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad], were sought out, and coffins prepared; and caused preparations to be made for putting his whole army into mourning. When the eighth night came round, and the city had become entirely desolated and consumed, and its inhabitants massacred, Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, on that night, improvised several strophes eulogistic of himself, and gave them to the minstrels, with directions to sing them accompanied by their chans and chighānahs before him; and the lines, which are appropriate, are as follows:—

"The world knoweth that I of the universe am king. The lamp of the family of the 'Abbāsīs am I. 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Ḥusain, am I, Whose house's sovereignty be ever enduring! When on the bright bay steed of my dominion I sit, One, to me, will be both the heavens and the earth. Death sports around the point of my spear: Hope follows [as goad] the dust of my troops. I should roam the world through, like unto Sikandar: I should in every city another sovereign place. I was determined on this, that of the vagabonds of Ghaznīn I would set a river of blood running like unto the Nil. But they be maudlin old dotards and infants, And my blooming fortune maketh intercession for them. For their own sakes I have granted them their lives, That the granting of their lives may of mine be the bond."

---

* Other writers state that the bones of the whole of the Maḥmūdī sovereigns were exhumed and burnt, with the sole exception of those of Sulṭān Maḥmūd.

? The greater number of copies of the original leave out the words یک —mourning—entirely; whilst the Bodleian MS., the R. A. S. MS., and one of the Paris copies have یک —food! The other Paris copy has یک —fighting, making war, &c. !

* He was gifted with a poetical genius.

* The first is a kind of guitar, or harp, and the latter a kind of violin.

* 'Alā-ud-Dīn had evidently an excited opinion of himself, or had imbibed more strong drink than was good for him.

* Several other works which give this poem leave out these two lines.

* As far as can be judged from all the exaggeration contained in these
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He then commanded, saying, "I have spared the remainder of the people of Ghaznin," and he arose from the assembly, and went to the hot-bath; and, on the eighth day of these proceedings, he got up at day-dawn, and, accompanied by the whole of the troops of Ghûr, and the Malikṣ [chiefs], came to the mausoleum of his brothers. He then donned mourning garments, together with his whole army, and, for [another] seven nights and days, he remained at the mausoleum observing funeral ceremonies.

During this period the whole Kurān was read through several times, and alms were there distributed; and the coffins of his brothers were placed on biers, and he [Alâ-ud-Dîn] marched from Ghaznin towards the districts of Dâwar and Bust. On reaching the city of Bust, he entirely destroyed the palaces and other edifices of the Maḥmûdî dynasty, the like of which were not to be found in the regions of the world; and the whole territory, which appertained to the Maḥmûdî sovereigns, he directed should be ravaged and desolated.

He returned to Ghûr, and, by his command, the corpses of his brothers were deposited by the side of their ancestors. He had ordered that several Sayyids of Ghaznin should be seized, according to the law of retaliation, in the place of Sayyid Majd-ud-Dîn, Mûsawlî, who was Sultân Sürlî's Wazîr, and who, along with Sultân Sürlî, they had hung up from one of the arches [of the bridge?] of Ghaznin, boastful effusions of 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Husain, he seems to have imagined that his own life might be lengthened in proportion to the lives he spared, after he had caused almost the whole of the inhabitants of Ghaznin to be massacred!

4 The word ḫâlî has other meanings besides "cradle." Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii, p. 289.

5 Such as mosques, colleges, fortifications, &c.

6 Some ruins of those edifices still remain. An intelligent man, a native of Kandahâr, and an Afghân, says these ruins are of immense size and height, particularly one arch, which was standing some few years since, said to have been one of the great mosque. There was also a stone bridge across the river Hîrmand, near this arch, called the Pul-i-'Ashîrîn—the Lovers' Bridge—remains of which may still be seen.

7 The whole of the district of Zamîn-i-Dâwar, I presume. The territory of the Maḥmûdî sovereigns, even at that time, was of great extent, and Ghûr formed only a very small portion of it.

8 The word used by our author signifies tombs, sepulchres, and the like, which, of course, would scarcely be interred. The coffins and their contents were interred.

9 The word used here is ṭâl, signifying an arch, among other meanings,
and they were brought before the Sultān. Bags were filled with the earth\(^1\) of Ghaznīn, and placed upon their backs, and they were brought along with him to Firūz-koh, the capital; and, on reaching that city, the Sayyids were put to death, and their blood was mixed with the earth which had been brought from Ghaznīn, and from it several towers\(^2\) were erected on the hills of Firūz-koh, which towers, moreover, were still remaining up to this present time. The Almighty pardon him!

After he had wreaked such vengeance as this, and returned to the capital again, 'Alā-ud-Dīn desired to devote himself to pleasure and revelry; and he gathered around him minstrels and boon companions, betook himself to conviviality and carousel, and improvised lines which he directed the minstrels to sing, and accompany on their harps and violins\(^3\). These are the lines:

\begin{quote}
"I am [he] in whose justice the world hath exultation;
And I am [he] through whose munificence the treasury sustaineth injustice.
The finger of his hand, to his teeth, the enemy placeth;\(^4\)
When, to the string of the bow, I the thimble apply.\(^5\)"
\end{quote}

and it is also a proper name; but no word signifying a bridge is used in any copy of the text collated, but some other writers say it was the Tāk Bridge—the bridge leading to Tāk, in Zābulistān, probably. Another writer, however, says, Sūrf and his Wazīr were hung at the head of "the Bridge of Two Arches"—سريل دو طاقی—and this is probably correct. In his account of Sūrf, farther on, our author says it was the Bridge of One Arch. See the first of the Ghaznīn dynasty, Section XIX.

\(^1\) Khab signifies earth, not "dirt." The context shows what this earth was intended for, but dirt would scarcely have answered for making mortar.

\(^2\) Another author states that it was the remainder of the people of Ghaznī—not Sayyids only—that 'Alā-ud-Dīn removed, and that they were laden with sacks of earth from that city, and on their arrival at Firūz-koh they were slaughtered, and a building was raised from the earth which was mixed with their blood. The word used by our author signifies a tower, bastion, &c. The probability is that they were small towers, such as are raised for landmarks, and that the earth brought from Ghaznī, mixed with the blood of the Sayyids, and amalgamated with the mortar, was used for these buildings.

\(^3\) Here again the idiom of the different copies of the original varies so much that it would lead one to imagine that the work of our author must, originally, have been written in a different language. One set of copies has مطران را چونو تا در چون و هیلا پرود و بنا ود and whilst another set of copies has مطران را چونو تا در عمل ژامیر آورود و بسانند و پرود and throughout the work the two sets agree word for word almost. The latter set is the least trustworthy.

\(^4\) In token of astonishment.

\(^5\) A sort of thimble used by archers to protect the left thumb from the bow-string.
When my bay steed leap’d a square within the ranks,
The adversary no longer knew ball from square. 6

When, out of hatred towards me, Bahram Shâh 7 bent the bow,
I pluck’d, with my lance, the quiver from his waist.
The support of my foe, although they were all Râes [and] Rânahs,
I reduced, with my mace, to atoms, both Râes’s and Rânah’s head. 8

to draw forth vengeance by the sword, I have indeed taught
The sovereigns of the time, and the kings of the age.
Ah, ravishing Minstrel! since I am released from war,
Sing that strain indeed, and that melody enkindle.
When fortune hath been grasp’d, it is not right to renounce
The singers’ melody, nor the fire-worshippers’ pure wine.’’

Trustworthy persons have related after this wise, that,
when Sulţân ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn ascended the throne of Firuz-
koh, he ordered his nephews, Ghiyâs-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-
i-Sâm, and Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-Sâm, sons of
Sulţân Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad Sâm, to be imprisoned,
and they were confined in the fortress of Wajristân, 1
and an allowance was fixed for their support.

He [‘Alâ-ud-Dîn] also began to show a contumacious spirit towards Sulţân Sanjar, and manifested open hostility

6 These two lines evidently refer to the game of Chaugân, from which the lately introduced game of Pola is derived. The text of these lines varies considerably in different copies of the original, but I have rendered the translation as close as possible; still the meaning is not clear. Probably horse and rider bore everything before them, and spread terror among the foe, and struck Bahram Shâh with amazement.

7 From this line, if correctly quoted, it was Bahram Shâh who encountered ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn, Husain; but other authors, as already noticed in note 8, page 347, distinctly state that he was dead before the second expedition against Ghazîn; but whether Bahram or Khusrau Shâh—the measure would not be lost if “Khusrau” were substituted for Bahram—it would appear that Râjput and other Hindû princes and chiefs were in the Ghaznawîd army on this occasion. See account of Sulţân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad, the second of the Ghazîn dynasty. In his account of Bahram Shâh’s reign, pages 109 to 111, our author says that he returned to Ghazîn after ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn, Husain, withdrew, and died there. Those authors who contend that Bahram Shâh had died a short time before ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn, Husain, appeared before Ghazîn, state that it was his son, Khusrau Shâh, who left him on his approach, and who returned to it after the departure of the Ghûfâns, and finally relinquished it on the advance of the Ghuzz Turks, in 548 or 549 H., after the defeat of Sulţân Sanjar, and his falling a captive into their hands in that year, two years only before the death of ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn.

8 The word خرید is used in all but one copy of the text, which has خرید signify “a ball,” and may even be the most applicable meaning after all.

9 Sâm [Bahâ-ud-Dîn] was the name of the father only.

1 The fortress of Nâc probably, which stronghold was used as a state prison by the Ghaznawîd Sulţâns.
towards him. What the Sultan's of Ghür had stipulated for, and which used to reach the Sanjarī court every year, such as arms and armour, rarities, and offerings, 'Alā-ud-Dīn withheld; and matters reached such a pass, that Sultan Sanjar assembled a numerous army, and determined to march into the territory of Ghür.

The Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn collected the forces of Ghür, and advanced to meet the Sultan as far as the limits of the town of Nāb, between Firūz-koh and Hirât, in the valley of the Harf-īr-Rūd. There is water there, and a delightful and extensive plain, which they call Sīh-gosḥāh-i-Nāb;

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\] This seems to confirm the statement of Faṣīḥ-ī [note \textsuperscript{4}, page 336], that Ḫusain ['Iz-ud-Dīn], son of Sām, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain's father, had also been made captive by Sultan Sanjar, some years before, and made tributary. Under the reign of Sanjar also, our author states, page 149, 'The Maliks of Ghür and Sultan of Jībāl were all subject to Sultan Sanjar. It is probable that, as Sultan Sanjar had deposed Sultan Arsalān and had set up Bahram Shāh on the throne of Ghaznī, he [Sanjar] received, as lord-paramount over Ghaznī also, the tribute formerly paid by the chiefs of Ghūr to the Sultan of the Māhmūdī dynasty. When Bahram executed Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, 'Alā-ud-Dīn's brother, he sent his head to his uncle, Sultan Sanjar. See also Fanāḵātī's statement, para. 10 to note \textsuperscript{3}, page 348.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\] Two copies have, 'There there is a delightful river and an extensive plain,' but of course the Harf or Harf-ūd, as the river of Hirât is named, was there, and the extra river appears redundant.

Faṣīḥ-ī states that the battle took place before Aobāh, near Hirât [Aobāh is Persian for 'water'], and in this Jahān-Ārā agrees, but the Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmfī says it took place at Marān-zād, but both places are in the Hirât district, and not far from each other.

In the year 544 H. [Faṣīḥ-ī says as early as 542 H.]. 'Alī, Jatrī, [called Ghatri by our author] who held the sie of Hirât, during Sultan Sanjar's absence, had become disaffected towards the Sultan, in what way is not mentioned, for but little is said about him in history. [See note \textsuperscript{6}, page 237.] He concertèd with 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, 'Malik of Ghūr,' in this hostility, and Sanjar marched against them. They were defeated and overthrown in 545 H.—some say 544 H., and Faṣīḥ-ī 547 H.—and 'Alī, Jatrī, 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, Ghūr, and the Malik-zādah, Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad [son of Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, of Bāmflān, elder brother of 'Alī-ud-Dīn], were taken prisoners, the last by the hand of the Sipah-sālār, Barānḵash. Orders were given to put 'Alī, Jatrī, to death at once, and 'Alī-ud-Dīn was thrown into prison; but Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, having obtained 50,000 dinārs from Bāmflān, the sum demanded for his ransom, that sum was paid to Barānḵash, and he was set free. After some time, Sultan Sanjar took compassion on 'Alī-ud-Dīn, set him at liberty, and made him one of his boon companions.

Fanāḵātī here relates the story respecting ['Alī-ud-Dīn] Ḫusain, which Faṣīḥ-ī, and some others relate of his father, Ḫusain, already recorded in note \textsuperscript{4}, page 336; but, although Faṣīḥ-ī relates matters entirely different here respecting 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, and gives such circumstantial details, I still cannot but consider Rashīd-ud-Dīn's account correct notwithstanding, who,
and at that place an engagement took place between the two armies. Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din, a day before the battle was fought, had directed so that the ground in rear of the forces of Ghur had been entirely laid under water; and he had caused it to be proclaimed that the ground in the rear had become quite flooded, and that whoever should attempt to fly to the rear would get into the mud, and stick there.

When the battle was arranged, and the two armies came in contact, a body of about 6000 Ghuzz, Turk, and Khalj horse, which was stationed on the right of the army of Ghur, deserted, and went over to Sultan Sanjar, and submitted to him, and the troops of Ghur were defeated and overthrown. The whole of the Amirs and warriors, and however, styles both of them Husain, without giving their titles. The anecdot is much the same in both authors.

Fasih-1 says, "When Husain ['izz-ud-Din, Husain, of our author], son of Saim, was taken prisoner, the Sultan commanded that he should be put to death, but, at the intercession of Shaikh Ahmad [the Imam-i-Rabbani of Rashid-ud-Din], Ghazzali, he was spared, and set at liberty. This was in the year 545 H. For two years he used to light the fires of the cooks of the Sultan's army [our author would scorn to relate this, as it did not tend to the glorification of his patrons], until one day, the Amir [commander] of the troops of Khurasan, 'Imad-ud-Daulah, Kirmaj, chanced to meet with him." Fanakatf says, for two years ['Ala-ud-Din] Husain wandered about the bazars of Sanjar's camp [or capital] as a mendicant, when one day as Kirmaj was passing the shop of a cook he noticed Husain, who was attending the fire and watching the cook's pot.

Kirmaj took compassion on Husain and made known his case to the Sultan, who directed that he should be brought to his presence. When admitted, he kissed the ground before the Sultan, who said to him:—"I understand thou hast neither wealth nor effects left unto thee. Hast thou no sense of cleanliness left thee either?" [Rashid-ud-Din says, "Hast thou not the means and power of keeping one head and face clean?""] Husain replied:—"In the days when this head was mine own head I had the good fortune to be attended by a thousand servants, but, now that it belongs to thee, thou keepest it thus wretched and abject." The Sultan was touched; he pardoned him, treated him with honour, and sent him back to his native country attended by a large retinue; and to the end of his days Husain paid obedience to that monarch.

'Ala-ud-Din, Husain, was restored to the sovereignty of Ghur in 547 H., just before Sultan Sanjar moved against the Ghuzz. He was defeated and made captive in the first month of 548 H., and, when released in 551 H., no power was left to him. 'Ala-ud-Din died a month before Sanjar's release. Several authors mention Sanjar's having bestowed a casket of gems, one night at a convivial meeting, upon 'Ala-ud-Din, Husain, but treasure, flocks, and herds are not referred to. See page 238, and note 4.
distinguished men of the Ghūrlān army, got entangled in that swampy ground and morass. Some of them obtained martyrdom, and some were made captive, and Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn himself was taken prisoner.

Sulṭān Sanjar commanded that he should be put in confinement, and they brought gyves of iron to place on his legs. He urged that it was requisite they should make a representation [from him] to the Sulṭān, saying:—"Do unto me as I intended to have done unto thee, for I obtained gyves of gold, in order that, thereby, reverence for thy sovereignty might be so much the more preserved." When this request was made known, those identical gyves were called for, and, when they were obtained, those very same gyves were placed upon 'Alā-ud-Dīn's legs, and they mounted him upon a camel, and Sulṭān Sanjar returned [to his own territory].

As the report of 'Alā-ud-Dīn's wittiness of temperament, and quickness of intellect, was much talked about at that period, and had become famous, and Sulṭān Sanjar had heard a great deal about it, either the next day, or a few days after, he sent for him, treated him with honour, and set him at liberty [from his gyves]. A salver of precious gems had been placed near the masnād of the imperial throne, and that was bestowed upon 'Alā-ud-Dīn, who arose and made his obeisance, and spoke these lines, befitting the circumstance. The following is the quatrain:—

"In the rank of battle the Shāh took me, but did not kill,  
Notwithstanding, of a verity, I was full worthy of being slain.  
A casket of precious gems he bestow'd upon me:  
In such wise his mercy [was], and his bounty such."

Sulṭān Sanjar made him one of his associates and boon companions, and there was no pleasure-party without the presence of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, until one day, during a banquet, the sight of 'Alā-ud-Dīn fell upon the sole of Sulṭān Sanjar's foot, who, seated on his throne, had extended one of his legs, upon the sole of the foot of which there was a large mole. He arose, kissed the mole, and improvised the following lines:—

4 Some other authors quote these lines differently, particularly the two last.
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"Verily the dust at the gate of thy palace is [my] diadem ⁶,
And [this], the collar of thy service, is my adornment.
In the same manner as I kiss the mole on the sole of thy foot,
Even so good fortune [likewise] salutes my head."

This anecdote has been already related in the account of
Sultân Sanjar’s reign. The latter gave him back again
the throne of Ghûr ⁶, and he commanded that stores,
treasure, all his herds of horses and camels and cattle, and
flocks of sheep, his own personal property, should be made
over to 'Alâ-ud-Din; and Sultân Sanjar said:—‘’Alâ-
ud-Din, thou art in the condition of a brother to me.
Return, and take all these things—cattle and treasure—
along with thee, and remove them to the country of Ghûr.
If the divine decree should in such wise will, that this
host of Ghuzz should be overcome, and we should
obtain the victory, when these things shall be demanded
of thee, send them back to me; but otherwise, if it should
turn out that my dominion shall have come to an end,
and the thread of the empire’s regularity shall have been
severed, it is far better that these things should remain
with thee than that they should fall into the hands of the
Ghuzz?.”

During this period of Sultân 'Alâ-ud-Din’s absence ⁶
from the capital of the kingdom of Ghûr, a number of the
Amirs, Malik, and the great men and judges of the Jibâl
[mountain tracts] and of the territory of Ghûr, had agreed
together to bring Malik Nâsîr-ud-Din, Hussain ⁶, son of
Muḥammad, of Mâdin, who was the brother’s son of 'Alâ-
ud-Din, and place him upon the throne of Firûz-koh. A
body of disobedient persons of the territory of Kashî ¹,
who excel all the rest of the people of Ghûr in arrogance and
obstinacy, had committed great violence, and by their
turbulence and clamour, under pretence of grants, gifts,

⁶ The first line here is slightly different in some few copies, and varies a
little from what was given at page 150, and reads, “Verily the dust of thy
steed’s hoof is my diadem,” but the rest agrees with the former version. Other
authors quote the line as given in the text above.
⁶ The Târîkh-i-Ibrâhîmî says “both Ghûr and Ghaznîn.”
⁷ Another author says that Sultân Sanjar bestowed a standard and kettle
drums upon 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, and restored him to the rulership of Ghûr.
⁸ Captivity did not sound well in Minhâj-i-Sarâj’s ears apparently.
⁹ Some have Ḥasan.
¹ This word is written “Kasf” in several copies.
alms, and robes of distinction, had appropriated the royal treasure and property.

When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn came towards Ghūr from Khurāsān with all that treasure, cattle, and wealth [conferred upon him by Sulṭān Sanjar], he first proceeded in the direction of the territory of Kashī, destroyed the whole of their Kūshkās [fortified villages], which exceeded a thousand Kasrs in number, and every one of which, in strength and height, was such, that the decision of conjecture and conception could not admit a plan of it.

After having taken vengeance upon the rebels of the Kashī territory and other mountain tracts, he ['Alā-ud-Dīn] returned to the capital Firūz-koh, and, before his reaching it, they had killed Malik Nāsir-ud-Dīn-i-Muḥammad, as will, subsequently, be recorded. When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn arrived at Firūz-koh, and [again] seated himself on the throne of his ancestors, he turned his attention to the making of fresh conquests. He brought under his sway the districts of Bāmīān and Tukhāristān, and seized the districts of Dāwar, Jarūm, and Bust also; and, of Khurāsān, took the fortress of Tūlak, which is situated in the mountains in the vicinity of Hirāt, after a period of six years.

There was a poet within the fortress of Tūlak, whom they called by the name of 'Umr-i-Sarāj; and, when hostilities were about to come to an end, and the fortress of Tūlak was about to be gained possession of by terms of accommodation, he composed some verses, two lines of which, which were deserving [of insertion], are here brought in:

"Seated on horseback, galloping up-hill and down,  
Thy object is Tūlak: lo! there is Tūlak."

In their language, galloping up-hill and down-dale is called "Wurlak-Fūlak." "The mercy of God be upon them!"

---

2 See the Tukhāristān dynasty farther on.

3 According to this statement, 'Alā-ud-Dīn must have been investing this place during the whole of his reign, for he only ruled six years.

4 These words, vary in most of the copies of the text, but the best copies have as above written. Some have "Ūrlak-Fūlak," "Warlak-Tūlak," and "Wurkal-Tūkal." The words are unintelligible, and are certainly not Pushto.
From that place 'Alā-ud-Dīn turned his face to the conquest of Gharrjistān; and took to wife the lady Ḥūr Malīkah, who was the daughter of the Shār, Shāh [by name], son of Ibrāhīm, Shār, son of Ardshīr, one of the Maliks of Gharrjistān; and the valley of the Murghāb river and [its] fortresses came into his possession. The fortress of Sabekjī [or Sabegji], however, held out, and carried on hostilities [against him] for six years; and of this time, for a period of three years, he sat down continually before it, until it was given up to him.

Towards the end of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn's life, Mulāḥidah emissaries came to him from Alamūt, and he treated them with great reverence; and in every place in Ghūr they sought, secretly, to make proselytes. The Mulāḥidah [heretic] of Alamūt had set his ambition on subjecting the people of Ghūr [to his heresy], and making them submissive. This fact became defilement which adhered to the train of the 'Alā-ī robe of sovereignty. Of his life, however, but a short period remained, and he died, and they buried him by the side of his ancestors and his brethren. The Almighty forgive him!

---

8 See note 4, page 341.
9 The name of this place is doubtful. The majority of copies have written above بیگسی but other copies have بیگسی and میگسی. Of Ghūr we have no knowledge whatever, and the Politicals, who were stationed in Afghanistan previous to the outbreak in 1841, although they did gain a little knowledge of the eastern parts of Afghanistan, appear almost to have neglected the western parts.
7 See note 4, preceding page.
8 Alamūt, from the name of the stronghold of Ḥasan-i-Ṣabbāh, the Shaykh-ul-Jibāl, or the Old Man of the Mountain, or Chief of the Assassins, as the chief of this sect used to be called. The person here referred to, however, is MUḤAMMAD, son of BUZURG-UMĪD, the third of the Alamūṭīs, who died in 557 H. In Elliot, India, vol. ii. pages 289-90, he is turned into "the Mulāhi-datu-I-maut"! See page 365, and note 4.
9 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, died at Hirāt in 551 H., the same year in which Sulṭān Sanjar escaped from the Ghuzz, and Itsiz, Khwārazm Shāh, died, according to Fāṣīb, Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh, Ḥāfīb-us-Siyar, Haft-Ikhtim, Mirāṭ-i-Jahān Numā, and several others, but, according to Jahān Arā and Muntahāb-ut-Tawārīkh, in 556 H., but this is incorrect. Jannābī says in 566 H. ! Our author, although brought up in the residence of his niece, and the glorifier of all things Ghūrfān, appears neither to have known the year of 'Alā-ud-Dīn's death nor the extent of his reign. He reigned six years.
10 How many sons he had our author did not appear to consider necessary.
XV. MALIK NĀṢIR-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN, SON OF MUḤAMMAD, MĀDĪNĪ.

When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, was made captive in the engagement with Sulṭān Sanjar, the [affairs of the] territories of Ghūr and the Jībāl [mountain tracts] became weak and disordered. The refractory and disobedient of Ghūr began to show contumacy, and each tribe fortified itself in the hills and defiles in which it dwelt, and commenced carrying on strife and hostility one against the other.

A party of the great Amirs who still remained [for a great number had been slain or made captive in the battle against Sulṭān Sanjar] brought Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, son of Muḥammad, Mādīnī, from Mādīn, and placed him on the throne of Firūz-koh. The treasures of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, and the treasures of his son, Sulṭān Saīf-ud-Dīn, he took into his own possession; and the whole of the precious things, treasures, and valuable property, and other effects stored up, he expended upon those Amirs, and great men, and on mean persons, and seized upon the dominions of Ghūr. His strength lay in the support of the rebels of the Kashī country.

This Malik, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, had a great passion for women and virgins, and he had taken a number of the handmaids and slave girls of the haram of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn under his own control, and used to have recourse to them. When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, having been dismissed with great honour and respect from the presence of Sulṭān Sanjar, set out towards the dominions of Ghūr, and reached the hill country of Hirāt, and the news of the advent of his exalted banners was brought to Firūz-koh, terror, and fright, and the fear of retribution, threw all hearts into dread.

A party, who were loyally devoted to the 'Alā-ī dynasty, secretly instigated and incited those slave girls of 'Alā-ud-Dīn's haram, who had been taken into Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn's haram, so that they sought an opportunity; and, at to state here; but we shall find that he had two at least, both of whom succeeded to the sovereignty.

1 He is not mentioned as a ruler by other authors, who pass at once from 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, to his son; but there is no doubt about Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫusain, having seized the sovereignty and held it during the former's captivity.
a time when Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din was lying asleep on his couch, they placed the pillow of the couch over his face, and, with all their force, held down the four corners of the pillow until they suffocated him, and he died.

XVI. SULTĀN * SAIF-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN.

When Sultān 'Alā-ud-Din departed from this world, his son, Sultān Saif-ud-Din, Muḥammad, with the concurrence of the whole of the Maliks, Amīrs, and chief men of Ghūr, ascended the throne of Fīrūz-koh.

He was a youthful and good-looking sovereign, and was beneficent in disposition, just, the cherisher of his subjects, and patronizer of his servants, bountiful, munificent, open-hearted, and liberal, humble, conciliating, pious, orthodox, and steadfast in the faith of Islām. When he ascended the throne, he, at the outset, repudiated acts of tyranny and injustice; and for all the injustice, oppression, and violence which his father had committed, he commanded that restitution should be made; and he carried out his purpose according to the institutes of justice, and the ways of rectitude.

Those emissaries who had come from the Mulāḥidah [heretic] of Alamūt [towards the close of his father's reign], and who, secretly, had exhorted every person to the vanities of heresy and schism, he directed should be brought to task, and the whole of them, by his orders, were put to the sword. In every place wherein the odour of their impure usages was perceived, throughout the territory of Ghūr, slaughter of all heretics was commanded. The whole of them were sent to Hell, and the area of the country of Ghūr, which was a mine of religion and orthodoxy, was purified from the infernal impurity of Ķarāmīṭah* depravity by the sword. By this orthodox war upon infidels, love for him became rooted in the hearts of the people of Ghūr and of the territory of the Jibāl; and the

* Styled Malik by several authors.
* Our author makes no difference between Mulāḥidahs and Ķarāmīṭahs, but they are different sects. See Sale, Kūfān, Preliminary Discourse, pages 130-31.
whole of them bound the girdle of his service round their loins, and placed the collar of obedience to him about the neck of sincerity.

One of the proofs of his equity, and of the goodness of his rule, was this, that he gave orders for the release from the fortress of Wajiristān of both his uncle's sons, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the sons of Sām, and he cherished and caressed them, and allowed them perfect liberty of action.

During his reign people, both comers and goers, enjoyed plenty, repose, and security beyond compute; but that youthful monarch of excellent disposition had but a short life, and his reign only extended to the space of one year and little more. The mercy of God be upon him!

The cause of his loss of life was this:—One day, seated in his pavilion, he was discharging arrows at a butt; and the Amīrs of Ghūr had been directed to be present, and were in attendance. The Sipāh-sālār [commander of the troops], War-mesh, son of Shīs, who was the brother of Abū-l-Abbās, son of Shīs, and the brother of Sulīmān, son of Shīs, was also in attendance on him. It was the custom with the Amīrs of Ghūr, and the Maliks of the Jībāl, at that period, that upon whomsoever they would confer honour, him they should present with a golden gauntlet studded with jewels, after the same manner as, in these days, they bestow a girdle; and on the hand[s] of this commander, War-mesh, son of Shīs, were two gem-studded gauntlets', which Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, Mādīnī, had honoured him with; and both those gauntlets were from the treasury of Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn's own ḥaram. When he perceived those two gauntlets belonging to his own ḥaram upon the hand of War-mesh, the honour of manhood, and the dignity of sovereignty, began to flame up within his heart, and the fire of wrath burst forth, and he said:—"Run, War-mesh, and bring back my arrow from the butt." When War-mesh turned his face towards the

---

4 The word used is دستوائی a glove or gauntlet; a bracelet may have been what our author intended, as it is difficult, I should imagine, to wear two gauntlets on one hand, but he says "on the hand," not the hands. The word for bracelet, however, is دسته Other writers say, a bracelet, which Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, had taken from one of ʿAlā-ud-Dīn's wives, and presented to War-mesh. It is the father's ḥaram at page 364.
butt, in order to carry out this command, and his back was turned towards the Sultan, he, Sultan Saif-ud-Din, fitted a broad steel-headed arrow to his bow, and drew the bow-string to his ear, and discharged the arrow with such force into the back of War-mesh, that the feathers of the arrow passed out through his breast, and he fell down dead on the spot.

As the empire of the Sanjar dynasty had come to an end, the Amirs of the tribe of Ghuzz had acquired power, and had taken possession of the different parts of the territory of Khurasan, and their violence and depredations had extended in all directions; and the disquietude and affliction consequent upon these depredations used to reach the frontier districts of the kingdom of Ghur, and the borders of the hill tracts of Ghaznistan.

When Sultan Saif-ud-Din brought the dominions of his father under his jurisdiction, he assembled his forces, and set out for the purpose of restraining the aggressions of the Ghuzz, and reached the confines of Ghaznistan, and the district of Madina. From thence he advanced to Rudbar of Marw, and passed beyond Dajzaq, which is a large city [town?], and came to a battle with the Ghuzz.

The Sipah-salar, Abul-'Abbâs, son of Shis, who was the champion of Ghur, of the family of the Shisanis, and who nourished revenge in his heart on account of War-mesh, son of Shis [his own brother], and waited his opportunity, on the day of the encounter with the Ghuzz, came behind the back of the Sultan, Saif-ud-Din, and thrust his spear into his side, and hurled him from his horse, and exclaimed [at the same time], “Men are not killed with their faces to the butt, as thou didst kill my brother, otherwise they [themselves] get killed at such a place as this.”

5 The arrow-head called bel-ak, formed in the shape of a shovel; hence its name—a little shovel. It is also called the “huntsman’s arrow-head,” and a double-pointed arrow-head also.
6 The “meek, conciliating, and pious” youth did not hesitate to shoot an enemy in the back!
7 Some copies of the text have Farus, which is sometimes written Kados, instead of Madina. See page 374, and note 6.
8 Rudbar also means “a river in a valley,” but here refers to a place so called.
9 Some writers mention that he was “killed in battle with the Ghuzz of Balkh,” and that it happened in 558 H.; but he is said to have reigned some-
When the Sultan fell, the troops of Ghūr were defeated and routed, and they likewise left the [wounded] Sultan on the field. A Ghuzz [soldier] came upon him, and, as yet, the Sultan was still alive. The Ghuzz, when he noticed the princely vest and girdle, was desirous of despoiling him of them. The fastening of the Sultan's girdle would not come open quickly, on which the Ghuzz applied his knife to the fastening, and divided it. The point of the knife entered the stomach of Sultan Saif-ud-Din with force, and from that wound he obtained martyrdom.


Trustworthy persons have stated, after the following manner, that Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, and his brother, Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, were both born of one mother; and that Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn was the elder of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn by three years and a little more. Their mother was the daughter of Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Kidānī, both of the lineage of Banjī, son of Naharān, and also of the seed of the Shansabānīs. The Malikah, their mother, used to call Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn [by the name of] Ḥabashi; and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Zangī³; but, originally, the august name of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn was Muḥammad, and the name of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn was

thing less than two years, and, in this case, if his father died in 551 H., there are three or four years unaccounted for, and, if the former date is correct, 'Alā must have died in 556 H., or his son must have reigned about seven years; but, as our author says that Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, who succeeded him, died in 599 H., after a reign of forty-three years, Saif-ud-Dīn, 'Alā's son, must have been killed in 556 H. Some other authors, however, say Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn only reigned forty-one years, which would make 558 H. as the year of Saif-ud-Dīn's death correct. The Mirāṭ-i-Jahān Numā says that his father died in 551 H., and Saif-ud-Dīn reigned one year and a half, and by some accounts seven years, and that he was killed in a battle with the Ghuzz of Balkh. In all probability he was killed in 558 H.

¹ The original title by many authors, like the whole dynasty.
² The legendary etymology of this assumed title has already been given at page 315; but its real meaning was, probably, co-sharer, or the like, from a share, portion, &c. See also page 316, and note ⁸.
³ Why their mother called them by these "pet" names does not appear. We must suppose that they were both very dark indeed, as both words signify Abyssinian, Ethiop, negro, &c.
also Muḥammad. In the dialect of Ghūr they call Muḥammad, Aḥmad⁴.

When Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, died within the limits of Kīān, and Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, ascended the throne of Fīrūz-koh, he commanded that his two nephews, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, should be imprisoned in the fortress of Wajīristān⁵, and fixed but a small allowance for the supply of their wants⁶. When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn departed from this world, Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn directed that they should be released from that fortress, and he allowed them entire liberty of action. Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn took up his residence at the Court of Fīrūz-koh in amity with Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn, and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, his brother, proceeded to Bāmiān to the presence of his paternal uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd.

Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn accompanied Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn, serving along with the army, on the expedition against the Ghuzz tribe; but he had, however, but a small following through want of means and scantiness of resources; but every one, among the old servants of his father and of his mother, used clandestinely to afford him some little help.

Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn continued always in the service of Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn up to the time when the heavenly decree arrived, and Sulṭān Saif-ud-Dīn was removed from the throne of life imperial to the bier of premature death⁷; and the army of Ghūr, discomfited, came out of the district of Rūd-bār and the borders of Dajṣā towards Gharjistān by way of Asir Darah and La-wīr [or Lū-ūr?], and passed beyond Āfsīn, which was the capital of the Shārs of Gharjistān; and, when they reached the town of Wadāwajzd⁸, the Sipāh-sālār, Abū-l-'Abbās, son of Shiṣ, who

⁴ See note ¹, page 313.
⁵ A few authors have stated that the two brothers were placed in charge of Ghāmīn [not a province of Ghūr] by their uncle, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, but such is not correct, and our author's statements here and at pages 357 and 366 are quite correct, and are confirmed by many authors of undoubted authority. See also Thomas: The Pathan Kings of Delhi, page 10.
⁶ See paragraph 14, note ⁸, page 347.
⁷ For shooting the greatest of his chiefs in the back, in a cowardly manner, in a fit of jealousy.
⁸ The text here in all the copies is more or less exceedingly defective, and it would be almost impossible to make anything of this passage without collating the number of copies I have seen. As it is there is some doubt about two or three of the proper names. Some copies have Abar [μ'] and Asir
had unhorsed Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn with his spear, there presented himself in the presence of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn; and such of the most powerful and illustrious personages, and the Amirs and Malik's of the troops of Ghūr and Gharjistān as were present, he assembled and brought together, and they all gave their allegiance to the sovereignty and dominion of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, and they raised him to the throne, and congratulated him on his accession to the supreme power. Command was given to erect a castle there [where this occurred], and up to this time, wherein the calamity of the infidel Mughals arose, that town and castle was inhabited. From thence they conducted him to the city of Firūz-koh, and, when they reached the city, they placed Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn on the throne.

Previously to this, his title was Shams-ud-Dīn; and his brother's, Shihāb-ud-Dīn; but, after he had been on the throne some time, his own title was changed to Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn; and, after the successes in Khurāsān, his brother Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn's title became Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn
deleted for misreading.

When his brother, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn
(deleted for misreading), became cognizant of his brother Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn's situation, he proceeded to the presence of his uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, and asked his permission, and came to Firūz-koh, and he was invested with the office of Sar-i-Jāندār [or chief armour-bearer], and he used to be always in attendance on his brother, Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn. The territory of Istīlah and Kajūrān were entrusted to his charge.

Some copies may be read any way, and have no diacritical points. The name of the capital of Gharjistān, which is also called Gharshistān, is also written in various ways, and, in some copies, is unintelligible; but the above reading is confirmed by Yāsā'ī, who gives a detailed account of the Shāhs; but Fasihī calls the town Afshānah. Ibn-Hišām says, the two [chief] towns of Gharjistān are not Nushī and Shīrshī; the first is evidently an error of the copyist for Afshānah and so confirms Yāsā'ī's statement.

Several years after his brother's accession. Modern writers of Indian history generally, and European writers, English in particular, put the cart before the horse in this respect, but the latest version of his name, in this way, occurs in The Student's Manual Of Indian History, where he appears as "Shahab ood Dem, Mahmood Ghoury"! Shihāb has a meaning, but "Shahab" none: moreover his name was not Mahmūd.

The writer does not mean that he was then Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, but subsequently.

Written by some other authors, Istiyā. It is the name of a small district and range of hills between Ghuznīn and Hirāt.
When the [Sultān's] pavilion was brought out of the city of Firūz-koh, and conveyed towards Ghūr, the contumacious of Ghūr began to manifest opposition. The Sipāh-sālār, Abū-l-'Abbās, son of Shīs, who had raised him to the throne, possessed great authority and influence, and the refractory of Ghūr used to shelter themselves under his protection. Both the brothers continued to nourish revenge in their hearts against him [Abū-l-'Abbās], on account of his having killed their cousin, Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn, and they both concerted a design [against him]. It was determined between them, that one of their own immediate Turkish followers should carry it out [in the following manner]:—When Abū-l-'Abbās should enter the audience-hall, and should stand up in the assembly to make his obeisance, and Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn should raise his hand to his cap, the Turk should strike off Abū-l-'Abbās' head; and such was done.

After Abū-l-'Abbās had been put to death, Ghīyās-ud-Dīn acquired strength, and the grandeur of the realm increased. The uncle of the brothers, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, of Bāmiān, being the eldest of the seven Sultān brothers, and there being neither one of them remaining [but himself], he became ambitious of acquiring the territory of Ghūr and the throne of Firūz-koh. Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Khīmāj [a noble] of the Sanjari dynasty, who was Malik [ruler] of Balkh, he sought aid from, and despatched envōys to Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-dūz, of Hirāt, and asked assistance from him also. Subsequently, the

---

3 From the manner in which our author here expresses himself [and the sentence is the same in all the copies collated], Ghūr must have been the name of a town 'as well as of the whole country. From many of his expressions, however, in other places, Firūz-koh would seem to refer to one district or territory, Ghūr to another, and the Jibāl to a third.

4 The word here used signifies not a cap exactly, but a head-dress made from the fur or skin of an animal, of cloth or other texture, or of cloth of gold, and the like, made into a head-dress, a tiara, diadem, &c., but not a turban. Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, the elder brother, engaged Abū-l-'Abbās in conversation, whilst the other brother gave the sign for his assassination. Abū-l-'Abbās appears to have suspected treachery, for he had half drawn his dagger from its sheath when he was cut down. This is a specimen of the noble qualities of those amiable and pious sovereigns of our author, and is quite in keeping with their treachery, or at least with Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's towards Khusrāw Malik. See note 5, pages 112-13.

5 They were not all styled "Sultān," even by his own account.

6 I-yal-dūz of others.
troops of Bāmiān and the forces of Balkh and of Hirāt advanced from different directions towards Firūz-koh.

Malik Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas'ud, of Bāmiān, being the uncle of the Sultāns, and there being a great number of the Amirs of Ghūr in his service, and he claiming the territory of Ghūr by right of heritage, set out at first, and Malik 'Alā-ud-Din, Kīmāj, the Amir [ruler] of Balkh, began to follow after him, at the distance of some leagues, by the route of Upper Gharjistān, while Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-dūz, marched to Firūz-koh with his army from Hirāt, it being the nearest route by way of the Harīw-ar-Rūd ⁷, or valley of the Hari river.

Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din and Mu'izz-ud-Din, came out of Firūz-koh, and proceeded to a place which is called Rāgh-i-Zarīr ⁸ [the Zarīr plain] and the forces of Ghūr there assembled around them. Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-dūz, of Hirāt, used the utmost expedition, being ambitious of this, that perhaps the capture of Firūz-koh and the destruction of the Ghūrīān army might be achieved by him.

When he arrived near to the position of the Ghūrīān forces, and both armies confronted each other, and preparations were being made for coming to action, so that only about the distance of half-a-league intervened between them, and the ranks of either army could be seen by the other, two Ghūrīān warriors from the midst of the army formed a compact, and came to the front of the [marshalled] ranks, and presented themselves before the Sultān, dismounted from their horses, and, bowing their faces to the ground, said, "We two your servants will disperse the army of Hirāt;" so by command they mounted, and, rousing both their horses, they drew their swords, and, like the fierce blast, and the flying cloud, they approached towards the ranks of the Turks of Hirāt, crying out, "Where is Malik Yal-dūz? We seek Malik Yal-dūz!"

Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-dūz, was standing beneath his canopy, and his troops all pointed towards him, so that those Ghūrīān warriors knew which was Yal-dūz; and both

---

⁷ This clause of the sentence is only contained in the best copies of the text.
⁸ In some copies "Rāgh-i-Zarīr," which is much the same, sar signifying golden or yellow, and Zarīr the name of a grass yielding a yellow dye. One old copy has Weij, which signifies pure.
of them like hungry lions and rampant elephants fell upon Yal-düz, and brought him from his horse to the ground by the wounds inflicted by their swords. When the troops of Hirât beheld this heroism, boldness, and intrepidity, they gave way and took to flight. As Almighty God had brought those two Sulţâns, Ghiyâs-ud-Din and Mu'izz-ud-Din, beneath the shadow of His kindness, He made such a victory and triumph as this a miracle of theirs*.

The next day a body of horse¹, lightly equipped and ruthless, was nominated to proceed against the force of Kîmâj of Balkh. They fell upon his army unawares, put it to flight, took Kîmâj, and slew him, and brought his head to the presence of the Sulţâns together with his standard. Then the head of Kîmâj was placed in a bag, and entrusted to a horseman's charge, and they sent him to meet their uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas'ûd. The latter had arrived near at hand; and, when they [the Sulţâns] had despatched the head of Kîmâj, they put their forces in motion to follow, and pushed on towards their uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-Din.

When that horseman brought the head of Kîmâj to the presence of Malik Fakhr-ud-Din he determined upon returning, and made his troops mount; and, by the time they had become ready prepared to begin their retreat, the two Sulţâns had come up [with their forces] and had occupied all the parts around. On reaching the place where their uncle was, Sulţân Ghiyâs-ud-Din and Mu'izz-ud-Din at once dismounted from their horses, and proceeded to receive him, and paid him great attention and consideration, and said, "It is necessary that your lordship should return;" and they conducted him to their camp and seated

---

* This "miracle" is not mentioned by other authors, with the exception of a very few who copy from our author. The Rauşat-uş-Şafa says that the brothers despatched two bodies of troops to oppose the advance of two of the confederates, the ruler of Hirât, whose name is not given, and Kîmâj of Balkh; and that the Ghûrfân forces slew both of them, and returned triumphant to the presence of Ghiyâs-ud-Din, who despatched the head of the son of Kîmâj of Balkh to his uncle, who repented of his expedition, and sought to retire. Troops had been despatched, however, to surround him, and the brothers followed; and, when they found Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas'ûd, their uncle, had been intercepted, they went to him. Then follows much copied almost word for word from our author.

¹ Three copies of the text have "several thousand horse," &c.
him on a throne, and both those sovereigns\(^2\) stood up before him with their hands stuck in their girdles [in token of servitude]. From this Malik Fakhr-ud-Din became filled with shame and compunction, and, overcome with humiliation, he spoke to them some words of rebuke, arose, and said, "You mock me!" They mollified him by many apologies and excuses, and accompanied him one stage, and sent him on his return back to Bāmiān; and the territory of Ghūr was left vacant to Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn.

After that event he proceeded into Garmsir and Zamīn-ī-Dāwar, and that tract was liberated\(^3\); and, as Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-dūz, of Hirāt, had been slain, and the army of Hirāt had returned thither discomfited, Badr-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl, who was one of [Sultan] Sanjar’s slaves\(^4\), took Hirāt into his own jurisdiction, and held possession of it for a considerable time, until the inhabitants of Hirāt despatched petitions to Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn inviting him [thither], and that success\(^5\) was also achieved.

\(^2\) Muʿizz-ud-Dīn was not then a sovereign prince, and did not become so nominally until after the taking of Ghazīn from the Ghuzz.

\(^3\) He obtained possession of Bādghais at the same period, and is said to have entered into a connexion with the chiefs of Ghurjīstān, and established his sway also over that tract of country. From whose possession Garmsir and Zamīn-ī-Dāwar were "liberated" our author does not state. Faṣīḥī, however, mentions that in the same year in which he succeeded his cousin, 558 H., Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn fought an engagement with the Ghuzz, vanquished them, and imposed tribute on them. The Ghuzz were doubtless in possession of the districts mentioned above.

\(^4\) This "success" could have been but a very temporary one, for, by our author’s own account, Tughrīl was in possession of Hirāt up to the year when Sultan Shāh, Khwārazmī, was defeated by the Ghūrīs, which event took place in 588 H. In another place, our author, referring to this "taking" of Hirāt, says it happened in 571 H., yet seventeen years after Tughrīl still, by his own account, held Hirāt. See page 249, and note 4, page 379.

\(^5\) During the Khilāfīt of the ‘Abbāsī Khalīfah, Miḥdī, the Ghuzz entered Māwar-un-Nahr from the north, and became converts to Islam; but Mūkanna’-i-Mīlī [the “great Mokanna” of Moore’s poem of “Lalla Rookh”], the false prophet, reduced them under his sway. When the ‘Abbāsīs set about putting down Mūkanna’, the Ghuzz deserted him, and retired to the more southern parts of Māwar-un-Nahr. They were constantly engaged in hostilities with the Kārlughīfah Turk-māns, who were generally victorious over them. The Ghuzz were in the habit of paying tribute to the sovereign of the period, and, when Sultan Sanjar ascended the throne of the Saljuqs, 40,000 Ghuzz families entered the territory of Khūtān and Ghāzbānān, and paid a tribute of 24,000 sheep to the royal kitchen. In 545 H., according to Alī, when Amīr Kimāj [the Kimāj mentioned above, and in note 4, page 336, also probably] was Wali of
After some years Fâras and the territory of Kâliyûn [or Kâl-yûn], and Fîwâr and Baghshôr, came into his posses-

Bâlkh, the Ghuzz became disaffected about the collection of the tribute. Kimây was at enmity with Amîr Zângf, son of Khâlfshâ, Shâibânî, the Wall of Tukhâristân [this was a short time before Fakhr-ud-Dîn, Masûd, Ghûrî, became ruler of Tukhâristân and Bâmûn], who, seizing the opportunity of Kimây's absence at the court of Sultan Sanjar, and fearing lest the Ghuzz, who had lately been worsted by the Khârsâhs, and had abandoned Mâwar-un-Nahr, and contemplated migration into Khurâsân, might be induced to join his enemy, Amîr Kimây, he invited them to take up their quarters in Tukhâristân, wherein he assigned them lands. In a dispute about the revenue, brought about by Kimây out of enmity to Zângf, the Ghuzz slew him and one of his sons, and, at last, Sultan Sanjar moved against them, and he fell captive into their hands. Sanjar returned from captivity in 551 H., having effectcd his escape by the aid of Aḩmad, son of Kimây, governor of Tîrmîd [see page 155, and note 6, and note 8, page 156], and died in 552 H. In 553 H. the Ghuzz poured forth from Bâlkh [the province of?], and moved towards Sarâkh. Mu'ayyîd-id-'Ă-īnâh-dâr, the slave of Mâhmûd, Sanjar's nephew, and, afterwards, ruler of Nîshâpur [see note 7, page 180], and other parts of Upper Khurâsân, made a night attack upon them, and overthrowcd them with great slaughter. He encountered them again, two months after, in sight of Marw, whether they had moved, when the Ghuzz were victorious, and they carried on great depredations in Khurâsân. Other events followed, which are too long to be related here; but, subsequently, Mu'ayyîd became independent, and acquired power over greater part of Khurâsân. The Ghuzz were in possession, however, of Marw, Sarâkh, Bâlkh, and some other tracts; and some parts were under the sway of the Khwârezmîs. Hirât was held by a chief named Malik Aektân, who, in 559 H., marched into Ghûr with a considerable army; but, the Ghûrîs being prepared to receive him, Aektân was slain in the battle which ensued. This in all probability is the Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-duz, of our author. He was succeeded at Hirât by one of his own officers, styled Babar-ud-Dîn in Alîf, and he must be our author's Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Tughîrî. This chief, not considering himself safe from the power of Amîr Mu'ayyîd, and having some previous acquaintance with the Ghuzz chiefs, called upon them to help him, intending to give up Hirât to them. On the appearance of the Ghuzz, however, the people of Hirât rose against Babar-ud-Dîn, and put him to death in the same year. [See note 2, page 239.] Mu'ayyîd was himself put to death in 569 H. Saif-ud-Dîn, Muhîmâyad of Ghûr, was slain when engaging the Ghuzz of Bâlkh in 558 H., and in the same year his successor, Ghîyâs-ud-Dîn, defeated them with great slaughter, and imposed tribute on [some portion?] of them, and in 571 H. his brother, Mu'izz-ud-Dîn, encountered a tribe of them, as will be mentioned under his reign. Ghîyâs-ud-Dîn, Ghûrî, gained possession of Hirât [temporarily?] in 571 H. These events appear to be identical with what our author relates above. See also second paragraph to note at page 349, page 367, and note 4, page 379.

4 With respect to these proper names there is great discrepancy in the different copies of the text. The majority of the best and oldest copies are as above; but in place of Fâras, some have Fâdas and Fâdas, and one Kâdâgh, which place is mentioned, in several places, written in the same manner. Inplace of Baghshôr, contained in one set of copies, Saif-rûd is contained in the other set. I have before alluded to this curious fact that the twelve copies collated appear, in several places, to be two distinct sets of the original. In
sion; and, when these parts came under his jurisdiction, he took to wife the daughter of his uncle, the Malikah, Tāj-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Ḍīn, Gohar Malik [Malikah?] the daughter of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Ḍīn, Ḥusain. The whole of Gharjistān, and Tāl-kān, and Juzarwān, devolved upon him; and Tigin-ābād, out of the district of Jarūm, Ghiyās-ud-Ḍīn made over to his brother, Muʿizz-ud-Ḍīn, after he had returned from Sijjistān. He [now] began to despatch [bodies of] horse towards Ghaznīn, and the district of Zābul, and parts adjacent thereunto; and, at that period, the territory of Kābul, Zābul, and Ghaznīn were in the hands of the tribes of the Ghuzz, who had wrested them out of the possession of Khusrau Shāh. The reign of Khusrau Shāh had terminated, and his son, Khusrau Malik, had made Lohor his capital.

The Amīrs of the Ghuzz [tribe] who were in Ghaznīn, not being able to oppose the forces of Ghūr [in the field] threw up intrenchments, and, from the excessive firmness of the Ghuzz, the Ghūrīān army very nearly sustained an overthrow. Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Ḍīn retired, and despatched a body of Ghūrīāns to the aid of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Ḍīn. Suddenly a body of Ghuzz warriors attacked [the army of Ghūr], and captured the royal standard of the Ghūrīāns, and carried it away within their own intrenchments. The Ghūrīān forces in the right and left wings imagined that the list of places and territories acquired at the end of Ghiyās-ud-Ḍīn's reign farther on, the name of Baghshor is not mentioned. It is probable that Flwār and Baghshor are correct, and that one has been omitted by different copyists.

7 A different place to Tāe-kān.
8 This is the place referred to fifth paragraph of note 2, pages 257-8.
9 In a few copies "and the district of Jarūm and Tigīn-ābād," &c.
1 See page 184.
2 This remark confirms the statements of those authors who state that Khusrau Shāh returned to his sacked and devastated capital after 'Alā-ud-Ḍīn, Ḥusain, had abandoned it, and also tends to show that it must have been the same monarch, and not his father, who fled from Ghaznīn when 'Alā-ud-Ḍīn, Ḥusain, appeared before. See para. 10 to note 2, p. 347, and note 8, p. 350.

The whole of this sentence, and the first word of the next, are neither contained in either of the Paris copies, nor in the Bodleian MS., the I.O.L. MS., 1952, or the R. A.S. MS.; and, certainly, the passage is somewhat obscure. It would appear that Ghiyās-ud-Ḍīn retired to obtain reinforcements, and also that he subsequently returned [as mentioned a few sentences after], which latter statement is contained in those very copies which omit the former. The Sulṭān, however, could not have retired to any very great distance, otherwise he would not have been in time to take part in the closing scene of the battle.
the royal standard had accompanied their own centre into the intrenchments of the enemy, and they advanced to the attack in all directions, broke through the intrenchments of the Ghuzz, and carried them, and put the Ghuzz to the rout: The news reached Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din, who returned; and the troops of Ghūr commenced slaughtering the Ghuzz, and laid the greater number of that race on the earth, and Ghaznīn was left in the possession of the Ghūris. This victory was gained in the year 569 H. ⁴

When Ghaznīn was conquered, Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din placed his brother, Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Din, upon the throne of the Maḥmūdīs, ⁵ and returned himself to Fīrūz-koh.

After two years, he [Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din] summoned his troops [again], and the armies of Ghūr and Ghaznīn were got ready, and he advanced to the gates of the city of Hirāt. The people of that place had been manifesting signs of duty and desire [to place themselves under his rule]. When Bahā-ud-Din, Ṭughrīl, became aware of this [latter] fact, he evacuated the city of Hirāt, and retired to the Khwārazm-Shāhīs; and, in the year 671 H., the city of Hirāt was taken possession of. Two years subsequent to this, Fūshanj was taken; and, after these successes, the

⁴ This is the second date given by our author throughout the whole of this Section. At page 112 he says the Ghuzz held possession of Ghaznīn twelve years, and here says Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn took it from them in 569 H., by which account they must have got possession of it in 557 H. Khusrau Shāh died in 555 H.; so, if the above dates are correct, they could not have wrested Ghaznīn out of his hands. I think our author is pretty correct as to the period the Ghuzz held Ghaznīn, and they appear to have obtained possession of it in 557 H., or 558 H., probably after the death of Saif-ud-Dīn, Sūrī, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain's son, and defeat of the Ghūrlāns by the Ghuzz.

⁵ From which time only he is entitled to be styled Sulṭān. Faṣīḥ-Ī says that as early as 566 H. the Malik of Ghūr had acquired power in the Ghaznīn territory and in part of Hind, and the Khwārazm Shāhīs in 'Irāk and Khorāsān; but agrees with our author as to the date of the acquisition of the city of Ghaznīn, but some other authors state that it was taken in 568 H. It was in 569 H. that Malik Mu-ayyid-ī-ʿAmah-dār, in concert with Sulṭān Shāh, fought an engagement with Sulṭān ʿImād-ud-Dīn, Takih. See note ⁷, page 180, and note ⁷, page 245.

⁶ Faṣīḥ-Ī does not mention the acquisition of Hirāt among the events of 571 H., but states that in that year Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Wālī of Ghaznīn, encountered the Sankurān, a sept of the Ghuzz tribe, and slew many of them. Some other authors, who say that Ghaznīn was taken in 568 H., state that Hirāt was acquired two years after—in 570 H. The particulars of Ṭughril's death will be found at page 379.

⁷ See note ⁴, page 379.
Malik of Nimroz and Sijistān despatched envoys, and he enrolled himself among the vassals of that Sulṭān.

Subsequently to these events, the Ghuzz Maliks who were in Kirmān paid submission to him; and different parts of the territory of Khurāsān, which were dependent upon Hirāt and Balkh, such as Ṭāl-kān, Andkhūd, Maimand, Fāryāb, Panj-dīn, Marw-ar-Rūd, Dajzaḵ, Kīlaḵ, the whole of those towns came into the possession of the Ghiyāṣi officers, and the Khubbah and the coin became adorned by the august name of Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din.

After some time, Sulṭān Shāh, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of I-yal-Arsalān, Khvārazm Shāh, was ousted by his brother, Takīsh, Khwārazm Shāh, and presented himself at the Court of Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn. After a time he became seditious, as has been previously recorded, and departed for Khītā, and from thence brought aid, and took Marw, and began to ravage the frontier districts of the territories of Ghūr, and commenced harrying and plundering them, until, in the year 588 H., Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn commanded, so that Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn from Ghaznīn, Malik Shams-ud-Dīn of Bāmiān, and Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Ḥarab, from Sijistān, with their forces, assembled at Rūdbār of Marw, and they came and confronted the forces of Sulṭān Shāh, who, with his troops, marched out of Marw, and proceeded up [the river]; and, in opposing the Sulṭān, used to make irregular and sudden attacks, and to continually harass the foragers of the Sulṭān's army. For a period of six months

--

8 Malik 'Imād-ud-Dīn, Dīnār, the Ghuzz chief, driven out of the territory of Sarakhs by Sulṭān Shāh, Khwārazmī [see note 8, page 246], retired towards Kirmān in 581 H.; and, taking advantage of the distracted state of that kingdom, succeeded in establishing himself therein in Rajab, 583 H., and reigned over it for a period of eight years, and his son succeeded him. The subjection of the Ghuzz rulers of Kirmān to Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn is not confirmed by other authors.

9 Called also Maihand by some other writers. “Meemuma” and “Meimuna” are mere Anglicised forms, according to the rule of writing Oriental names contrary to the mode of the inhabitants of places, and also contrary to the way in which they are spelled.

1 This name is somewhat doubtful. Some have Kašīf, but the majority of copies have كیف the probably of Ibn-i-Ḥūkal.

2 See page 239 and note 2.

3 The same that was taken prisoner in the battle with Sulṭān Sanjar, along with 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥussain, and 'Alī, Jatrī, and ransomed for 50,000 dinārs. See note 2, p. 358.
this harassing warfare went on; and the two armies continued in proximity to each other until Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Din commanded that a ferry over the river Murgh-āb should be sought for, and he crossed it [with his own forces], and the other troops crossed over after him; and Sultan Shāh was defeated and put to the rout.

This success was gained in the year 588 H.; and Malik Bahā-ud-Din, Tughril, the Sanjari, in that encounter, fell into the hands of the Bāmiān troops, and they brought his head to the presence of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Din. On that day, likewise, Malik Shams-ud-Din of Bāmiān, son of Malik Fakhr-ud-Din, Mas‘ūd, who was the Sultāns’ uncle, obtained [the honour of] a canopy of state, and they gave him the title of Sultan.

In this same year likewise, previous to the time that the forces of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, and Bāmiān were about to assemble at Rūdbār of Marw, for the purpose of restraining Sultan Shāh, commands had been issued for the martyrdom of the gentle and beneficent Sultan, Khusrau Malik. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

Every year fresh successes were taking place in different directions of the territories of Ghūr, until, in the year

---

4 This was the year in which, according to most writers, and also our author himself, Mu’izz-ud-Din of Ghaznīn defeated the Rāe of Dihlī.

5 Our author, in another place, page 377, says Ghaznīn was taken in 569 H. [others say, in 568 H.], and that in 571 H. Hirāt was taken, and Bahā-ud-Din, Tughril, evacuated the city on the approach of the Ghūrīs, and joined the Khwārazmīs. The Ghūrīs could not have held Hirāt very long, for this affair with Sultan Shāh, in which Tughril was taken, took place, by our author’s own account, in 588 H., seventeen years after that evacuation of Hirāt by Tughril, and he is even then styled “Tughril of Hirāt” by our author, and so he styles him in his account of Tughril and his death, at page 249. From this it is obvious that the Ghūrīs could only have held Hirāt for a very short time after 569 H., and Tughril must have regained possession of it soon after, and only finally left it, on the advance of the Ghūrīs against Sultan Shāh, in this year, 588 H., or, more correctly, in 587 H. See note 4, page 374.

6 One of these pious brothers and model Sultāns of our author, Mu’izz-ud-Din, having deceitfully inveigled this amiable monarch into his power, broke his promises, and sent him and his family away into Ghūr to his other worthy brother who immured him in a fortress. At the time in question, finding Khusrau Malik an obstacle in their way, they had him put to death, and also his son, Bahram Shāh. Here our author says it took place in 588 H., and 587 H., in his account of Mu’izz-ud-Din, but, in his account of Khusrau Malik, he says it happened in 598 H. See pages 114 and 115, and note 6 to page 112, para. 10.

7 Sic in all the copies.
596 H., Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din-i-Takish, Khwârazm-Shâh, died. Sultan Ghïyas-ud-Dîn and Mu'izz-ud-Dîn moved into Khurâsân with the armies of Ghûr and Ghâznîn, and advanced to the gate of Nîshâpûr. While the forces occupied a position in the vicinity of Nîshâpûr, and hostilities commenced, trustworthy persons have, among the miracles of the victorious Sultan Ghïyas-ud-Dîn, related on this wise, that one day he mounted, in order to reconnoitre a place from which to attack the city, and rode round the edge of the ditch, and reached a spot from whence, in his august opinion, he determined to make the attack, as being the point where the capture of that city was likely to be effected. He made a sign with his whip, saying:—"It is necessary that the battering-rams should be planted from this tower to that tower, in order to make a breach, and enable a general assault to be made, so that the capture of this city may be effected, and this victory achieved." At the very time that he made this indication [with his whip towards those towers, the very portion of the walls of the city which he had pointed out, and the [two] towers, with everything near them, gave way, and the whole fell down, and became destroyed in such wise that not one brick remained upon another, and Nîshâpûr was taken. Malik 'Ali Shâh', son of Sultan 'Imâd-ud-Dîn, Takish, Khwârazm

---

* At page 255, in our author's account of his succession, he says, "'Ala-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, son of Takish, brought his father's dominions under his own jurisdiction in 595 H."

* If we choose to be guided by what English and some other European writers of Histories of India say, on the authority of translations of Firâsâb's work, from which their inspirations are drawn, Ghïyas-ud-Dîn was either a mere imbecile or a puppet, for he is said by several of them to have "retained nothing of the empire but the name," whilst others, including Elphinstone, of whom I expected something better, rush into the almost opposite extreme and say, that "he appears to have resumed his activity before his death, and to have been present in person in all the campaigns in Khârsân except the last!" but they forget, or, more likely, are unable to, mention, when all these campaigns took place, and against whom. The fact is that none of these statements are correct. Ghïyas-ud-Dîn reigned in glory to the end of his days, and his brother, Mu'izz-ud-Dîn, held the sovereignty of Ghâznîn subject to him, and undertook the conquest of Upper India by his commands. His last campaign, according to Ya'âsî, was in 597-8 H., only a few months before his death. See the specimens of translations under his brother's reign, Section XIX., and note 7, page 255, and note 3, next page.

1 He is styled "Sultan 'Alî Shâh," and "a very great and illustrious prince," at page 252, and also "Malik" in some places.
Shāh, together with the Khwārazmi Maliks who were there, and chiefs, and other persons of distinction, such as Sur-tāsh and Gaz-lak Khān, and a considerable body of others, fell into their hands.

To Malik Ziyā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, son of Abū 'Alī, Shansabī, who was the uncle's son of both the [Ghūrīn] Sulṭāns, and the son-in-law of Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, they gave the government and throne of Nishāpur, and returned [to their own dominions] that same year. The next year [597 H.] they advanced to Marw-i-Shāh-i-Jahān, and took it; and Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Khar-nak, they installed at Marw; and conferred the government of Sarakhs upon their uncle's son, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Zangī, who was the son of Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'tūd, Bāmiānī. Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn acquired jurisdiction over the whole of that territory, and Khurāsān became clear.

Malik 'Alā'-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, used great endeavours that they [the Sulṭāns] might perhaps

2 Yāsafī gives the following account of this “miracle” which our author makes so much of. "In the month of Rajab, 597 H., the Ghūrīs with an immense army, and ninety great elephants, each of which was like a mountain in size, advanced against Shād-yākh [of Nishāpur] where was, at that time, 'Alī Shāh, Sulṭān Muḥammad's brother, who had very recently arrived there on his return from Iran, and several men of distinction in the service of his other brothers. The Ghūrī Sulṭāns [the two brothers], in order to reconnoitre the place, were making a circuit around it, and came to a stand opposite the city [Nishāpur]. A vast crowd of people, from within Shād-yākh, in order to gaze upon the Ghūrī army, flocked to one of the towers facing it. Suddenly the tower gave way, from the crowd within it [the fortifications at the time were not in good repair], and fell down. This the Ghūrīs took as a good omen, and, during the same day [through this accident], took possession of the place." Another author states that the place was at once assaulted, captured, and plundered, and the date given is Rajab, 597 H., not 596 H., as our author states. Nishāpur was retaken from the Ghūrūs five months after. See page 393, note 8.

3 This is incorrect. See page 346, and note 8 and note 9, page 391.

4 Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn was merely left in charge as governor. The “throne of Nishāpur,” is one of our author's absurdities.

5 After getting possession of Nishāpur Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn returned to Hirīt, and his brother, Mu'tizz-ud-Dīn, marched into Kūhistān for the purpose of destroying the strongholds of the Mūlāhidah heretics of that part, and, after several [minor] encounters with them, an accommodation was brought about, and Junābīd was occupied, and the Kašāf of Tūlak [the same who was previously left as governor of Tabarhindah. See the reign of Mu'tizz-ud-Dīn. Section XIX.] was left there in charge.

6 Sulṭān, by his own account, and a much greater one than either of the Ghūrūs in many respects, and the ruler of a far greater extent of territory.
consent to accept his services [as their vassal], and relinquish Khurāsān to him again; but it was not given up to him. Trustworthy persons have related after this manner, that, when Takish, Khwārazm Shāh [the father], died, Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh [the son], sent envoys to the presence of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din, the purport of their embassy being to the effect, that, between the Sultāns of Ghūr and his father, a compact of friendship and unanimity was firmly established. He, their servant, desired that, according to that same compact, he might be [accounted] in the series of their other servants. If his exalted opinion thought well of it, the Sultān-i-Ghāzī, Mu’izz-ud-Din, should take his [servant’s] mother to wife, and consider him, his very humble servant, as a son; that from the Ghiyāṣiah Court he, his [Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din’s] servant, might receive an honorary robe, and a patent of investiture for Khurāsān and Khwārazm, and his servant would set free all the territory of ‘Irāk and Māwar-un-Nahr from the hands of enemies.

When they [the envoys] had discharged the purport of their mission, Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Din did not become agreeable to the proposed union, and hostility arose. As the Almighty God had ordained that the whole of the dominions of ‘Irān should fall under the sway of Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, he, upon several occasions, towards the close of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din’s life, retired discomfited before the forces of Ghūr and Ghaznin, and, at last, those Sultāns died before him.

Upon several occasions rich dresses of honour from the Court of the Khilāfat, from the Lord of the Faithful, Al-

---

7 Who, as usual, are nameless.

8 Very probable, seeing that his ancestors ruled over it for more than a century previously, and over all Khurāsān and greater part of ‘Irāk, by our author’s own accounts, for many years. See the reign of Maḥmūd, son of Ghiyāṣ-uDin, Muḥammad, farther on, where a treaty with the Khwārazmīs is mentioned.

9 Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, recovered most of his Khurāsān possessions, which the Ghūrīs had overrun the previous year, in 598 H. See previous note, and our author’s own account of Sultān Takish’s conquests at pages 241-2, and note 8, page 393, and his account of the Khwārazmī Sultāns generally.
Mustafa B'illah, and from the Lord of the Faithful, Un-Nasir-ud-Din Ullah, and reached the Court of Sultan Ghiyâsgud-Din. On the first occasion, Ibn-ur-Rabbi came; and the Kâzî, Majd-ud-Din, [styled] the Model, went along with him to the Court of the Khilâfat, and, on the second occasion, Ibn-ul-Khatib came; and the father of this their servant, Maulâna Sarâj-ud-Din, son of Minhâj-i-Sarâj, he [the Sultan] nominated to proceed along with him to the Court of the Khilâfat. On the arrival of the honorary dress from the Court of Un-Nasir-ud-Din Ullah, the imperial naubat five times a day was assumed by the Sultan.

His dominions became wide and extended, and from the east [eastern extremity] of Hindûstân, from the frontier of Chin and Mâ-Chin, as far as 'Irâk, and from the river Jihûn and Khurâsân to the sea-shore of Hormuz, the Khutbah was adorned by his auspicious name. He reigned for a period of forty-three years.

His bounty and benefactions, bestowed upon the meritorious, the learned, the recluse, and the devout, reached to the extremes of the empire of Islâm, from the east to the west, to 'Arab and to 'Ajam, to Turkistân and to Hind; and the names of all those meriting his bounty and charity were recorded in his civil courts and record offices. His life extended to a period of sixty-three years; and the removal of this great monarch from this transitory sphere to the eternal habitation took place at the city of Hirât, on Wednesday, the 27th of the sacred month of Jamâdi-ul-Awwal, 599 H. His mausoleum was raised by the side of the Jâmi' Masjid of Hirât. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

The Most High God had adorned the incomparable nature of the victorious Sultan, Ghiyâsgud-Din, Muham-

1 The Khilafah's proper name and title is Al-Mustâf Bi-Nûr Ullah. He died 575 H.
2 The Khilafah was stimulating the Ghûrfân Sultanans to hostility against Sultan Muhammad's father, Sultan Takiâsh, and afterwards did the same with respect to himself. See page 243, and note 1.
3 Kettledrums and other instruments sounded, at stated periods, before the gate of sovereigns and great men.
4 Some copies have the 7th, but the 27th of the month is confirmed by other authors. His tomb was on the north side of the Jâmi' Masjid which he had himself founded. Some authors state that 597 H. was the year of his decease, and others again, 598 H.
mad-i-Sām, with divers virtues and endowments, both outward and inward; and his Court was graced with learned doctors of religion and law ecclesiastical, accomplished scholars, illustrious philosophers, and the celebrated in eloquence; and his magnificent Court had become the asylum of the world, and the retreat of the worthy and laudable persons of the earth. Chiefs of the [holders of] religious tenets of every sect were there gathered together, incomparable poets were there present, and masters in the art of poetry and prose were entertained in the service of his sublime Court.

At the outset of the career of those sovereigns [Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din and Muʿizz-ud-Din], both the brothers followed the tenets of the Kirāmi sect⁶, in imitation of their ancestors and [the people of] their dominions; but Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sām, the younger brother, when he ascended the Ghaznin throne, the people of that city and territory being followers of the tenets of the Great Imām, Abū Ḥanīfah of Kūfā, in conformity with them, adopted the doctrines of Abū Ḥanīfah. Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din, however, saw, whilst in a dream, that he was used to be in the same masjid along with the illustrious Kāẓi, Waḥid-ud-Din, Marwazī, who followed the religious doctrines of the Traditionists⁶, and who was one of the leaders of the Shāfī sect. Unexpectedly, Imām Shāfī himself enters, and proceeds to the Mihrāb⁶, and begins to repeat the prayers; and Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din, and Kāẓi Waḥid-ud-Din, both of them follow Imām Shāfī in so doing.

On awakening from his dream, the Sultān commanded, so that, at break of day, Kāẓi Waḥid-ud-Din was requested to deliver a discourse. When he occupied the seat of the pulpit, he remarked, during the discourse⁹, saying,

---

⁵ The Kirāmīs, also called Mujassamīn—Corporealists—the followers of Muḥammad, son of Kirām, are one of the subdivisions of the Shīʿī sect who follow the tenets of Muḥammad, son of Idrīs, Ush-Shāfī. Ghiyāṣ ud-Din being of that sect, the offices of Imām and Khaṭīb of the great masjid of Hirāt, and other minor offices, were conferred on its ecclesiastics.

⁶ The four orthodox sects of Muḥammadans are Traditionists.

⁷ The chief place in a masjid where the priest prays with his face turned towards Makkah.

⁸ The different copies of the text express this clause of the sentence in three different ways, and use three different verbs although their meanings are similar.
"Sovereign of Islām! this your servant hath during the past night dreamt a dream," and he related the very same dream that the Sūltān had himself dreamt, for he had had one like it; whereupon, when the Kāzī descended from the chair, and went up to make his obeisance to the Sūltān, the latter seized the blessed hand of Kāzī, Waḥid-ud-Dīn, and adopted the tenets of Imām Shāfī'.

When the withdrawal of the Sūltān to the sect of the Traditionists became divulged, a load came upon the hearts of the Ulama of the sect of Muḥammad-i-Kirām [the Kirāmis]. Of this body, the great ecclesiastics were numerous; but, at that time, the most eloquent among them all was Imām Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Haṣam, the Niṣḥāpūrī, who was resident at, and the head of the college of the city of Ḍāshīn of Gharjistān. He composed a strophe on the Sūltān, and in it censured his withdrawal from the sect; and, when that strophe came to the Sūltān's knowledge, his sacred mind became much irritated with him, and Imām Ṣadr-ud-Dīn found it impossible to continue to dwell within the dominions of Ghūr. The strophe is this:—

[This polemical squib is of some length, and varies more or less in almost every copy, is of no particular interest, and need scarcely be translated.]

Imām Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, on this account, removed out of the territory of Ghūr, and proceeded to Niṣḥāpūr, and there he remained for the space of a year; after which he despatched [another] strophe to the presence of the Sūltān, so that he was sent for to come back again, and a robe of honour was despatched; and he returned to the Court from Niṣḥāpūr again. Strophe:—

[These lines have also been left out for the reasons previously given. As may be imagined, they are as full of fulsome adulation as the first were of aspersions.]

Trustworthy persons have thus related, that Sūltān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, in his early youth, was greatly addicted to conviviality, and fond of the sports of the field; and from

---

* The Āgār-ūl-Bilād states that Ghīyās-ud-Dīn used to copy Kurāns with his own hand, and sell them, and give the money they were sold for in alms to the poor. The celebrated Imām, Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of 'Umr of Rāz, wrote and dedicated to him a work entitled Laṭāfī-Ghīyāsī. See under the reign of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Section XIX.
the capital city, Firūz-koh, which was the seat of government, as far as the Zamīn [district] and town of Dāwar, which was the winter capital, not a human being dared to pursue the chase. Between these two cities [towns] is a distance of forty leagues, and he [the Sulfān] had commanded that a pillar should be erected at each league of distance; and in Zamīn-i-Dāwar he had laid out a garden, and he had given it the name of Garden of Iram

1, and certainly, for pleasantness and freshness, no such garden had ever been seen in the whole world, nor did any monarch possess the like of it. The length of this garden was more than sufficient for two courses of a horse, and the whole of its glades were adorned with pine and juniper-trees, and various sorts of shrubs and odoriferous herbs; and the Sulfān had commanded, so that, adjoining the wall of that garden, a plain had been cleared corresponding in length and breadth with the garden itself.

Once every year he used to give directions, so that for a distance of fifty or sixty leagues or more, a nargah

2 [semicircle] of huntsmen would be drawn out; and it would require the space of a whole month for the two extremities of this semicircle of huntsmen to close up. More than ten thousand wild beasts and animals of the chase, of all species and descriptions, used to be driven into that plain; and, on the days of chase

3, the Sulfān was in the habit of coming out on the pavilion of the garden, and holding a convivial entertainment; and his slaves, his Maliks, and the servants of the Court, one by one, with the royal permission, would mount on horseback and enter the plain, and chase and kill the game in the Sulfān’s august sight.

Upon one occasion he was desirous of entering the plain and enjoying the sport, upon which Fakhhr-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh

4, got upon his feet, and repeated a quatrain. The Sulfān retracted his intention, and devoted himself

1 The famous garden of Shadād, son of 'Ād, described by the eastern poets as a perfect model of the promised Muḥammadan Paradise.
2 One set of copies of the original use the word لی and the other لی. They are both of much the same signification.
3 If such can be called “the chase.”
4 The same who composed the History of the Shansabāns in verse, referred to by our author at page 300. Other writers state that he was one of the most learned of his time in the science of astrology.
to enjoyment. The following is the quatrain in question:

"To follow the wine, the beloved, and enjoyment,  
Will be better than that thou shouldst pursue the chase.  
When the gazelle of paradise is within thy net,  
Of what use that thou shouldst follow the mountain goat?"

Trustworthy persons have related that, when Sultan Ghiyäs-ud-Din forswore wine, and devoted himself to rectitude and goodness, at the period that Sultan Shāh, Khwārazm Shāh⁴, brought the forces of Khitā against Khurāsān, and made Marw his capital, the latter began to harry the border-tracts of the territory of Ghūr, and brought his troops to the Dahānah-i-Sher—the Lion's Jaws—[Pass] of Sarakhs, and despatched an emissary to the presence of the Sultan, Ghiyās-ud-Din, and preferred certain requests of his own to him. The Sultan commanded that an entertainment should be prepared to do honour to the envoy, and a gay party was brought together. Wine was circulated among the Malikṣ and Amirān of Ghūr, and the envoy was treated with great honour; and he was plied with wine, in order that, when in a state of inebrity, the disposition of Sultan Shāh might be discovered from his emissary.

For the Sultan's own drinking, sweet pomegranate juice was poured into a flask, and, when it came to the Sultan's turn to pledge, they would fill his goblet with that pomegranate juice, and would present it to him. When the envoy of Sultan Shāh became excited from the effects of the wine, he rose to his knees, and requested a minstrel to sing the following quatrain, which he accordingly did:

"Of that lion whose abode is within the Lion's Jaws,⁶  
The lions of the universe are in great affright.  
Thou shouldst, O lion, from 'The Jaws' show thy teeth,  
Since these are [as though] in 'The Lion's Jaws' from terror."

When the envoy called for this verse, and the minstrel sang it, Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Din's colour changed, and the

⁴ See page 246 and note ⁸.  
⁶ The point of these lines depends upon the play on the word Dahānah. It signifies the jaws, the mouth of a pass, yawning, and the like.
Maliks of Ghūr became much agitated. Khwājah Ṣafī-ud-Din, Maḥmūd, one of the most distinguished of the Wazīrs of his Court, and who was a miracle of wit and address, and endowed with a forcible poetic genius, and composed excellent poetry, arose to his feet, and, looking on the ground, in reply to the envoy, called on the minstrel for this verse:

"On that day when we shall raise the standard of hostility,
And shall take in hand the enemy of the territory of the world,
Should any lion from 'The Jaws' [dare] show his teeth,
We, with our mace, will crush his teeth within 'The Jaws.'"

Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Din was greatly pleased at this, and bestowed a liberal present upon the Khwājah, and honoured him with honorary dresses of great value; and the whole of the Maliks commended him. The Almighty have mercy upon the whole of them! and may He keep the Sulṭān of Islām, the sovereign of the seven climes, the great king of kings, the lord over all the rulers of Turk, 'Arab, and 'Ajam, the defender of the world and of the faith, the glory of Islām and of the Faithful, the aider of kings and emperors, the protector of the dominions of the Almighty, the pastor of the servants of God, the aided by Heaven, the victorious over the greatest of all species, the place of safety to the orthodox, the heir of the dominions of Sulimān, Abū-l-Muẓaffar-i-Maḥmūd, son of the Sulṭān [I-yal-timish], the Қasim [the co-sharer] of the Lord of the Faithful, in sovereignty and dominion for years unending, permanent and lasting, for the sake of His Prophet Muḥammad, on whom be peace abundantly abundant. 7

7 I have generally abstained from giving our author's fulsome and unctuous prayers for his patron, the puppet and recluse, who nominally ruled at Dihlī; but this was such a curious specimen that I could not leave it out. It shows that our author did not stick at any exaggeration—and the above contains many—and is a convincing proof that he "rarely indulges in high-flown eulogy, but relates his facts in a plain straightforward manner," &c. We must not imagine that all the epithets bestowed upon these rulers by their parasites were the titles they assumed.
THE SHANSABANIAH DYNASTY OF GHUR.

Titles and Names of the Sultān:

US-SULṬĀN-UL-A’ZAM, GHIYAS-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN,
ABŪ-IL-FATH, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SĀM
KĀSIM-I-AMĪR-UL-MŪMININ.

Offspring.
Sultān-ul-A’zam, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd,
Malikah-ul-Mu’azzamah, Jalāl-ud-Dunyā wa-ud-Dīn.

Length of his reign — Forty-three years.
Summer capital:—The City of Firūz-koh of Ghūr.
Winter capital:—The district of Dāwār.

Kāzīs of his Court.
Kāzī-ul-Kuṭūt [Chief Kāzī], Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Harawī.
Kāzī Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Ḥarmawādī.

Wazīrs of the Kingdom.
Fakhr-ul-Mulk, Sharaf-ud-Dīn, Wadārī.

* From the way in which his titles and names are here written in the very old copy of the text, within a circular area, it is evident that this was the inscription on his coins.
* A few copies have “Mu’aggam,” but it is incorrect.
* Forty-one in a few copies.
* Also written Ḥarmabādī in one or two copies: probably Jarmabādī or Jarmawādī may be more correct.
* Sharaf-ul-Ashraf.
* In one copy Fardārī.
THE ṬABAKĀT-I-NAṢIRĪ.

'Ain-ul-Mulk, Sūrānī [or Sūrlānī].
Zahir-ul-Mulk, 'Abd-ullah, Sanjarī.
Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Dīw-Shāhī [or Dīw-Shāhī].
Majd-ud-Mulk, Khwājah Ṣa'd-ud-Dīn.

**Standards.**

On the right, Black; on the left, Red.

**Motto on his august Signet.**

“For me God alone is sufficient.”

**His Sultāns and Malikīs.**

Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, his brother, ruler over Ghaznīn.
Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Mas'ūd, Bāmilānī.
Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad Sām, Bāmilānī.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Ḥarab, Sijistānī.
Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Alb-i-Ghāzī, son of Ḥāzil Aṟsalān.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Timrānī.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Zangi, son of Mas'ūd, Bāmilānī.
Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Yūsuf, Timrānī.
Malik Ţiyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Durr-i-Ghūr [the Pearl of Ghūr].
Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, son of Sūri, Mādīnī.
Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Kidānī.
Malik Shāh, Wakhshī [of Wakhsh of Badakhšān].
Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Timrānī.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn of Mūkrān.
Malik Mu-ayyid-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, Timrānī.

**Victories and Conquests.**

The territory of Hirāt, [defeat of] Ķimāj, Dāwar, Fāras, Kāliyūn, Flwār, Saif-rūd, Gharjistān, Ğal-ḵān, Juzarwān,

---

6 See page 346, and next page.

7 The list of these victories and conquests is only contained in three copies of the original. Even if a place was evacuated before the arrival of the Ghūrs, it is styled a “conquest” on their reaching it. What the “conquest” of Nīmroz and Sijistān was may be seen from what our author himself says at page 378. The Malik of Sijistān merely acknowledged his suzerainty.

7 Also written Bāras. See page 375 and note 6.
Jarūm, Tīgbīn-ábād, Kābul, 'Ighrāk', victory over Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, of Hirāt, Ghaznīn, Fūshanj, Sijistān, Nimroz, Maimand [or Maihand], Fārāb, Panj-dīn, Marw-ar-Rūd, victory over Sultan Shāh, Lohor* and Maro Malkah[?]1 Nishāpūr, and Nisā.

XVIII. MALIK-UL-HĀJĪ, 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF MALIK SHUJĀ'-UD-DĪN, ABI'-ALL, SON OF [IZZ-UD-DĪN], AL-ḤUSAIN, SON OF AL-ḤASAN, SHANSABI.

Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, was the son of Malik Shuja'-ud-Dīn, Abī'-All, and he was the uncle's son of both the Sultan, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and was older than either of the brothers. He had performed the pilgrimage, as well as fought against infidels; and in addressing him, they [the Sultan] used to style him Khudāwand [my Lord]. The daughter of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, who was named Māh Malik [Malikah], and styled by the title of Jalāl-ud-Dunyā wa-ud-Dīn, whose mother was the daughter of Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jahān-soz, was married to Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn.

That daughter was a highly dignified princess, and knew the sacred Kur'ān by heart, and she had also committed to memory the A'khbār-i-Shihābī [the Shihābī traditions*],

* In some copies but it is evidently the tract from whence Saif-ud-Dīn, who joined Sultan Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārezm Shāh, at Ghaznīn [see note 1, page 287,] against the Mughals, took his name.

* Lohor will, of course, be repeated as one of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's victories, as Ghiyās-ud-Dīn never passed the Indus.

1 This name is doubtful, and is not very plain in either copy of the text. It might be, Mar and Malkah. No such place is mentioned in the account of his reign, and some of the places here recorded as conquests were derived by marriage, or their rulers, as in the cases of Sijistān and Nimroz, merely acknowledged his suzerainty.

2 See page 346, para. second. This Malik-ul-Hājī, or the Pilgrim Malik, was, by our author's own account, the son of Abī'-All, son of Shuja'-ud-Dīn, Abī'-All, and therefore he was not the uncle's son of the two Sultan brothers, but the son of their uncle's son—a second cousin.

To save perplexity to the reader, I must mention that this personage is the same as was mentioned at page 346 by the name of Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Pearl of Ghūr. See also page 393, and note 1.

3 She was first betrothed to Sanjar Shāh, son of Tughrān Shāh, son of Mu-ayyid-i-Ā'īna-dār, Malik of Nishāpūr; and, after his, Sanjar Shāh's, captivity, betrothed to Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad. See page 182.

4 At page 301, our author states that this princess was the depository of the traditions of martyrdom [خیابات]; but, it is evident, from what he says here,
and her handwriting was as pearls befitting a king. Once every year she was in the habit of performing a prayer of two genuflexions, during which she would repeat the whole Kur'ān from beginning to end. The cause of her passing from the world a maid was this, that, before he was joined in wedlock to her, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, possessed a Turkish hand-maid, who was the mother of his son [Rukn-ud-Dīn]; but he had contracted marriage with her, and was not capable of consummating his marriage with this princess. In beauty, purity, and self-restraint, she had no equal in the whole world.

The mother of the writer of these pages was the foster-sister and school-companion of this princess; and this devotee [himself] was brought up in the princess’s own hall of favour and her haram of chastity, up to the period of his entering upon the bounds of adolescence, in the service of her royal dwelling, and her private apartments. The maternal uncles 4 of this devotee, and his maternal ancestors, were all attached to the service of that princess’s Court, and to the Court of her father; and this poor individual [himself] received many proofs of that lady’s favour and bounty: God reward her! At last her martyrdom and death took place in the territory of 'Irāk during the calamities which arose on the irruption of the infidels [the Mughals]. The mercy of the Almighty be upon her!

During the lifetime of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn held in fief, belonging to Ghūr, the district of Bust, and Wajjāh [or Wejah] of the territory of Garmsīr [of Ghūr], and Ürgān [or Urkān] of Ghaznīn 6. In the battle

and from what other writers state, that the book in question was the work entitled “Akbhār-i-Shihābī” 5, the Shihābī Traditions, so called from the author’s name, or the person to whom he dedicated his work.

6 A few copies have خولان—brothers, instead of خولن—maternal uncles.

* The text is hopelessly defective here, and of the whole of the twelve copies collated no two agree, except the I. O. L. copy and the Ro. As. Soc. copy, but they agree in leaving out several words. The two oldest copies agree as above given, with the exception that one has Wurmashān [وَرَمْشَانُ] or Durmashān [ذِرْمَاشْانَ] which last word also occurs in the defective passage in the two first-named copies. Wajjāh [وَاجْجَاهُ], which here, in several copies, seems written والجة and has been referred to at page 340. Some copies have زنوار and قفان and even زنوار in place of بين [بِينَ] of Ghaznīn, whilst the third best copy of the text omits these two words altogether. It is tiresome not to be able to fix this passage of the text for certain.
which the Sultân-i-Ghâzi, Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, fought against Pithorâ Râe of Ajmîr, and in which the Sultân was defeated, ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muhammad, accompanied the Sultân-i-Ghâzi, and, during that expedition, did good service. When the Sultân of Ghûr proceeded into Khurâsan, and Nîshâpûr was taken, ‘Alâ ud-Dîn was installed in the territory of Nîshâpûr, and, for a considerable period, he remained at the city of Nîshâpûr, and acted towards its people with justice and beneficence.

When Sultân Muḥammad, Khwârazm Shâh, arrived from Khwârazm before the gate of Nîshâpûr, ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn defended the place for some time. At last he entered into a convention, and surrendered the city to Sultân Muḥammad, Khwârazm Shâh, and returned again into Ghûr.

When Sultân Ghiyâṣ-ud-Dîn was removed to the Almighty’s mercy, the Sultân-i-Ghâzi, Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, conferred the throne of Firûz-koh, and the territories of Ghûr, Gharjîstân, and Zamîn-i-Dâwar, upon him; and, in the Khûtbah, his title became Malik ‘Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad. Previous to this they used to style him Malik Žiyâ-ud-Dîn, the Pearl of Ghûr.

7 The I. O. L. copy, and also the Ro. As. Soc. MS., and one of the others, have—“In the battle which Sultân Ghiyâṣ and Mu’izz-ud-Dîn fought,” &c. See under Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Section XIX.

8 Nîshâpûr [Shâd-yâkh] was taken in Rajab 597 H. Five months afterwards—in Zl.-Kâ’dâh—Sultân Muḥammad, Khwârazm Shâh, appeared before it. Malik Žiyâ-ud-Dîn had been left there, in command, at the head of a large force; and the walls [which, like the walls of Jericho, had fallen when Sultân Ghiyâṣ-ud-Dîn performed the miracle of pointing his riding whip at them, as related by our author at page 380] had been put into thorough repair. The Ghûrfis came out to fight, but, finding what the Sultân’s army was, “they retired,” says Yâfâ-i, “like so many mice into their holes.” The walls were pounded to dust and the ditch filled, when Malik Žiyâ-ud-Dîn sent out the chiefs of the ‘Ulamâ to solicit quarter, for himself and troops. The Sultân acceded to his request, and he and his troops were treated with honour, and sent back to Ghûr. So the Ghûrfis only held Nîshâpûr about five months. It must have been on this occasion that Žiyâ-ud-Dîn stipulated never again to draw his sword against the Sultân, referred to at page 418. After retaking Nîshâpûr, the Sultân advanced to Marw and Sarâkhs, which latter place was held by his own nephew, Hindî Khân [see page 252], on the part of the Ghûrfis. He fled to Ghûr on the approach of his uncle, but, the officer he left in charge not presenting himself, Sultân Muḥammad left a force to invest it, and set out, vid Marw, for Khwârazm to prepare for an advance upon Hirît.

9 Our author has a peculiar way of his own for distracting his readers very often. After giving an account of Malik Žiyâ-ud-Dîn, under the heading of his grandfather, Shuja’-ud-Dîn, at page 345-6, and calling him there by the title of Žiyâ-ud-Dîn, he is here introduced again under a totally different...
He held possession of Firūz-koh and the territories of Ghūr and Gharjistān for a period of four years; and in the year 601 H., when the Sultān-i-Ḡāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, proceeded towards Khwārazm, and took [with him] the armies of Ghūr and Ghaznin, Malik ʿAlā-ud-Dīn, the Pearl of Ghūr, conducted sundry of the troops of Ghūr into Mulḥidistān and Kūhistān, and advanced to the gate of the city of Kā-īn, and [from thence] pushed on to Junābād of Kūhistān, and captured the castle of Kākh of Junābād; and, after having performed numerous feats of arms and holy warfare, he returned into Ghūr again.

When the Sultān-i-Ḡāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, attained martyrdom, Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of [Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn] Muḥammad, son of Sām, advanced out of Bust, which was one of his fiefs, into Zamīn-i-Dāwar; and the Maliks and Amīrs of Ghūr joined Sultān Maḥmūd, and he set out towards the capital city, Firūz-koh.

Malik ʿAlā-ud-Dīn came from Firūz-koh into Gharjistān, and, when he reached the head of the bridge over the Murgh-āb river, the Sipah-sālār; Ḥasan-i-Abd-ul-Malīk, came up after him, and caused him to turn back; and, by command of Maḥmūd, he was confined in the castle of Ashīyār of Gharjistān.

name; and it is only now, after three or four pages, that he tells us that ʿAlā-ud-Dīn is the same person as figured before, in another place, under the title of Ẓiyyā-ud-Dīn. The fact is, that his correct title, up to this time, was Ẓiyyā-ud-Dīn; and, when Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn conferred the throne of Firūz-koh and other tracts upon him, his title was then changed to ʿAlā-ud-Dīn. Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn held him in great estimation, and he appears to have deserved it; and this fact, taken in connexion with Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd’s real character, noticed farther on, will account for the Sultān’s making him sovereign over Ghūr in preference to Maḥmūd, and also for Maḥmūd’s enmity towards him, and the murder of his son, Maḥmūd-i-Īrān Shāh.

1 Not the name of a territory. It is derived from mulhīd—heretic, &c. The Kūhistān of Khurāsān was full of these schismatics. All the copies of the text have the conjunction and between Mulḥidistān and Kūhistān; but it reads redundant, and “the heretical country of Kūhistān” appears to be the more correct rendering.

2 Junābād, also called Günābād, is situated between Tabas and Hīrāt. Kākh itself means a castle, a lofty building, and the like; but here refers to a small town of that name, a dependency of Junābād,—the “Goonabad” of Frazer and the maps.

3 Our author takes a most round-about way of relating ordinary events, and seems desirous of making a mystery of them. Malik ʿAlā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, unable to resist the combination against him, retired from Firūz-koh, was pursued, and imprisoned.
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When Sulṭan Maḥmūd was assassinated, and the sovereignty of Ghūr fell to Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Din, Utsuz-i-Ḥusain, he caused Malik 'Alā-ud-Din, Muḥammad, to be released from the fortress of Ashiyār, brought him to Fīrūz-koh, and treated him with honour and respect, until he slew the Sipah-sālār, 'Umr-i-Shalmatī, for murdering his son, Malik Ruṅ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Īrān Shāh. The cause of it was this, that, when Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, in the reign of Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Muḥammad-i-Sām, was seized [as just previously related], his son, Malik Ruṅ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Īrān Shāh, retired to Ghaznin. He was a prince of sufficient greatness, and endowed with perfect wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, and famed for his lofty-mindedness and activity. From Ghaznin he proceeded into Garmsīr, and from thence came into Ghūr; and the Kashī people, who were the [most] refractory of Ghūr, to the number of about 50,000 men, joined him. Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Muḥammad-i-Sām, with about 500 horse, of the main portion of his army, and some 2000 or 3000 foot, came forth from Fīrūz-koh, and a fight took place between them, and defeat befell the Ghūrlāns; and Malik Ruṅ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Īrān Shāh, discomfited, retired to Ghaznin, and again came into Garmsīr. He was seized by the Khudāwand-zādah, Saif-ud-Dīn, Timrānī, and he brought him to the presence of Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, who directed that he should be imprisoned in the residence of the Amīr-i-Ḥājib, 'Umr-i-Shalmatī.

On the day that Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, was assassinated, the Turkish slaves of Maḥmūd raised a tumult, and despatched one, who was named Amīr Mangabarās-i-Zār, to put Malik Ruṅ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-

---

4 Another son of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, Jahān-soz. He was named Utsuz after the third monarch of the Khwārazmī dynasty. See page 238.
5 That is to say, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām.
6 Five thousand more likely. Our author grossly exaggerates the numbers here. See page 399.
7 From this it is evident that the Kashīs were Ghūrlāns.
8 The son of a lord or great man.
9 There is some discrepancy with regard to this person’s name. Some copies of the text have مکورس—مکورس and the second word, Zār, signifying sale, sallow, and the like, is written in some copies Zūd, swift, quick; and in one
Iran Sháh, to death. The writer of these words, Saráj-i-Mínháj, states on this wise:—I was in my eighteenth year in the year 607 H., and was present at the entrance [gateway] of the Sulṭán's palace, in the capital city of Firúz-koh; standing looking on, as is the custom among youths, when this Amir Mangbaras-i-Zard came riding up with a wallet, with blood dropping from it, hanging from his arm. The head of Malik Rukn-u-Din, Maḥmúd-i-Irán Sháh—may he rest in peace!—he had placed in that wallet, and he entered into the Sulṭán's palace² with it.

I now return to my relation again:—In the reign of Sulṭán 'Alá-u-Dín, Utsuz-i-Ḥusain, when Malik 'Alá-u-Dín, Muḥammad, obtained an opportunity, he seized Amir 'Umr-i-Shalmat, saying, "Thou hast used thy endeavours in bringing about the murder of my son;" and at night he slew him. Early the next morning, when [Sulṭán] 'Alá-u-Dín, Utsuz, became aware of it, and the Amirs of Ghūr demanded redress, 'Alá-u-Dín, Utsuz, issued commands for Malik 'Alá-u-Dín, Muḥammad, to be imprisoned the second time in the fortress of Balarwán of Gharjistán. The remaining account of him, respecting what befell him when he ascended the throne of Firúz-koh the second time, will be related at the end of this Section.

XIX. SULṬÁN GHIYÁS-UD-DÍN, MAḤMÚD, SON OF GHIYÁS-UD-DÍN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF BAḤÁ-UD-DÍN, SÁM, SHAN-SABĪ.

Sulṭán Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Maḥmúd, son of Sulṭán Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, was a sovereign of good qualities, and conviviality, pleasure, and jollity were dominant in his disposition³.

When Sulṭán Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, his father, died⁴, Maḥmúd was desirous that his uncle, the Sulṭán-i-Ghāzi, Mu’izz-u-Din, should assign to him the

Zál, which means old, decrepit, &c. One copy has Mangúras-i-Zúd suwár, which would signify Mangúras, the swift or quick horseman.

¹ Our author, being in his eighteenth year in 607 H., would have been in his sixty-ninth year when he composed this work.
² The palace or residence of the Sulṭáns.
³ See note ³, para. 3, page 400, and page 405.
⁴ The L. O. L. MS., 52, is minus a leaf here.
throne of his father. But that expectation was not fulfilled, and the throne of Firuz-koh was conferred upon Malik 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad\(^6\), the Pearl of Ghur, to whom the daughter of Sul tan Ghiy\(\text{a}\)s-ud-Din, Muhammad-i-S\(\text{a}\)m, was betrothed\(^5\); and the territory of Bust, Isfizar\(^7\), and Farah, were given to Sul tan Ma\(\text{m}\)mud\(^6\).

In the year in which [his uncle] the Sul tan-i-Ghazi led an army into Khwaraizm, Ghiy\(\text{a}\)s-ud-Din, Ma\(\text{m}\)mud, marched the troops of Bust, Farah, and Isfizar, into Khurasan, and proceeded to the gate of Marw-i-Sh\(\text{a}\)h-i-Jahan; and in that expedition he manifested many marks of skill and activity\(^9\).

When the Sul tan-i-Ghazi, Mu'izz-ud-Din, was assassinated, Ma\(\text{m}\)mud determined to proceed from Bust to Firuz-koh, and, when he reached Zamin-i-Dawar, the Khalji\(^1\) Amirs of Garmsir, with a numerous following, joined him. The Amirs and Maliks of Ghur all came forth to receive him; and, in the year 602 H.\(^3\), he reached Firuz-koh, and the throne of Ghur came into his possession, and he brought the territories of his father under his jurisdiction\(^8\).

Malik 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad, retired from Firuz-koh into Gharjistan, and therein he was taken prisoner; and

---

\(^5\) Styled Ziya-ud-Din before he was raised to the throne of Firuz-koh.
\(^6\) She was either the full or half-sister of Ma\(\text{m}\)mud.
\(^7\) In some copies written Isfizar—the present Sabzwar.
\(^8\) Not styled Sul tan until he gained the throne after the death of his uncle.
\(^9\) His title had been Malik hitherto.

The compact which our author states to have existed previously between Ma\(\text{m}\)mud and Sul tan 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad, Khwaraizm Sh\(\text{a}\)h, at page 400, may have been entered into at this period. See also note \(^3\), page 400. The object he had in marching to Marw-i-Sh\(\text{a}\)h-i-Jahan does not appear, neither in the account of his uncle's reign is it referred to.

The Khalji tribe, I beg to remark, are neither Afghans nor Patans, although some persons have made such an absurd assertion. I shall have more to say about them as I proceed.

\(^3\) In this same year Fakhr-ud-Din, Mubarak Sh\(\text{a}\)h, the author of the history of the Ghuris in verse, referred to at page 300, died.

\(^9\) When information reached Ma\(\text{m}\)mud of the assassination of his uncle, Sul tan Mu'izz-ud-Din, he, in the first place, sent intimation to his brother-in-law, 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad [the Pearl of Ghur], son of Al\(\text{f}\)'-All, and called upon him to acknowledge his authority. Ma\(\text{m}\)mud also communicated the tidings to Izz-ud-Din, Husain, son of Khar-mil, Wali of Hizarat. Both of them, however, declined to acknowledge his authority, on which Ma\(\text{m}\)mud advanced to Firuz-koh with a large army. On this the generality of the Ghuristan Amirs deserted the cause of 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad, and went over to Ma\(\text{m}\)mud, and he gained possession of Firuz-koh, and threw 'Ala-ud-Din, Muhammad into confinement. See also note \(^3\), page 400.
was confined in the castle of Ašhiyār, as has been previously recorded; and when the whole of the various parts of the dominions of Ghūr, and Gharjistān, Tāl-kān, and Guzarwān, and the district of Fāras, and Garmsir, came under the sway and jurisdiction of his Slaves, such as Sulṭān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and Sulṭān Kūṭb-ud-Dīn I-bak, and other Turkī Malikṣ and Amīrs, who were Slaves of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, each of them despatched a person of rank to the presence of his Court, and solicited from Sulṭān Maḥmūd letters of manumission, and the investitures of the territories of Ghaznīn and of Hindūstān respectively.

He despatched a deed of investiture of the territory of Ghaznīn and a canopy of state to Sulṭān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz; and, when Sulṭān Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, advanced to Ghaznīn, he despatched Nizām-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, to Fīrūz-koh, in the year 605 H.; and Sulṭān Maḥmūd directed that a scarlet canopy of state and a deed of investiture of the government of the dominion of Hindūstān should be sent to him.

Throughout the whole of the territories of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, and Hindūstān, the Khuṭbah was read for Sulṭān Maḥmūd, and the coin was stamped with his name; and, as he was

4 Also with j, as at page 376; and in the same way as Sijistān for Sigistān, the one being the Arab mode of writing the word, and the latter the local.
5 This name also is written Bāras; and in some few copies Kādus. See page 342.
6 All these Slaves were of Turkish parentage. Maḥmūd having succeeded to the sovereignty of the dominions of his late uncle, the latter's slaves became his slaves also, according to Muḥammadan law, by succession. It is not to be supposed that either Yal-duz [I-yal-duz] or I-bak were then styled Sulṭāns, or that our author means it to be so understood. They were styled so ultimately. See note 9, page 496, and page 502.
7 Just above he says, "Yal-duz, I-bak, and other Turk Malikṣ and Amīrs;," but all could not have demanded the investitures of Ghaznīn and Hindūstān. Yal-duz [I-yal-duz] and I-bak sent agents to Sulṭān Maḥmūd expressing their loyalty, submission, and obedience to him; and in the whole of the empire the Khuṭbah was read for him and the money stamped with his name and titles.
8 Two copies of the text add here, "in order that he might assume jurisdiction over the Ghaznīn territories."
9 See the reign of Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, beginning of next Section. There our author contradicts this statement entirely, and says Kūṭb-ud-Dīn received the investiture in 602 H., and that he went to Lohor to receive it.
10 These events occurred, as our author here states, in 605 H.; but Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, appears to have received the investiture of Ghaznīn some time previous to this, and it is somewhat strange that he should have continued to coin money in the name of the late ruler, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, after what our author
the heir of the kingdom of his father and his uncle, all the Maliks and Sultāns paid reverence to his dignity, and showed the obedience of vassals unto him.

When one year of his sovereignty had passed, Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Irān Shāh, son of Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, advanced from Ghaznī towards Fīrūzkoh, as has been previously recorded, and Sultān Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, marched from Fīrūzkoh, and put him to the rout, and about 5000 Ghūrīs [in that affair] bit the dust.

After a period of two years and a half, Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, son of ['Alā-ud-Dīn] Ḥusain, who was his [Maḥmūd's] father's uncle's son, proceeded from the country of Bāmtān into Khwārazm, and sought assistance from Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, to enable him to seize the dominions of Ghūr. The Malik-ul-Jibāl, Ulugh Khān-i-Abi-Muḥammad, and Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, the Ḥājīb, who were two of the greatest of the Turkish Maliks of the Khwārazm Shāhs, with the troops of Marw and Balkh, Sarakhs and Rūdbār, were nominated to give him assistance, and he ['Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz] proceeded by way of Tāl-kān towards Ghūr.

Sultān Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, brought out his forces from Fīrūzkoh, and on the limits of Maimand and Fār-yāb, here states, and even after Sultān Maḥmūd, the former's successor, had given Tāj-ud-Dīn his freedom with the investiture of Ghaznī, much more up to the year 610 H., when even Maḥmūd had been killed in 607 H. But see page 497, and 500—505; and Thomas: Coins of the Pathān Kings of Delhi, page 30.

2 He was heir certainly in name at least; but the two favourite slaves of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn already possessed the greater portion of their master's dominions, from which Maḥmūd would have, in all probability, been unable to oust them. Mu'izz-ud-Dīn had, on more than one occasion, expressed a desire that these slaves, especially I-yal-dūz, should succeed to his dominions. See page 500.

3 Styled Ziyā-ud-Dīn, the Pearl of Ghūr, before he came to the throne from which Maḥmūd deposed him. See page 393, and note 6, and page 408.

4 Page 395.

6 Our author styles him "Sultān," as well as many others, before their attaining sovereignty.

6 Referred to in the account of the Khwārazm Shāhs. He subsequently became the father-in-law of Rukn-ud-Dīn, son of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh. See page 235.

7 Also called Fār-āb, Fār-āw, Bār-āb, and Bār-yāb. This battle and victory of Maḥmūd is not mentioned by other authors. See also pages 409 and 414.
at a place which they call [by the name of] Sālūrah⁸, a battle took place between the two armies. The Almighty bestowed the victory upon Sultān Maḥmūd, and 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, and the Khwārazm Shāhī Malikṣ, and the troops of Khurāsān were overthrown⁹.

When four years of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd's reign had expired, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, 'Alī Shāh¹, son of Sultān Takīsh, Khwārazm Shāh, sought refuge from his brother's [Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh] presence with Sultān Maḥmūd. On the Khwārazmī Sultān² becoming aware of this, he despatched distinguished personages [as envoys] to Firūz-koh. During the life-time of the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, a firm compact existed between Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd³, son of [Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn], Muḥammad-i-Sām, and

⁸ A few copies have Aslūrah.
⁹ See note ⁸, below.
¹ His title was Tāj-ud-Dīn, not 'Alā-ud-Dīn. See the account of him, page 252-3. He had been a prisoner in Ghūr some few years previously, and was known to the Ghūrīān Princes.
² The I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, and R. A. Soc. MS. both have—"when Sultān Takīsh became aware of it." Takīsh had been dead many years. The printed text, of course, is the same.
³ By this statement our author entirely contradicts that made at pages 256 and 382, and the present statement is certainly one more likely to be correct. It tends to confirm what Yāfa-i and some other works say, and which I shall presently refer to.

Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, after the death of his father, expected that his uncle, Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, would have placed him, the son, on his late father's throne of Firūz-koh and the kingdom of Ghūr; instead of which, knowing Maḥmūd's love of wine and other sensual pleasures, he bestowed it upon the son-in-law of the late Sultān, Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, the Pearl of Ghūr, and gave the western districts of the empire to Maḥmūd as his appanage, as stated by our author at page 472. On this account Maḥmūd entertained no very good feeling towards his uncle, and he may have entered into communication secretly with the Sultān of Khwārazm, who was naturally hostile to Muʿizz-ud-Dīn; and such an understanding as our author mentions may have been entered into at the time Maḥmūd went on the expedition to Marw, mentioned at page 397, when Muʿizz-ud-Dīn invaded Khwārazm.

I rather expect, however, that our author, who rarely indulges in dates, has confused the events of this period, as Maḥmūd, previous to the assassination of his uncle, was not in a position to enter into "a firm compact" with Sultān Muḥammad, unless secretly. Yāfa-i says [and Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh agrees] that when Maḥmūd seized the throne of Ghūr, shortly after his uncle's death, "he gave himself up to drinking and riotous pleasures; as was the habit of the Amirs of Ghūr, and attended to singing and jollity, whilst he neglected the affairs of the kingdom, and could not endure the fatigues of war. His great chiefs and nobles, perceiving his weakness of character, began to
Muḥammad-i-Takīsh⁴, Khwārazm Shāh, that friendship and concord should exist between them, and that the

⁴ Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Takīsh. Before he succeeded his father, his title was Kūb-ud-Dīn. See note ¹, page 253.

grow disaffected; and 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-ml, the Wāli of Ḥirāt, who was the greatest prop of the Ghūrīān empire, took precedence of all the other chiefs in tendering allegiance to the Sultan of Khwārazm, and despatched agents repeatedly soliciting that the Sultan would annex Ḥirāt; although that monarch had other important matters to attend to, still, fearing lest a portion of the Ghūrīān dominions, such as Balkh and districts around, might offer allegiance to the ruler of Karakhitā, and that that city might fall into his hands, he determined to move towards Balkh."

"The Wāli of that part, styled 'Imād-ud-Dīn, the chief of the Nāfīān [Bāmīān] Amīrs [called by our author, at page 260, 'Imād-ud-Dīn, 'Umr, Fīwārī], at first was most warm in his professions of loyalty and fidelity, and Balkh was made over to the Sultan, who continued the government, as heretofore, in the Wāli's hands; but, being afterwards detected in acts of treachery, and an intercepted letter having been placed in his hands, he threw himself at the Sultan's feet. His life was spared, but he was sent away to Khwārazm, after being allowed to take what treasure and other valuables he desired with him. His son [name not given] was also removed from the charge of the fortress of Tīrmīd, and that important post was made over to the guardianship of Sultan 'Uṣmān of Samarkand."

The Tārīkh-i-Alī differs considerably on these matters. It is stated therein, that, on the death of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn becoming known to Sultan Muḥammad, he assembled a large army for the purpose of attacking Balkh, then held by the officers and troops of Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of the late Sultan Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, of Bāmīān and Tukhrāstān, and invested that stronghold. At this crisis, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, had led an army against Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, ruler of Ghaznī. On this account Sultan Ghīyāq-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, who had intended to march his forces against Ḥirāt, to reduce 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-ml, to obedience, paused in order to see what the upshot of the other two affairs would be.

Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Ali Shāh [Sultan Muḥammad's brother, who subsequently took refuge with Maḥmūd], who commanded the forces investing Balkh, being unable to take it, Sultan Muḥammad proceeded thither in person, and summoned the governor to submit. All was of no avail, and the Sultan determined to proceed without further loss of time to Ḥirāt, when news reached him that Malik 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and his brother, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, 'Allī, had been defeated by Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, taken prisoners, and thrown into confinement. This happened, according to Faṣḥī, in 605 H. On this, 'Imād-ud-Dīn ['Umr], Governor of Balkh, hopeless of succour, surrendered the place. He was treated with honour and kindness, and continued in charge of Balkh, as before. After this, Sultan Muḥammad advanced to Balkhūr, got possession of that place, then proceeded to Tīrmīd, and obtained possession of that stronghold likewise, and then he returned to Khwārazm.

This latter statement is incorrect. The Sultan proceeded to Ḥirāt before returning to Khwārazm, as will be presently stated.

The Ghūrīān Amīrs and Chiefs, who were in accord with Amīr Maḥmūd, were preparing forces, says Yāʿānī, to attack Sultan Muḥammad's forces then
enemy of one should be the enemy of the other; and, on this occasion, Sultan Muhammad, Khwārazm Shāh, sent before Balkh; but the Sultan’s troops made a swoop upon them, like a falcon on a covey of partridges, and routed and dispersed them before they had had time to complete their preparations. This must have been the affair called a victory of Maḥmūd’s by our author. The territory of Balkh was now entrusted to the charge of Badr-ud-Dīn, Jā‘līsh [7], with a strong force to support him; and, after having disposed of the affairs of Balkh, the Sultan proceeded by way of Juwarwān [or Guzarwān] to Hirāt, which he entered in the middle of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 605 H., to the great joy of its people. [Yaṣa-ī is, as well as other writers, somewhat confused as to the dates here, and says this took place in 607 H., and so it is stated in note 8, page 257–258, taken from that work; but it is evidently an error for 605 H., as it was only in the third month of 607 H.—some say in 606 H.—that the Sultan first defeated the forces of Karā-Khiṭā under Bāṅko of Tarāz, and a month after Maḥmūd Ghūrī’s death, if he died in Safar 607 H., as our author and some others say, and not in 609 H.]

Rulers and chieftains from the adjacent parts now hastened to tender submission and allegiance to the Sultan, and to present themselves; and among these was the Malik of Sijistān [Yamīn-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh?], who was received with great honour. 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of Khar-mīl, was continued in the government of Hirāt and its dependencies, as previously related; and the Sultan, having disposed of these matters, despatched several ecclesiastics of the Kirāmī sect [Yaṣa-ī says in 606 H.] with proposals to Amīr Maḥmūd, ruler of Fīruz-koh and Ghūr. Maḥmūd accepted those proposals, which were, that he should acknowledge the suzerainty of Sultan Muhammad. He despatched valuable presents to the Sultan from the hoards accumulated by his ancestors and his uncle, and, among other rarities, a white elephant. [A white elephant is said to have been captured in the battle in which Jai Chandra, Rājah of Kinnauj, was defeated by Mu'izz-ud-Dīn. See page 470.] Amīr Maḥmūd was named Nāyab or Deputy of the Sultan, for whom he read the Khutbah, and stamped the coin with his name. This must be the treaty our author refers to, but he has confused the events. This acknowledgment of the superiority of the Sultan is evidently what Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, took umbrage at, as mentioned in Alīf, in note 7, page 433, when he set at liberty Jalāl-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī, of Bāmfn, who, in 605 H., along with his brother, was taken prisoner in a battle against him [I-yal-duz], and sent him back to recover the throne of Bāmfn, which probably was early in 606 H.

Sultan Muhammad, leaving 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of Khar-mīl, as Wālī of Hirāt, returned to Khwārazm, and subsequently entered on the campaign against Gūr Khān of Karā-Khiṭā. 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Hussain, son of Khar-mīl, hearing the report of the Sultan having been killed or taken captive in the second engagement with Gūr Khān’s troops [see page 258, and last para. of note 7], began to pave the way to make his peace with his former sovereign, and he again read the Khutbah for the ruler of Ghūr, and substituted his name on the coin. This must refer to Maḥmūd, as his young son, three months after his father’s death, was taken away to Khwārazm, and 'Alī-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, had been set up by the Khwārazmī Sultan as ruler of Ghūr; and, such being the case, Maḥmūd could not have been assassinated in Safar, 607 H., for this reason, that these events took place in the latter part of that year, or even in 608 H.; but if Safar, 607 H., is correct, then Maḥmūd was dead one month before the first battle between the Sultan and Bāṅko of Tarāz.

'Izz-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of Khar-mīl, finding almost immediately after that
Maḥmūd a copy of that treaty, with a request, saying, "As 'Ali Shāh is the enemy of my dominion, it is necessary that he should be seized." In compliance with the terms of that compact, Sulṭān Maḥmūd seized 'Ali Shāh, and imprisoned him in the Kaṣr, which they call the Baz Kūshk-i-Sulṭān, at Firūz-koh.

That Kaṣr is an edifice the like of which is not to be found in any country or in any capital—a Kaṣr in height and area, and with buttresses, balconies, and turrets, and of the Sulṭān was safe, to get himself out of this scrape, sent a requisition to the Khwārazmī nobles located in Eastern Khurāsān for aid against the Ghūrīs, who, on account of 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain's perfidy, were marching against him. This evidently is the matter referred to by our author at page 503, where he says I-yal-dūz aided Maḥmūd against 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl, but distorts the facts to suit his own purposes and inclinations, about the Sulṭān of Khwārazm "flying before the forces of Ghūr and Ghāzīn;" and what Aflī refers to, namely, that Amīr Ismā'īl, Maḥmūd's general, sent against 'Izz-ud-Dīn, was defeated and taken prisoner, and the remnant of his army returned to Firūz-koh. See note 2, page 504.

With the aid of the Khwārazmī nobles of Khurāsān the Ghūrīs were overthrown, and this affair broke their power entirely, and their party dispersed; and 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, was also seized and put to death, as related at page 258, last para., note 2.

The Ḥābil-us-Siyar states that Sulṭān Muḥammad demanded that Maḥmūd, Ghūrī, should seize the former's brother, Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī Shāh, and send him back in conformity with the terms of treaty previously existing "between himself and the late Sulṭān, Muʾizz-ud-Dīn" [see note 5, page 481], but says nothing about a previous treaty between him and Maḥmūd. This event, our author says, happened in the fourth year of Maḥmūd's reign, which, by his own account, would be towards the close of 606 H. The treaty thus referred to is doubtless the treaty mentioned by Fasīḥ-ī and others, which took place between Sulṭān Muḥammad and Sulṭān Muʾizz-ud-Dīn, after the latter's disastrous campaign against Khwārazm.

I have burthened the text with this lengthy note in order to show what discrepancy exists with regard to the events in the history of the Ghūrīs about this time, and to show the impossibility of the correctness of the dates given by several authors. Yāsīrī and Fasīḥ-ī and several others [see note 5, page 407] also say that Maḥmūd was assassinated in 609 H., and the Mirʿāt-i-Jahān-Nūmā confirms it. It is also certain, from our author's statements, as well as from the statements of others, that Maḥmūd was assassinated in the same year as Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī Shāh was; and that event, even our author says, happened in 609 H. See also page 253.

It is moreover proved beyond a doubt, that, soon after the decease of Sulṭān Muʾizz-ud-Dīn, the Ghūrīan rulers became mere vassals of the Khwārazmī sovereigns, who, at last, annexed the whole of their extensive territory as far as the Indus, or even to the Jihālam.

The word bas [bas], which is doubtless correct, signifies a mound, the spur of a mountain or hill, high ground. Some of the more modern copies have abāz [abāz], and some leave out the word altogether.

The signification of Kūshk and Kaṣr has been given in note 2, at page 331.
such configuration as no geometrician hath made manifest. Over that Ḍaṣr are placed five pinnacles inlaid with gold, each of them three ells and a little over in height, and in breadth two ells; and also two gold kumāz', each of about the size of a large camel. Those golden pinnacles and those kumāz, the Sultān-i-Ghażī, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, after the capture of Ajmīr, had sent in token of service, and as valuable presents, to [his brother] Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, with many other articles of rarity, such as a ring of gold, with a chain of gold attached, the dimension of which was five ells by five ells, and two great kos [kettle-drums] of gold, which were carried on carriages. Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn directed that the ring and chain, and those kharbūsah [kettle-drums], should be suspended before the portico of the Jāmī' Masjid at Firūz-koh; and, when the Jāmī' Masjid was destroyed by a flood, the ring, chain, and those kharbūsah [kettle-drums], the Sultān sent to the city of Hirāt, so that after the Jāmī' Masjid of that city had been destroyed by fire, they rebuilt it by means of those gifts.

Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, son of [Ghīyās-ud-Dīn], Muḥammad-i-Sām, was a sovereign very great, beneficent,

7 A fabulous bird peculiar to the East. It is considered to be a bird of happy omen, and that every head it overshadows will, in time, wear a crown. See also G. P. R. James's ATILLA, chap. vi.

8 The word used is 骟 Burlington, signifying small turrets in the wall, and also sometimes used for battlements, cornices, pinnacles, &c. The last is the most probable meaning here, or possibly small open domes, such as we see in some old Hindī buildings.

9 The text here again is very defective in all but the three oldest copies. Some of the more modern copies have "one kos," and state that the ring was "five ells by five ells," and instead of Kharbūsah have jazfrāh, which signifies an island. The same word occurs in Firūshtah—the original text I mean—who says two were presented to Kūbī-ud-Dīn by the ruler of Ajmīr, which Dow, very correctly, translates "two melons of gold," without apparently knowing what they were; but BRIGGS, by way of improving on Dow, turns them into "two tens of gold tissue." See his translation, vol. i, p. 194-5. The word _tac or =" which signifies a musk melon, suggests the shape of these drums.

1 I do not find any notice of this fire in other works, not even in Fāsīh-ī which generally contains minute particulars of every event occurring at Hirāt, as the author was a native of that city. Rauṣāt-ūs-Ṣafā merely mentions that Maḥmūd finished the Masjid of Hirāt which had been left unfinished at his father's death, and this statement is confirmed by the Khulāsāt-ī-Ākhbār and some other histories. I do not find any account of a flood. Amīr 'Alī Sher, the celebrated Wazīr of Sultān Ḥusain, Bahādur Khān, subsequently rebuilt this masjid in 905 ی, just a year before his death.
humane, munificent, and just. When he ascended the throne he opened the door of the treasury of his father. That treasury remained untouched as before, and Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Din had not appropriated any portion of it; and they have related, that of pure gold there were four hundred camel loads, which are eight hundred chests—but God knows best—and rich garments, vessels, pearls, and jewels in proportion, together with other valuable property of every description, the whole of which he disposed of.

During his reign gold, apparel, perfumed leather, and other things, through his munificence and his presents, became very cheap. He also purchased a number of Turkish slaves, and greatly valued them all, and raised them to competence and wealth; and his presents, gifts, and donations were constantly reaching people, until one day, during the second year of his sovereignty, the son of his aunt, the sister’s son of the Sultans [Ghiyāṣ-ud-Din, Muḥammad, and Mu’izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad], Malik Tāj-ud-Din, died, and no heir survived him, and his effects and treasures, consisting of ready money, gold and silver vessels, a vast quantity of wealth, were brought to the presence of Sultan Maḥmūd. He commanded that a banquet and festal entertainment should be arranged beneath [the walls] of the Kūshk, which is situated in the middle of [the city of] Firūz-koh.

He spread the carpet of pleasure, and directed that festivity and gaiety should be the order of the day; and, from the time of meridian prayer to the period of evening prayer, the whole of that money, consisting of darhams and dinārs, contained in leather bags and in scrips, was poured out of the windows of the Kasr. As it was a

---

1 Perfumed leather must have been extremely valuable in those days.
2 Malik Tāj-ud-Din; Zangī, son of Sultan Shams-ud-Din, Muḥammad, sovereign of Bāmīān and Ṭukhāristān. He was taken prisoner in battle with a body of Khwārazmī troops in the vicinity of Marw-ar-Rūd, at a time when peace existed between the Sultan of Khwārazm and Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, of Ghūrīn, and sent to Khwārazm with other chiefs taken at the same time, and their heads were struck off. See page 425, and page 481, note 4.
3 The text varies here again. The oldest copies are plainly written as above; but, according to some, the sentence may be read: “in the Kasr of Nar Kūshk which is situated in the midst of the city of Firuz-koh,” and, according to others, merely “in the Kasr which is situated in” &c. It is quite a different place to the Kasr of Baz Kūshk. The Europeanized Kūshk is derived from this latter word.
public banquet and a largess to both high and low, great
and small, every description of the different classes of the
people of the city of Firuz-koh were arriving in crowds at
the foot of the Kushk, and kept themselves under the
Sultan's observation. To each class of persons he was
giving a liberal share of dishes, long-necked flasks, lamps,
ewers, cups, platters, bowls, goblets, and other vessels of
different descriptions, all of gold and of silver, and, among
other presents, above a thousand slaves of his own, both
male and female, which he repurchased again from their
[new] owners. The whole city, from those largesses,
became [so to speak] filled with gold.

Sultan Mahmud was a sovereign of very great good quali-
ties, and his alms, donations, and honorary robes, to a large
amount, were received by all classes of the people; but, as
the decree of fate had [now] come, the motives of its advent
began to appear. Having, at the request of Sultan Muham-
mad, Khwārizm Shāh, seized the latter's brother, 'Alī Shāh,
and imprisoned him, 'Alī Shāh's servants, followers, and
dependents, consisting of 'Irākis, Khurāsānis, Khwārizmīs,
and Turks, in great numbers, together with his mother, his
son, and his women, along with him, the whole of them
agreed together with one accord, and several times, by means
of each of the most notable among them, sent messages,
secretly, to Sultan Mahmud, saying: "The reliance we
have in the Sultan is, that as we have all come and sought
refuge with his Highness, in the service of our master, 'Alī
Shāh, and have thrown ourselves under the shadow of the
Sultan's power and protection, it behoveth he should not
deliver us up into the hands of the enemy, for to seize and
make captive of those who have sought one's protection will
not turn out fortunate, otherwise we will make sacrifice of
ourselves, and let it not be that the Sultan should be in
dread of his life from us."

As the decree of destiny had gone forth, this communi-
cation, which they continued to represent to the Sultan,
was without any effect whatever, and a party of 'Ali Shāh's
dependents used, at night, to ascend to the summit of the
hill, called Koh-i-Āzād, which was facing the Kašr, and
the sleeping apartment of Sultan Mahmud, and there they
sat concealed, and examined the Kašr and noticed the
Sultan's sleeping apartment, and marked the way to the
place. All this they had done, until on the night of Tuesday, the 7th of the month of Safar, in the year 607 H., four individuals of the party referred to climbed up on the roof of the Sultan's Kasr, and assassinated him, and got away again by the same road as they had got up. They then crossed the river of Firuz-koh, which flows in front of the Kasr, and also climbed to the top of that high hill [the Koh-i-Ázad], and cried out with a loud voice: “O foes of our Malik! we have killed the Sultan: arise, and search for your Malik!” When the day broke, the whole city became agitated; and they buried the Sultan in the Kasr itself, and subsequently the body was removed to Hirat, and finally interred in the Gázár-gáh [catacombs] of Hirat.

The eldest son of the Sultan, namely Bahá-ud-Dín, Sám, was raised to the throne.

---

6 There is considerable discrepancy among authors respecting the year of Maḥmúd's assassination. Yáfa-i, Jámí'-ut-Tawáríkh, Faṣîh-i, Alít, Lubb-ut-Tawáríkh, Guzîdah, Mirât-i-Jahân-Numâ [which says “after reigning nearly eight years”], and some others say it happened in 609 H., while Jahân-Áría, Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣafá, Munkahab-ut-Tawáríkh, and a few others agree with our author's statement here as to the year 607 H. The former says it took place on the 7th of Safar, whilst the latter, Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣafá, and some others say, on the 3rd of Safar. Habîb-us-Siyar, on the other hand, affirms that it happened in 606 H., Khulásat-ut-Akhbâr, 607 H., and the Tārikh-ı-Ibrâhîmî, that it happened on the 3rd Safar, 597, but this must mean the year of the Rištāt [death of Muḥammad], not the Hijrah [Flight], between which two eras a period of about eleven years intervenes; and 597 of the former is about equal to 608 of the latter. There is no doubt but that Maḥmūd was assassinated in the same year in which Firuz-koh was taken by the Khwârazmîs, and Tâj-ud-Dîn, ʿAlî Shâh, put to death; and this last event our author himself states, at page 253, took place in 609 H. The words ٌس and ٌس without the diacritical points, may be easily mistaken by a copyist. See note 6, page 410.

7 It is not certain who killed Maḥmūd, and authors are at variance on this point. Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣafá agrees with our author, but merely copies his statements. Habîb-us-Siyar of course agrees with Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣafá. Yâfa-i, Faṣîh-i, Târikh-ı-Ibrâhîmî, and a few others, state that he was found dead on the roof of his palace, and that his slayer was not known, and Jahân-Ária, and Munkahab-ut-Tawáríkh, agree with our author. Another writer says ʿAlî Shâh slew him with his own hand.

8 Sometimes written Gázár-gáh as above, and also Gázar-gáh. It signifies the place of caves or hollows, a grave yard, catacombs. There is one at Shiráz in which the Poet Saʿdî was buried, and the one near Hirat in which the venerated Khwâjah ʿAbd-ullah, Anṣârî, was buried. The meaning of gázar is certainly a bleacher or washer, and gâh a place, but the above term does not refer to any “bleaching ground,” as a modern writer terms it, except that it is the bleaching ground for dead men’s bones.
XX. SULTĀN BAHĀ-UD-DĪN, SĀM, SON OF GHIYĀSH-UD-DĪN, MAḤMŪD, SON OF GHIYĀSH-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF BAHĀ-UD-DĪN, SĀM, SHĀNSABI.

Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, son of Sultān Maḥmūd [at this time] was about fourteen years of age, and his brother, Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, about ten. Their mother was the daughter of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, of Timrān; and in the haram likewise were two daughters by this Malikah.

When Sultān Maḥmūd was martyred, the next morning, all the Amīrs of Ghūr and the Turk Amīrs assembled together, and raised Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, to the throne of Firūz-koh; and the Malikah-i-Muʿizziah, who was the mother of Bahā-ud-Dīn, and the other children of Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, incited the Turkish slaves to slay the competitors for the sovereignty. Of that party one was Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd-i-Irān Shāh, the son of Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Abi-'Alī, and they martyred him, as has been previously recorded. Malik Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn, Timrānī, was imprisoned, as was Malik Shīhāb-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Mādīnī, likewise, who was the son of the uncle of the Sultāns [Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn, and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn]; and the Ghūrī and Turk Amīrs, in concert, stood around the throne with girded loins.

The followers of 'Alī Shāh, after five days, when they found the city had become tranquil, and that 'Alī Shāh still remained in durance, contrived to get up another tumult. They placed a number of men in chests, and pretended that they were going to bring treasure into the city from without, such was the plan they chose to enable them to enter the city and create another disturbance; but, unexpectedly, one among them who had conceived the idea of this wicked action came and gave information about

---

9 Her title, not her name.

1 In some of the more modern copies this is reversed, and they have "the Turkish slaves incited her," &c.

2 Several Princes of the family who were supposed likely to cause trouble, and interfere with this arrangement, were put to death by his supporters.

3 See pages 394, and 396. At page 399 this is differently related.

4 Other writers say, "cases of merchandize," and that forty-five persons were made to come out of these chests, and were, at once, put to the sword.
it. The chests were seized at the gate of the city, and about eighty men came out of the chests, of whom three were of those who had killed Sultan Mahmūd. All three were made a public example of and put to death, two others were cast headlong from the hill [of Aṣād] and seventy-five were thrown at the feet of the elephants and killed, amid the clamours and reprobation of the crowd.

Subsequent to this, Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Abī-‘Alī, Jahān Pahlawān, from Fiwār and Kāl-yūn presented himself [at the court]; and, when three months of the sovereignty of Sultan Bāhā-ud-Dīn, Sām, had passed away, Malik ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz [son of ‘Alā-ud-Dīn], Ḥusain [Jahān-soz], who was in attendance on Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, solicited aid from that monarch to enable him to possess himself of the dominions of Ghūr. Malik Khān [governor] of Hirāt, who at the commencement of the reign of the Khwārazmī Sultan bore the title of Amīr-i-Ḥājib, and who was an ‘Ajami Turk of great intrepidity, and the slayer of Muḥammad-i-Khār-nak, was nominated to proceed from Khurāsān to render assistance to ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, son of [‘Alā-ud-Dīn], Ḥusain.

Malik Khān, with the forces of Khurāsān, set out accordingly to assist Sultan ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz-i-Ḥusain, in possessing himself of Fīrūz-koh. When they arrived in the vicinity of Fīrūz-koh, the Malikis and Amīrs of Ghūr took counsel together, and came to the conclusion that it was advisable to release Malik ‘Alī Shāh from confine-

8 If it was so well known that ‘Ali Shāh’s followers had done the deed, it seems strange that they should have been allowed even to approach the gate, and that they should have come near the place and thus thrust their heads into danger.

9 That is a Turk born in ‘Ajam. This personage is mentioned in a number of places. He is the chief who joined Sultan Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārazmī, in after years, with 50,000 men, was present in the battle of Barwān, and was the unfortunate cause of Saif-ud-Dīn, Ighrāk’s desertion. Our author styles him Malik Khān, Amlin-i-Ḥājib, at page 287, but more correctly, Amīr-i-Ḥājib, at pages 415, 416, and the last Section on the invasion of the Mughals. His correct name appears to be Malik Khān, entitled Amlin-ul-Mulk, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib. See notes to pages 287-291. The Jami’-ut-Tawārīkh styles him “Amlin Malik of Hirāt.”

7 See note 6, page 287, and note 9, page 471.

8 Subsequently perhaps styled Sultan, after he had been set up as a vassal of the Khwārazmīs, but Malik is more correct.

9 Some copies are much more curt with the following passage.
ment, and treat him with great honour and reverence, so that, on his account, some of the Khurāsānī forces might evince an inclination towards that Prince, and, as he was also the adversary of his brother [Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh], he might, in concert with this sovereignty, oppose in battle the forces of Khurāsān. Malik 'Alī Shāh they accordingly set at liberty, and they appointed Amīrs to the [defence of] different sides around the city.1

Malik Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Alī, son of 'Abī-'Alī, and Amir 'Uṣmān-i-Khār-fash2, and other Amīrs, with troops, were appointed to occupy the summit of the Koh-i-Maidān, and Amir 'Uṣmān-i-Maraghānī, who was the Sar-i-Jāndār [the Chief Armour-Bearer], with a body of forces, was named to occupy the upper part of the Koh-i-Āzād3. Other Amīrs, such as Muḥammad-i-'Abd-ullāh, and Ghūrī, Shalmātī, and 'Umr, Shalmātī, were nominated to the Zār-Maragh gate4; and on a Thursday, during the whole day, round about the city and on the hills constant fighting went on. On a Friday, in the middle of the month of Jamādi-ul-Awwal, in the year 607 H.5, the city [of

1 After strengthening the defences as well as they were able.
2 This is evidently a nickname or byname [like Khar-mīl, Khar-nak, &c.] of no very complimentary nature—Ass-like. "Fash" has, however, other significations, which see. Two good copies have حرفش and حرفش respectively, but no doubt حرفش is intended.
3 This was the hill the followers of 'Alī Shāh used to climb to reconnoitre the palace of Sultān Maḥmūd.
4 Some copies have "Salmaṇ" and "Sulmān," but the above is correct.
5 Some few copies of the text, the best Paris copy included, name it the Tarā'īn gate. It is possible a gate might subsequently have been so named in remembrance of the victory over Pithorā Rāe, but the other best and oldest copies are as above.
6 Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, having delivered Hirāt from 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl, did not interfere in any way with Sultān Maḥmūd, Ghūrī, who had previously acknowledged his suzerainty, as already stated in note 3, para. 10, page 402. While, however, Sultān Muḥammad was engaged in a campaign beyond the Jīhān, his brother, Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī Shāh, having become dissatisfied with his brother, the Sultān, left his dominions and sought the Court of Maḥmūd, who received him honourably and with distinction, and supplied all his requirements. After some time had passed 'Alī Shāh [and some of his adherents probably], managed to eftect an entrance, secretly, into the Sarāī-i-Ḥaram [private apartments] in the middle of the day, where he found Maḥmūd asleep on the throne, and slew him, and no one knew who had done the deed. It however became noised abroad, that Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī Shāh, had conspired against him, in order to obtain the throne of Ghūr for himself.
Firuz-koh was taken [by the Khwārazmī forces], and the dominion of the family of [Ghiyāsh-ud-Dīn] Muḥammad, son of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, passed away.

I have already pointed out [note 8, page 407] what discrepancy exists between authors as to the year of Maḥmūd’s assassination, and that, in all probability, 609 H. is the correct date, and not 607 H. Our author himself says, in his account of Tāj-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī Shāh [page 253], that he was put to death in 609 H. and every copy of the text available agrees, and Yāfā-ī, and Faṣīḥ-ī, and Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh confirm it; and, from the various accounts of these events, it is beyond a doubt, that both Maḥmūd and Tāj-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī Shāh, were put to death in the same year, probably within a few months of each other, and before ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, ascended the throne, subject to the Khwārazmīs.

Our author here says it happened in the fourth year of Maḥmūd’s reign, and, as he ascended the throne about the middle of 602 H., this would make it before the middle of the year 606 H.; and, in this case, the date given by most authors for the battle between Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and Bānīko of Ṭarīz, namely Kabī’-ul-Awwal 607 H., cannot be ‘correct, as it is certain that the Sulṭān entered Hirāt, after ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Ḵᵛār-mīl, had been put to death, in Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 607 H., three months after the date of Maḥmūd’s assassination given by our author and several others. See note 7, pages 260-261.

Faṣīḥ-ī distinctly states, that, after Maḥmūd had been killed in 609 H., as no one remained of the descendants of the Sulṭāns of Ghūr worthy of the wand of sovereignty, the chief personages of Firuz-koh concerted together [our author’s own statement above tends to confirm this, although probably he did not like to acknowledge that the Ghūrīān Amīrs had set up a Khwārazmī as ruler], and raised Tāj-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī Shāh, to the throne. They then despatched an emissary to the presence of Sulṭān Muḥammad, to represent to him the facts of the case, and to solicit him to confirm ‘Alī Shāh in the sovereignty. The Sulṭān [seemingly] acceded to their request, and despatched Muḥammad-i-Baḡfir [one of his chamberlains] with a robe of honour for ‘Alī Shāh. After Muḥammad-i-Baḡfir arrived and began to congratulate ‘Alī Shāh with the usual ceremonies, ‘Alī Shāh proceeded towards an inner apartment and commenced arraying himself in the robe, when Muḥammad-i-Baḡfir drew his sword, and with one blow struck off his head; and congratulation was turned into condolence.

After this event no other could be found capable of the sovereignty, and Firuz-koh and Ghūr, and parts adjacent, were left in the possession of the Khwārazmī Sulṭān.

Ḵhābūs-Siyar says that Khwārazm Shāh, unable to secure his brother’s person, advanced upon Ghūr with a numerous army. The Ghūrīān nobles released ‘Alī Shāh to create a diversion, but it was of no avail, and Firuz-koh was taken in 607 H. Raṣūl-ʿal-Ṣafā states, that, after two or three days fighting in the hills and around the city, it was taken, as our author mentions, in the middle of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 607 H., and in this Jahān-Ārā, Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh, and others agree, the latter giving the 15th of that month as the exact date, which was just three months and seven days after the death of Maḥmūd, if he died in that year.

The statement of Yāfā-ī is different from those of other authors, who probably copied from our author’s work, but as the former work gives far more details
The Amirs, who had been despatched to occupy the hill-tops around, all escaped in safety, and 'Ali Shâh, and Malik Ḥusâm-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-Abî-'Ali' of Kâl-yûn, went out by the gate of the Reg Pul of Bust, and each and every one of them betook himself to some part or other. Malik Ḥusâm-ud-Dîn betook himself to Kâl-yûn, and 'Ali Shâh set out towards Ghaznîn. Sulṭân A'îâ-ud-Dîn, Utsuz, was placed on the throne, and Malik Khân of Hirât returned thither.

Sulṭân Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Sâm, with his brother [Malik Shams-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad], his sisters, and his mother, together with the treasure then ready at hand, and their aunt the Malikah-i-Jalâlî, the daughter of Sulṭân Ghiyâs-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-Sâm, who was betrothed to Malik 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad, and the whole, with the bier of Sulṭân Ghiyâs-ud-Dîn, Maḥmûd, were conducted towards Khurâsân. The bier of Sulṭân Maḥmûd was deposited in the Gâzâr-gâh [catacombs] of Hirât. The dependents, the married and the younger ladies of the family, and their property were removed to Khwârazm; and, up to the time of the troubles caused by the irruption of the infidels of Chîn, they continued in Khwârazm, and were treated with esteem and honour.

Chroniclers have related in this wise, that when the Mughal troubles arose, the mother of Sulṭân Muḥammad, Khwârazm Shâh, had those two Princes [Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Sâm, and Malik Shams-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad] drowned in the Jîhûn of Khwârazm—the Almighty have mercy upon them and forgive them!

Two daughters of Sulṭân Ghiyâs-ud-Dîn, Maḥmûd, up to the date of the composition of this History [are still living]—one is at Bukhârâ, and the other is at Bâlkh, respecting the Khwârazmîs than any other writer with whom I am acquainted, its statement, taken in consideration of what our author mentions, appears worthy of credit. Jahân-Ârâ, another good authority, states that it was 'Alâ-ud-Dîn, Utsuz, with an army sent along with him by Khwârazm Shâh, who invested Fîrûz-koh, and took the city in the year and date above-mentioned, when Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Sâm, and his brother were sent away to Khwârazm and met the fate mentioned by our author, at the time of the irruption of the Mughals.

7 Styled Jahân Pahlavân at page 409.
8 The "sand," or "gravel gate" leading to Bust. The text is very defective here, in nearly every copy.
9 See page 280
married to the Malik-zādah of Bahlōl, the son of Al-mās, the Ḥājīb.

XXI. SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, UTSUZ, SON OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, AL-ḤUSAIN, JAHĀN-SOZ.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, was the son of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, Jahān-soz, and was left by his father [at his death] very young in years; and he had grown up in the service of the two Sultāns, Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, but served the greater portion of his service at the court of Ghazvin with Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn.

The chronicler relates after this manner, that, upon one occasion, Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn was attacked by the cholic, to such degree that people had given up all hope of his recovery. The Amirs of Ghūr agreed together, in secret, on this matter, that, if the Sultān should unfortunately die, they would raise Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, to the throne of Ghazvin. Almighty God sent the draught of health from that dispensary, whence "indeed, when I am sick He healeth me," to Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and he recovered.

Certain informers made the Sultān acquainted with this circumstance, and this compact; and he commanded that it was necessary that 'Alā-ud-Dīn should be removed from the court of Ghazvin lest, through the wrath of humanity, odium might chance to touch him. 'Alā-ud-Dīn proceeded to the court of Bāmīān to his uncle's sons; and [at that time] the throne of Bāmīān had passed to Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, son of Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, son of Malik Faḵhr-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd. After he [Utsuz] had pro-

1 Ḥabib-us-Siyar, and some others likewise agree with our author, and say that 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, was set up by Khwārazm Shāh after the dethronement of Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām; and that 'Alī Shāh fled to Ghazvin after the capture of Fīrūz-koh. The reason why this Khwārazmī, or rather Turkish name, was given to 'Alā-ud-Dīn is mentioned at page 238. He was, no doubt, set aside by Abū-l-'Abbās-i-Shīr who slew Utsuz's brother, Saif-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, for killing his brother, War-maḡh, otherwise he was the next heir to the throne after his brother Sultān Saif-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad.

2 Not Sultān at that time, for he had not then come to the throne.

3 Kur'ān : chap. 26, verse 80.

4 It appears that all rulers had these news-givers or informers in their employ.

5 See page 428 for the account of him.
ceeded thither, they treated him with reverence, and the district of Nāe of Bāmīān was assigned to his charge.

After some time his [Utsuz's] daughter was given [in marriage] to his [Sultān, Bahā-ud-Dīn's] eldest son, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, as will subsequently be, please God, recorded in the Section on the Maliks of Bāmīān.

The course of the days allotted to the extent of the dominion of the Sultāns, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, having run their course, and Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, having likewise died, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, proceeded from the court of Bāmīān to the presence of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, to solicit assistance to enable him to obtain possession of the dominion of Ghūr and the throne of Firūz-koh. He was treated with great honour there, and received the most princely usage, and the Amir of Khurāsān, such as Ulugh Khān-i-'Abi-Muhammad, Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Utsuz [the Hajib], and the Majd-ul-Mulk, Wazir of Marw, with the whole of the troops of Upper Khurāsān were directed to afford assistance to Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, in possessing himself of the territories of Ghūr.

Sultān Maḥmūd advanced out of Firūz-koh to meet them and overthrow their forces, as has been previously recorded; and they [the Khwārazmī nobles] retired, and again resumed their duties in the service of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh.

---

6 This place is often mentioned in Bahaiṭ.
7 See account of him, No. III. of Section XIX.
8 Bahā-ud-Dīn of Bāmīān must be meant. Maḥmūd's son, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Sām, only reigned three months, but he did not die until cast into the Jihūn between ten and eleven years after these events, and after the slaves of Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn had succeeded to the whole of his dominions. See page 409.
9 The reader will not fail to observe that this mighty sovereign to whom the latter Ghūrīs appealed when they wanted help, and whose suzerainty the nephew of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn acknowledged, is the same that our author would make us believe sent such abject petitions to Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn and his brother, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, mentioned at page 381-2.
1 Styled Malik-ul-Jibāl at page 399.
2 Scarcely probable, even by our author's own account, if the "firm compact" mentioned at page 400 is correct; but, as mentioned in note 8, page 400, the "treaty" must, really, mean Maḥmūd's acknowledgment of Sultān Muḥammad's supremacy, which took place after the affair here alluded to. The defeat of the Khwārazmī troops is not mentioned by the various authors I have quoted, but quite the contrary.
3 At page 400.
Matters continued in this wise until after the assassination of Sultān Maḥmūd, when Malik Khān of Hirāt, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib, and [Malik] 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, from Bust, and the forces of Khurāsān, advanced towards Fīrūz-koh⁴; and they placed 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, on the throne of Ghūr, and Malik Khān of Hirāt again retired.

The Malikis and Amīrs of Ghūr submitted to Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz; but hostility showed itself between him and the Turk Amīrs of Ghaznīn, and Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and Mu'ayyid-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad-i-'Abd-ullah, Sistānī⁵, who was the Wazīr of Ghaznīn, and in pomp like a sovereign, encountered Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, in the limits of Kidān and the Margh-i-Nūlah, in battle, and the army of Ghaznīn was defeated and overthrown.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, was a just monarch, learned, and a patron of learned men; and the Kitāb-i-Mas'ūdī, on ecclesiastical jurisprudence, he knew by heart. In the promotion of 'Ulamā [theologians], and the bringing up of the families of men of learning, he used to do his utmost, and every one among the sons of 'Ulamā, whom he continued to find diligent and persevering, he was accustomed to honour with his benevolent regard.

When he ascended the throne he set at liberty Malik⁶ 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muhammad, from the fortress of Aṣḥiyār of Gharjistān; but, on account of his killing 'Umr-i-Shalmatī, the Sultān again shut him up within the walls of the fortress of Balarwān.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, reigned⁷ for a period of four years, until Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Husain, the Amīr-i-Shikār [Chief-Huntsman], brought an army from Ghaznīn against him⁸, and a battle took place between them in the

⁴ Compare the account at page 409, and on the preceding page. In a few copies of the text the words "and [Malik] 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz," are left out.
⁵ Styled Sanjarī in the list of Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's ministers and nobles, at page 205
⁶ Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the last of the dynasty. See page 417.
⁷ Subject to Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāḥ.
⁸ Any one reading this would imagine that this Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Husain, was some independent chief who had made war upon 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz. He was sent by Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, against 'Alā-ud-Dīn, who, being a vassal of the Khwārazmīs, was naturally inimical to I-yal-duz, the trusted Slave of the late Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and on whose side most if not all, of the
centre of Ghūr, within the limits of Jarmās. The right wing of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz’s, army was commanded by Malik Ḫuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Ali, son of Abl-‘Ali’, who attacked the left wing of Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain’s, troops, and overthrew and routed [that portion of] the Ghaznīn forces, and pursued the fugitives [off the field]. Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, [with his centre] charged the centre of the Sulṭān’s army, and wounded him with his spear, and a Turk among the troops of Ghaznīn smote the Sulṭān on the head with his mace in such wise that both his august eyes exuded from their sockets ¹, and he fell down from his horse. Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, remained on horseback over the head of the Sulṭān, when Malik Ḫuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, returned from the pursuit of the routed left wing of the Ghaznīn army, and charged Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, and again recovered the [wounded] Sulṭān, and conveyed him towards the district of Sangah, and on the way the Sulṭān was received into the Almighty’s mercy ². They buried him by the side of his kindred, the Malikīs of the family of the Shansabānīs.

Sulṭān ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, reigned for a period of four years and a little over; and, after his death, his sons became dispersed. One of them, Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd, went into Ghārjistān to the castle of Sīvā-Khānah ³, and

Turkish Amīrs were ranged, whilst the Ghūrī Amīrs were on the opposite side.

¹ This chief is again mentioned by our author in his account of the Mughal invasion of these parts. Malik Ḫuṭb-ud-Dīn was directed by Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, under whose rule the Ghūrīn empire west of the Indus had fallen, to put all the fortresses of Ghūr into a state of efficiency for defence against the Mughals. Malik Ḫuṭb-ud-Dīn, at last, succeeded in reaching Hindūstān after a narrow escape of falling into the hands of those infidels.

² This event happened, near Ghaznīn, in 611 H. ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, ruled over Ghūr for about four years; and most authors state that he was the last of the race of Shansabānī who held sovereign power, and, with him, the dynasty terminated. This must have happened very shortly before the death of I-yal-dūz, who was put to death in the tenth month of this year, according to some, and in 612 H. according to others; but it is very probable that I-yal-dūz did set up the favourite and trusted kinsman of his late master. See page 418.

³ Several of the more modern copies of the text have Sātā-Khānah for Siyā-Khānah. This fortress is again referred to in the last Section containing the account of the Mughal invasion.
there he remained for some time; another, Malik Naṣir-ud-Din, Muḥammad, went to the fortress of Bindār [or Pindār], in Upper Ghārjistān, and long continued there. The youngest son, Jamshed by name, during the troubles of the infidel Mughals, entered into the district of Harīwar-Rūd, and, in the Darah of Khyṣht-Āb, he was martyred [by Mughals]. Those two elder sons of the Sulṭān, through the calumny of Malik Khān of Hirāt, received martyrdom at the hands of the slaves of Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh. They strove greatly, and strained every nerve; but, as it was not the Divine will, neither one of them attained unto sovereignty.

XXII. SULṬĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SHUJĀ'-UD-DĪN-I-ABŪ-ALĪ, THE LAST OF THE SULṬĀNS OF GHŪR.

Previous to this, in several places, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, has been made mention of, that, at the outset of his career, he used to be styled Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, the Pearl of Ghūr, and when, after Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of [Bahā-ud-Dīn] Sām, he ascended the throne of Firūz-koh, his title became Malik [Sulṭān] 'Alā-ud-Dīn.

Since Malik Naṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, at this time martyred Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, Firūz-koh, and the dominion of Ghūr came under the control of the Amirs and troops of Ghaznīn, and of Ghūr. They, in concert, set up Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain-i-'Abd-ul-Malik, Sar-i-Zarrād, over Firūz-koh, and they repaired the fort of Firūz-koh, and, in the midst of the city, and on the hill of

4 Khyṣht and Khūṣht, in Pūshto, signify damp, wet, humid, dank, soaked, &c., and āb is Persian for water. The Pūshto equivalent for water is ao-bab.

5 Our author makes the same blunder here as at page 391. Shujā'-ud-Dīn, Abū-'Alī, was 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad's, grandfather. See page 346.

6 This should be, Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, restored. See page 391.

7 See note 5, page 393.

8 Previously mentioned as Amīr-i-Shīkār, or Chief Huntsman. The idiom here varies considerably.

9 One copy of the text has "Sīh-Zarrād," and another Sī-Zād. He was set up as temporary ruler perhaps. He is, no doubt, the same person who is referred to by our author in his account of the Mughal invasion, and who, at that time, held the fortress of Saγah of Ghūr for Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh, and his son Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn.
the fortress of Baz Kūşhk, they placed a barrier of iron, and raised a rampart, and commenced hostilities. They brought Malik 'Ala-ud-Din, Muḥammad, out of the castle of Ašhiyār [of Gharjistān] and carried him away to Ghaznīn. These events happened in the year 610 or 611 H.

When Sultān 'Ala-ud-Din, Muḥammad, reached Ghaznīn, Sultān Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz, treated him with great honour and reverence, and commanded so that they took the canopy of State of Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Din from the head of that monarch’s mausoleum, and they raised it over the head of Sultān 'Ala-ud-Din, and he [Tāj-ud-Din, Yal-duz] gave him the title of Sultān, and sent him to the capital, Firūz-koh.

He returned to Ghūr again; and, when he had ruled for a period of one year and a little more, and the Khuṭbah was read, and the money was coined in his name, and his title of Sultān was made universally [public] in the Khuṭbah, Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, sent him the treaty which the Sultān had, at Nishāpūr, taken from him, to the effect that he ['Ala-ud-Din, Muḥammad] should never, at any time soever, draw sword against him [Sultān Muḥammad]. Accordingly, in the year 612 H., Sultān 'Ala-ud-Din, Muḥammad, delivered up the city of Firūz-koh to the trusty officers of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm

1 The text here is very defective in most copies, and varies considerably both in words and idiom. Whom hostilities were carried on with does not appear.
2 Sultān Maḥmūd was killed, according to our author and some other writers [see note 4], in the second month of the year 607 H.; and 'Ala-ud-Dīn, Utsuz, was killed after a reign, by our author’s account, of four years and a little over, which, supposing the “little over” to have been one month only, would bring us to the third month of the year 611 H.; and, according to several authors, on the 3rd or the tenth month of that same year, Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, was himself put to death at Budā‘īn by I-bak’s son-in-law, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, who then ruled at Dihlī. If these dates be correct, ‘Ala-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, could not have reigned more than six months, which is evidently incorrect. Jahān-Ārā says he vacated the throne, and retired to the court of Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, leaving him to take possession of the country, after he had reigned one year and a little over. This would bring us to about the fourth month of 612 H.; and the Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīš states that I-yal-duz was defeated and put to death in this year, not in 611 H. The period assigned for Utsuz’s reign is probably too great. See under Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, No. IV., Section XIX.
3 I do not think any of his coins have been found.
4 At that time styled Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad. See note 8, page 393.
Shāh, and was himself conducted to Khwārazm, and was treated with great honour and veneration.

He took up his residence near to the Malikah-i-Jalālī, the daughter of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, who was joined in wedlock to him. They dwelt together in the Khwārazmī dominions for a considerable time, and [at length] death's decree arrived, and he was received into the Almighty's mercy. During the period of his own dominion and sovereignty, he had despatched trusty and confidential persons, and had acquired a place adjacent to [the tomb of] Shaikh Abū-Yazid, Busṭāmī, and had caused the position of his tomb to be fixed upon; and, at the time of his decease, he had made it his last request that his body should be removed from Khwārazm to Busṭām.

Tāj-ud-Dīn, I yal-duz, being dead at this time, Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, was deprived of his support; and this may have been another reason for his abdicating. Several other authors agree with respect to this year, but others again distinctly state that Sultān Muḥammad obtained possession of Fīrūz-koh and Ghūr, and also of Ghaznī, in 611 h. Ghūr, as previously stated, had been subject to him in the time of Utsuz. Yāsafī says: "After these events [before related], in 611 h., [the Jāmi'-ut-Tawārīkh agrees,] news reached the Sultān [Khwārazm Shāh] that Tāj-ud-Dīn, I yal-duz, had died at Ghaznī [our author and several others state that he was put to death at Budā'īn], leaving no heir who was capable of succeeding him [he left no son], and that one of his slaves had assumed his place. This determined the Sultān to devote his energies to the annexation of that territory, together with other extensive provinces. Having effected his purpose, Hirāt, Ghūr, Ghurjistān, and Sijistān, and the territory as far as the frontier of Hind, an extensive empire, and containing many flourishing cities and towns, previously ruled by Sultān Maḥmūd-i-Sabuk-Tīgin and his descendants, up to the period of the rise of the Sultāns of Ghūr, fell under his sway, and he nominated his eldest son, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, to the government of it," and a Khwārazmī Amīr [see page 257] was appointed to rule it as his deputy or lieutenant. See the reign of Yal-duz further on.

In the treasury, at Ghaznī, where Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn had placed them, were found, at this time that Sultān Muḥammad obtained possession of Ghaznī, several documents from the Khalīfah's Court to the Ghūrīān Sultāns, inciting them to hostility against him, and vilifying and maligning him and his acts. The finding of these documents proved to him that the hostility of the Ghūrīs towards him proceeded from the instigation contained in them. He did not make known the contents of these documents at this time, intending to do so after sufficient time had elapsed for him to free the countries of the East. See note 4, page 265.

How was it possible for them to have dwelt together, when, as our author himself states at pages 301 and 392, the marriage was never consummated, and the princess died a maid? They may have resided near each other. She had been betrothed to Ṭughan Shāh, grandson of Malik Mu-aṣyid-i-Āfnah-dār, before she was betrothed to Ziyā-ud-Dīn. See page 182.
When, in accordance with his last will, they conveyed his remains to Busṭām, the attendant at the Khānkhāh [monastery] of Busṭām, the night previously, saw Shaikh Abū-Yazīd in a dream, who said to him, “To-morrow a traveller and guest arrives: it behoveth that thou shouldst perform the rite of going forth to receive him.” At the dawn of the morning the attendant of the Khānkhāh set out from Busṭām, and, at about the first watch of the day, the bier of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, arrived from the direction of Khwārazm. It was conducted with all reverence, and veneration into Busṭām, and they buried him likewise adjoining the Shaikh-ul-'Ārifān, Abū-Yazīd—the mercy of the Almighty be upon them!—and the Maliks of Ghūr, and the Sultāns of the Shaṁsabi race, by the extinction of his dominion, came to a termination.