UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_170710

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

ORIENTAL TEXTS APPROVED BUT NOT FINANCED BY THE TRUSTEES AND SOLD BY MESSRS. LUZAC & CO.

The **Safar-náma, Rawshaná'í-náma** and **Sa'ádat-náma** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1923). 8*s.*

The **Zádu 'l-Musáfirín** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1923). 15*s.*

The **Wajh-i Dín** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1924). 4*s.*

The **Silsilatu 'n-Nasab-i Ṣafawiyya** of Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Shaykh Abdál-i Záhidí ("Íranshahr" Press, Berlin, 1343/1924). 2*s.*

"E J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL"
SERIES

NEW SERIES, V

ORIENTAL TEXTS APPROVED BUT NOT FINANCED BY THE TRUSTEES AND SOLD BY MESSRS. LUZAC & CO.

The **Safar-náma, Rawshaná'í-náma** and **Sa'ádat-náma** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1923). 8*s.*

The **Zádu 'l-Musáfirín** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1923). 15*s.*

The **Wajh-i Dín** of Náṣir-i Khusraw ("Kaviani" Press, Berlin, 1924). 4*s.*

The **Silsilatu 'n-Nasab-i Ṣafawiyya** of Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Shaykh Abdál-i Zahidí ("Íránshahr" Press, Berlin, 1343/1924). 2*s.*

"E J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL"
SERIES

NEW SERIES, V

TURKESTAN
DOWN TO THE MONGOL INVASION

BY W. BARTHOLD

Second Edition

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL RUSSIAN
AND REVISED BY THE AUTHOR
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF
H. A. R. GIBB, M.A.

PRINTED BY THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS FOR
THE TRUSTEES OF THE "E. J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL"
AND PUBLISHED BY MESSRS. LUZAC AND CO.
46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1
1928

Printed in Great Britain

THIS VOLUME
IS ONE OF A SERIES
PUBLISHED BY THE TRUSTEES OF
"THE E. J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL"

The funds of this Memorial are derived from the Interest accruing from a Sum of money given by the late MRS. GIBB *of Glasgow, to perpetuate the Memory of her beloved Son*

ELIAS JOHN WILKINSON GIBB

and to promote those researches into the History, Literature, Philosophy and Religion of the Turks, Persians and Arabs, to which, from his Youth upwards, until his premature and deeply lamented Death in his forty-fifth year, on December 5, 1901, *his life was devoted.*

تِلْكَ آثَارُنَا تَدُلُّ عَلَيْنَا * فَانْظُرُوا بَعْدَنَا إِلَى الْآثَارِ

" *These are our works, these works our souls display;*
Behold our works when we have passed away."

"E. J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL"

ORIGINAL TRUSTEES

[JANE GIBB, *died November* 26, 1904],
[E. G. BROWNE, *died January* 5, 1926],
G. LE STRANGE,
[H. F. AMEDROZ, *died March* 17, 1917],
A. G. ELLIS,
R. A. NICHOLSON,
SIR E. DENISON ROSS.

ADDITIONAL TRUSTEES

IDA W. E. OGILVY GREGORY, *appointed* 1905.
C. A. STOREY, *appointed* 1926.
H. A. R. GIBB, *appointed* 1926.

CLERK OF THE TRUST

W. L. RAYNES,
90 REGENT STREET, CAMBRIDGE.

PUBLISHER FOR THE TRUSTEES

MESSRS. LUZAC & CO.,
46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C. 1

E. J. W. GIBB MEMORIAL" PUBLICATIONS

OLD SERIES. (25 WORKS, 40 PUBLISHED VOLUMES.)

I. Bábur-náma (Turkí text, fac-simile), ed. Beveridge, 1905. *Out of print.*

II. History of Ṭabaristán of Ibn Isfandiyár, abridged transl. Browne, 1905. 8*s.*

III, 1–5. History of Rasúlí dynasty of Yaman by al-Khazrají; 1, 2, transl. of Sir James Redhouse, 1907–8, 7*s.* each; 3, Annotations by the same, 1908, 5*s.*; 4, 5, Arabic text ed. Muḥammad 'Asal, 1908–1913, 8*s.* each.

IV. Omayyads and 'Abbásids, transl. Margoliouth from the Arabic of G. Zaidán, 1907, 5*s.* *Out of print.*

V. Travels of Ibn Jubayr, Arabic text, ed. de Goeje, 1907, 10*s.* *Out of print.*

VI, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Yáqút's Dict. of learned men (*Irshádu'l-Arib*), Arabic text, ed. Margoliouth, 1908–1927; 20*s.*, 12*s.*, 10*s.*, 15*s.*, 15*s.*, 15*s.*, 15*s.* respectively.

VII, 1, 5, 6. Tajáribu'l-Umam of Miskawayhi (Arabic text, fac-simile), ed. le Strange and others, 1909–1917, 7*s.* each vol.

VIII. Marzubán-náma (Persian text), ed. Mírzá Muḥammad, 1909, 12*s.* *Out of print.*

IX. Textes Ḥouroûfîs (French and Persian), by Huart and Riẓá Tevfíq, 1909, 10*s.*

X. Mu'jam, an old Persian system of prosody, by Shams-i-Qays, ed. Mírzá Muḥammad, 1909, 15*s.* *Out of print.*

XI, 1, 2. Chahár Maqála; 1, Persian text, ed. and annotated by Mírzá Muḥammad, 1910. 12*s.* *Out of print.* 2, English transl. and notes by Browne, 1921, 15*s.*

XII. Introduction à l'Histoire des Mongols, by Blochet, 1910, 10*s.*

XIII. Díwán of Ḥassán b. Thábit (Arabic text), ed. Hirschfeld, 1910, 7*s.* 6*d.*

XIV, 1, 2. Ta'ríkh-i-Guzída of Ḥamdu'lláh Mustawfí; 1, Persian text, fac-simile, 1911, 15*s.* *Out of print.* 2, Abridged translation and Indices by Browne and Nicholson, 1913, 10*s.*

XV. Nuqṭatu'l-Káf (History of the Bábís) by Mírzá Jání (Persian text), ed. Browne, 1911, 12*s.*

XVI, 1, 2, 3. Ta'ríkh-i-Jahán-gushây of Juwaynî, Persian text, ed. Mírzá Muḥammad; 1, Mongols, 1913, 15*s.* *Out of print.* 2, Khwârazmsháhs, 1917, 15*s.*; 3, Assassins, in preparation.

XVII. Kashfu'l-Maḥjúb (Ṣúfí doctrine), transl. Nicholson, 1911, 15*s.* *Out of print.*

XVIII, 2 (all hitherto published), **Jámi'u't-Tawáríkh** of Rashídu'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh (Persian text), ed. and annotated by Blochet, 1912, 15*s.*

XIX. Kitábu'l-Wulát of al-Kindí (Arabic text), ed. Guest, 1912, 15*s.*

XX. Kitábu'l-Ansáb of as-Sam'ání (Arabic text, fac-simile), 1913, 20*s.* *Out of print.*

XXI. Díwáns of 'Ámir b. aṭ-Ṭufayl and 'Abíd b. al-Abraṣ (Arabic text and transl. by Sir Charles J. Lyall), 1913, 12*s.*

XXII. Kitábu'l-Luma' (Arabic text), ed. Nicholson, 1914, 15*s.*

XXIII, 1, 2. Nuzhatu'l-Qulúb of Ḥamdu'llah Mustawfí; 1, Persian text, ed. le Strange, 1915, 8*s.*; 2, English transl. le Strange, 1918, 8*s.*

XXIV. Shamsu'l-'Ulúm of Nashwán al-Ḥimyarí, extracts from the Arabic text with German Introduction and Notes by 'Aẓímu'd-Dín Aḥmad, 1916, 5*s.*

[**XXV. Díwáns of aṭ-Ṭufayl b. 'Awf and aṭ-Ṭirimmáḥ b. Ḥakím** (Arabic text), ed. Krenkow, in the Press.]

NEW SERIES

I. Fárs-náma of Ibnu'l-Balkhí, Persian text, ed. le Strange and Nicholson, 1921, 20*s.*

II. Ráḥatu'ṣ-Ṣudúr (History of Saljúqs) of ar-Ráwandí, Persian text, ed. Muḥammad Iqbál, 1921, 47*s.* 6*d.*

III. Indexes to Sir C. J. Lyall's edition of the Mufaḍḍalíyát, compiled by A. A. Bevan, 1924, 42*s.*

IV. Mathnawí-i Ma'nawí of Jalálu'ddín Rúmí. 1, Persian text of the First and Second Books, ed. Nicholson, 1925, 20*s.*; 2, Translation of the First and Second Books, 1926, 20*s.*

V. Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, by W. Barthold. Second Edition, translated from the original Russian and revised by the author, with the assistance of H. A. R. Gibb.

Mázandarán and Astarábád, by H. L. Rabino, with Maps (in the Press).

Díwán of al-A'shá, Arabic text with German translation by R. Geyer (in the Press).

Jawámi'u'l-Ḥikáyát of 'Awfí, a critical study of its scope, sources and value, by Niẓámu'ddín (in the Press).

Letters of Rashídu'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh, abridged English transl. by Muḥammad Shafí', followed by transl. of **Tansúq-náma** (on Precious stones) by the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler (in preparation).

A History of Chemistry in Mediaeval Islám, by E. J. Holmyard.

WORK SUBSIDIZED BY THE TRUSTEES

Firdawsu'l-Ḥikmat of 'Alí ibn Rabban aṭ-Ṭabarí, ed. Muḥammad az-Zubayr aṣ-Ṣiddíqí (in the Press).

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

NO excuse is required for the present translation nor for its inclusion in the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series.

Barthold's epoch-making work appeared in 1900 under the Russian title of Туркестанъ въ эпоху монгольскаго нашествія, that is to say, *Turkestan at the Time of the Mongol Invasion.* In spite of being written in a language which is comparatively little known it has found its place in all libraries boasting completeness and in those of all scholars interested in Central Asian history, and consequently it has long been out of print.

The present work is, however, no mere translation, for this English edition has been thoroughly revised and amplified by Professor Barthold himself in the light of the vast new materials which have been made accessible in the last quarter of a century. That the actual alterations in the text of the work have, in spite of this, been relatively slight is the strongest tribute to the thoroughness and critical acumen of the author Thus the history of Central Asia from the period of the first invasion by the arms of Islam down to the arrival on the scene of Chingiz-Khān at the beginning of the thirteenth century is now available to Western readers with a wealth of detail which perhaps Professor Barthold is alone able to supply.

As the author explained in his preface to the first edition, he selected as the subject of his special study the most important period in the history of Central Asia, the period, namely, of Mongol rule. It was his original intention to touch on the history of the preceding centuries only in so far as this was indispensable for his main purpose, but in the course of his examination of the original sources he found that the rise and development of Mongol rule in Central Asia had not hitherto been adequately dealt with. He therefore found it necessary

to devote the greater part of his book to an exposition of the history of the pre-Mongol period. His work thus became an inquiry into the factors which determined the course of history of the country prior to the arrival of the Mongols, the circumstances of their appearance in Turkestan, and the manner in which they conquered the country.

Originally the author proposed also to examine what were the conditions of life introduced into Central Asia by the Mongols and to bring his work down to the establishment of an independent Mongol State in Turkestan in 1269. The history of the Jaghatay Kingdom has not yet been undertaken by the author, and owing to the extreme meagreness of the Moslem accounts we must wait for a complete translation of the Yüan-shih before the history of Central Asia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries can be adequately dealt with.

The original Russian edition included a number of extracts from Persian and Arabic histories occupying 172 pages bearing on his subject, most of the extracts being taken from hitherto unpublished works. Seeing that these texts are available in the original edition, the Gibb Memorial Trustees have not thought that the re-printing of them would justify the large additional expense which this would involve.

Professor Barthold has been at special pains to compile a historico-geographical sketch of Transoxania, and has made use, not only of all available documentary sources, but also of such ancient monuments as have been preserved. In his original preface he repeats what he himself wrote in 1899 on the importance attaching to the preliminary labours of those who have carried out investigations on the spot.

"On this question the author has nothing to add to the remarks which he published in the *Turkestanskiya Vyedomosti* (1899, No. 87): 'among the duties of the local force lies the collection of the raw materials, and the more raw material that is collected the easier is the task of its scientific manipulation, and the more

accurate and circumstantial are the results attained'; but at the same time 'for the successful work of amateurs it is indispensable that they should have the opportunity of making more extensive use of the results of scientific researches, and at all events in their own labours they should have at their disposal such works as would enable them to find their bearings in the matter and save them from the unproductive occupation of seeking what has already been found and of discovering America.' In this way there is created an enchanted circle of a peculiar kind; the labours of local workers cannot be successful until they have at their command 'the results of scientific researches'; the deductions of scientific investigators cannot be 'accurate and circumstantial' until the local forces have provided them with a sufficient quantity of 'raw materials'. The breaking of this circle will be possible only in the event of both scientific investigators and local workers endeavouring to give what they can, and reconciling themselves to those deficiencies in their own work which arise from temporary conditions of this sort. The author hopes that his book will in some degree give local workers the opportunity of 'finding their bearings' in the history of Central Asia down to the death of Chingiz-Khān, and that on their side they will procure material both for the rectification of the errors in the book and for further researches."

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to refer to any of the additional sources which have appeared since the Russian edition appeared, but the amount of such material will be readily apparent from a perusal of Professor Barthold's foot-notes. The translation has been revised, under Professor Barthold's personal control, and the English edition and index prepared by Mr. H. A. R. Gibb. The task was not always an easy one, and though here and there the English has inevitably borne the colour of a translation, it is trusted that the precise meaning of the original has nowhere been departed from. No additions

have been made to the author's own material, except for a few references, enclosed in square brackets, to recent publications as the work was passing through the press.

It remains only to acknowledge the meticulous care which the printers and readers of the Oxford University Press have bestowed on the publication of a work presenting unusual difficulties.

E. DENISON ROSS.

CONTENTS

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION xiii

INTRODUCTION. SOURCES 1

I. THE PRE-MONGOL PERIOD 1

Question of the existence of historical literature in Central Asia before the Arabs, 1. Arabic Historical compilations, 1. Bibliographical works, 4. Sources of Ṭabarī, 5. Historians of the third century A. H., 5. The early geographers, 6. Historians of the Būyids, 7. Literature in the Sāmānid kingdom, 9. Tenth-century geographers, 11. Works on the history of various towns, 13. Period of the Qarā-Khānids, 17. Historians of the Ghaznevids, 18. Eleventh-century writers, 24. Historians of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries, 26. Historians of the Ghūrids and Khwārazm-shāhs, 31. Collections of official documents, 33. Travellers and Geographers, 34. Ḥaydar Rāzī, 37.

II. THE MONGOL INVASION 37

Chinese and Muslim contemporaries, 37. The work of Juwaynī, 39. Literature among the Mongols, 41. Yuan-shi, 44. Rashīd ad-Dīn, 44. Waṣṣāf, 48. Fourteenth-century historians, 49. Literature in the Jaghatāy kingdom, 51. The compilations of Mīr-khwānd, 57. Kitāb-i-Mullāzāda, 58.

III. EUROPEAN WORKS OF REFERENCE 59

Deguignes, 59. D'Ohsson and subsequent works, 59. Raverty, 60. Cahun and recent works, 61. General works on Muslim history, 62. Russian works, 63.

CHAPTER I. GEOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF TRANSOXANIA 64

Definition of Transoxania, 64. Banks of the Amu-Darya, 65. Balkh, 76. Road between Balkh and Merv, 79. Road along the Amu-Darya from Balkh to Āmul, 80. Valley of the Zarafshān, 82. Samarqand, 83. The district of Samarqand, 92. Road between Samarqand and Bukhārā, 96. Bukhārā, 100. The district of Bukhārā, 112. Names of towns and villages in the Zarafshān basin according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt, 121. Valley of the Kashka-Darya, 134. Kish and its district, 134. Nasaf and its province, 136. Roads from Nasaf to Bukhārā and Samarqand, 137. Villages in the Kashka-Darya valley according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt, 139. Khorezmia, 142. Kāth, 144. Khorezmian canals, 146. Gurgānj, 146. Maqdisī's itineraries, 147. Roads from Khorezmia to the neighbouring provinces, 154. Basin of the Syr-Darya, 155. Farghāna, 155. Khojend, 164. Ushrūsana, 165. Īlāq and Shāsh, 169. Isfījāb and its province, 175. Lower reaches of the Syr-Darya, 178.

CHAPTER II. CENTRAL ASIA DOWN TO THE TWELFTH CENTURY 180

Life of the population down to the Muslim conquest, 180. Relations between Arabs and natives, 182. Qutayba b. Muslim, 184. Struggle between Arabs and Turks, 186. Umayyad governors after Qutayba, 187. Shi'ite movements, 190. Naṣr b. Sayyār, 192. Administration of Abū Muslim, his victories and death, 194. Policy of the 'Abbāsids, 197. 'Abbāsid governors in Khurāsān, 197. Internal administration under the 'Abbāsids, 203. Debased coinage, 204. Ṭāhirids, 208. Rise of the Sāmānid dynasty, 209. Character of the Ṭāhirid and Sāmānid administration, 212. Rise of the Ṣaffārid dynasty, 215. Administrative system of 'Amr b. Layth, 219. Policy of Isma'īl in Transoxania, 222. War between 'Amr and Isma'īl, 224. Organization of the state under the Sāmānids, 226. Native dynasties, 233. Industry and commerce, 235. Taxation and customs, 238. Isma'īl's successors, 240. Rise of the Qarā-Khānid dynasty, 254. Bughrā-Khān, 257. Sabuktagīn; his relations with the Sāmānids and Qarā-Khānids, 261. The last Sāmānids, 264. Qarā-Khānids after Bughrā-Khān, 268. Isma'īl Muntaṣir, 269. Maḥmūd's assumption of the title of Sulṭān, 271. Maḥmūd's struggle with the Qarā-Khānids, 272. Dissensions among the Qarā-Khānids, 274. Maḥmūd's conquest of Khorezmia, 275. Events in Transoxania after 1017, 279. Character and importance of Maḥmūd's reign, 286. Reign of Mas'ūd, 293. Victories of the Saljūqids, 302. Rise of a separate branch of the Qarā-Khānids in Transoxania, 304. Differences between the administration of the nomads and that of the preceding dynasties, 305. Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, 311. Shams al-Mulk, 314. Successors of Shams al-Mulk, 316. Subjugation of Transoxania by the Saljūqids, 316. Nature of Arslān-Khān Muḥammad's administration, 319. Victory of Sinjar, 321.

CHAPTER III. QARĀ-KHIṬĀYS AND KHWĀRAZM-SHĀHS 323

Appearance of the Qarā-Khiṭāys in Transoxania, 323. Rise of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs, 323. Struggle between Atsiz and Sinjar, 325. Conquest of Transoxania by the Qarā-Khiṭāys, 326. Last years of reign of Atsiz, 327. Il-Arslān, 332. Events in Transoxania, 333. Events in Khurāsān, 334. Activities of the Qarā-Khiṭāys and Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān, 336. Takash and Sulṭān-Shāh, 337. Rise of the Ghūrids, 338. Successes of Takash, 339. Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad, 349. His conflict with the Ghūrids, 349. Events in Transoxania, 353. Course of the struggle between Muḥammad and the Qarā-Khiṭāys; two versions, 355. Conquest of Transoxania and subsequent events, 363. Operations against the Qipchāqs and collision with the Mongols, 369. Struggle with the Caliph, 373. Struggle with the priesthood and military party, 375. Dislocation of the Eastern Muslim political organization, 379.

CHAPTER IV. CHINGIZ-KHĀN AND THE MONGOLS . 381

Character of Mongolian history in the twelfth century, 381. Chingiz-Khān's guard, 382. Military and civil administration, 385. Uighūr culture, 387. Chingiz-Khān's relations with the representatives of civilization, 391. Division of the Empire into appanages, 393. Intercourse between Chingiz-Khān and the Khwārazm-shāh, 393. The Utrār catastrophe, 397. Victory of Mongols over Kūchluk, 401. Preparations for war on part of Chingiz-Khān and the Khwārazm-shāh, 403. Appearance of Mongols in Transoxania, 406. Chingiz-Khān's advance on Bukhārā and Samarqand, 407. Jūchī's advance down the Syr-Darya, 414. Fall of Banākath and Khojend, 417. Operations of the Khwārazm-shāh, his flight and death, 419. Operations of Chingiz-Khān after the conquest of Transoxania, 427. Conditions in Khorezmia, 428. Fate of Turkān-Khātūn, 430. Fate of Khorezmia, 431. Operations of Jalāl ad-Dīn, 437. Jalāl ad-Dīn's flight to India, 446. Events in Khurāsān, 446. State of Transoxania after the Mongol invasion, 450. Chingiz-Khān's return journey, 453. Restoration of the cities of Transoxania and Khorezmia, 456. Quarrel between Chingiz-Khān and Jūchī, 457. Character-sketch of Chingiz-Khān, 459.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVENTS 463

BIBLIOGRAPHY 471

GENERAL INDEX 483

REFERENCE TABLE OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN PLACE-NAMES . 514

CORRIGENDA

p. 124 *read*:

Īdhaj, Īdhūj, or Īdhūkh	الايذجى and الايذوخى	

p. 133 *add*:

Wanūfakh	الونوفخى (in the facs. erroneously الونوفجى)	iv, 942	In the neighbourhood of Bukhārā (evidently identical with Wanūfāgh).

INTRODUCTION

SOURCES

I. THE PRE-MONGOL PERIOD

WHETHER there existed any historical treatises in Central Asia prior to the Muslim conquest is not known with certainty. The statement of the Chinese traveller Hiuen-Tsiang (seventh century)[1] points to the existence of a literature of this sort, but not even the titles of such works have come down to us. If the eleventh-century writer Bīrūnī[2] is to be believed, the Arab conquerors, especially Qutayba ibn Muslim (at the beginning of the eighth century), in Persia, Sogdiana and Khorezmia exterminated the priests (the repositories of local culture). together with their books. Earlier sources, however, make no mention of such an extermination, which in itself seems but little probable[3]. In the accounts of the Arab conquest which have come down to us no facts are quoted which would point to the existence of an influential local priesthood inciting the people to oppose the Arabs. It is much more probable that in Central Asia, as in Persia down to the Sāsānid period, there were no historical works in the present sense of the word, but only national traditions, which lost their significance after the acceptance of Islām by the population, and were forgotten without any violent measures on the part of the conquerors.

However this may have been, we can judge of the march of 2
the Arab conquest and of its results only from the accounts of the Arabs themselves. In the first three centuries of the Muhammadan era the Arabic language remained the language of almost all prose literature throughout the whole extent of the Muslim territories. From the fourth century of the Hijra the Persian language gradually established itself as the literary

[1] Hiouen-Thsang, *Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales*, trad. par Stan. Julien, Paris, 1857, i, 13.

[2] Alberuni, *Chronologie orientalischer Volker*, herausg. von E. Sachau, Leipzig, 1878, pp. 36, 48; Alberuni, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, trans. by Edw. Sachau, Lond. 1879, pp. 42, 58.

[3] Prof. Sachau, the editor of Bīrūnī's works, suggests that in speaking of the conquests of Qutayba Bīrūnī has recalled the narrative of the conquest of Persepolis by Alexander (Sachau, *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwârizm*, Wien, 1873, i, 29).

language of the Eastern part of the Muslim world, and it has preserved this importance down to our own times. The number of prose compositions in the Turkish language is still extremely insignificant.

Both of the Persian and of the Arabic works the first to penetrate to Europe were the latest compilations, which had in the East supplanted the original compositions. Of the Arabic compilations Latin translations were made as early as in the seventeenth century of the works of al-Makīn[1] (d. 672/1273–4) and Abu'l-Faraj[2] (d. 685/1286). Greater importance was for long attached to the work of the fourteenth-century compiler Abu'l-Fidā[3], which was published at the end of the eighteenth century in the original and a Latin translation. It is now proved that in recounting the history of the first six centuries of the Hijra Abu'l-Fidā copied almost word for word the work of an earlier compiler, Ibn al-Athīr ('Izz ad-Dīn Abu'l-Ḥusayn 'Alī b. Muḥammad, d. A.H. 630), whose work was brought down to the year A. H. 628. It was only after the publication of Ibn al-Athīr's remarkable work[4] that students of the history of the Muhammadan East could feel themselves on firm ground. With the greatest conscientiousness and a critical tact rare in those times, the author collected material for his work on all sides. In those cases when he hesitates to which of two contradictory sources to give the preference, he quotes both accounts. His work is by no means a simple chronicle of external events; so far as the framework of his composition allows Ibn al-Athīr gives us a fair conception of the ideas and tendencies prevailing at different periods, and of the true character of historical figures, &c., assigning as well a fitting place to literary workers.

3 For the history of the first three centuries of Islām Ibn al-Athīr's chief source was the compilation of Abū-Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr aṭ-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), which was brought down to A. H. 302. The publication of this work, undertaken by a group of Orientalists, and completed in 1901[5], represents a great step forward in Oriental knowledge. The question of Ibn al-Athīr's relation to Ṭabarī has been investigated by the German scholar C. Brockelmann[6]. He arrives at the conclusion that even after the publication of Ṭabarī's work Ibn al-Athīr's composition retains an outstanding place amongst original

[1] G. Elmacini, *Historia Saracenica*, Lugd. Batav. 1625; see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, i, 348.

[2] *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum*, Oxon. 1663; Brock. i, 349 sq.

[3] Abulfedae, *Annales Moslemicae*, Hafniae, 1789–94; Brock. ii, 44 sq.

[4] *Ibn al-Athiri chronicon quod Perfectissimum inscribitur*, ed. C. I. Tornberg, Ups. 1851–3 et Lugd. Batav. 1867–76. Also published in Cairo, 1301 (1883), &c. Brockelmann, i, 345 sq.

[5] At-Tabari, *Annales*, Lugd. Batav. 1879–1901; Brockelmann, i, 142 sq.

[6] *Das Verhältniss von Ibn el-Atirs Kâmil fit-ta'rîḫ zu Ṭabaris Aḫbâr errusul wal mulûk*, Strassburg, 1890.

sources, even for the history of the most ancient period of Islām. Ṭabarī, so Brockelmann has observed, made it his aim to give in his work a digest of all the historical information of the Arabs. For the most part he merely reproduces his sources, sometimes combining in one narrative data taken from various compositions, but he scarcely ever touches on the comparative reliability of this or that tradition. The complete absence of criticism in his work is astonishing even for those times. Besides this, Ṭabarī's account, differing in this respect from the majority of other compositions, becomes more and more meagre as it approaches the lifetime of the author, and in relating events contemporary with himself this meagreness is carried to extremes, which, as Brockelmann observes, may perhaps be explained by Ṭabarī's advanced age (he was born in 224/839). Ibn al-Athīr dealt with the material at his disposal with greater understanding, and to a considerable extent supplemented the work of his predecessor. In many cases his sources still remain inaccessible to us, but in others we are able to verify his statements. The results of this verification are so favourable to the author that we may rely upon him even when his sources are unknown to us. The justice of this view of Brockelmann's may be seen from the following example. It is only in Ibn al-Athīr that we find an accurate account of the conflict between the Arabs and the Chinese (in 751), which decided the fate of the western part of Central Asia. Neither Ṭabarī nor the early historical works of the Arabs which have come down to us in general make any mention of this, | while Ibn al-Athīr's statement is completely 4
confirmed by the Chinese *History of the T'ang Dynasty*[1].

Of the other later Arabic compilations which are of importance for us, reference may be made to the biographical dictionary of Ibn Khallikān (Shams ad-Dīn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, d. 681/1282), which has been published several times[2], and translated into English[3]. For the most part the author names his sources[4], and sometimes gives extensive extracts from compositions lost to us. Of less importance to us is the "Universal History" of Ibn Khaldūn (Walī ad-Dīn Abū Zayd 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, d. 808/1406)[5], although it is to this work, along with that of Ibn

[1] Cf *Zapiski, Vost. Otdyel. Arkh. Ob.* (hereafter quoted as *Zapiski*), viii, 7; now also Chavannes, *Documents sur les Toukiue Occidentaux*, 142 sq., 297 sq. The same battle is alluded to in Tha'ālibī's *Laṭā'if al-ma'ārif*, ed. Jong, p. 126.

[2] *Ibn-Challikani vitae illustrium virorum*, ed. Wüstenfeld, Gott. 1835–50. Ibn Khallikan, *Vies des hommes illustres de l'islamisme*, publiées par le baron MacGuckin de Slane, Paris, 1838–42. Also an Eastern (Bulaq) edition in 1275/1859, &c. Brockelmann, i, 326 sq.

[3] Ibn Khallikan, *Biographical Dictionary*, trans. by MacGuckin de Slane, Paris, 1842–71 (Oriental Translation Fund).

[4] On these see Wüstenfeld, *Ueber die Quellen des Werkes Ibn-Challikani*, &c., Gott. 1837.

[5] Published at Bulaq in 1284/1867.

al-Athīr, that the authors of articles on one or other of the Eastern dynasties most frequently refer. For the history of Central Asia Ibn Khaldūn, who lived in Spain and Africa, gives little that is new compared with Ibn al-Athīr, of whom he evidently made use. The few facts communicated by him which we do not find in Ibn al-Athīr do not always bear criticism. In the same way the remarkable historico-philosophical views which he expresses in the famous "Preface"[1] have but little connexion with Central Asia.

We shall be in a position to satisfy the requirements of historical criticism, of course, only when we abandon the latest compilations for the original sources. Thanks to the labours of some Arabists a considerable number of the Arabic original sources which have been preserved are now published; unfortunately their number is very inconsiderable compared with the number of the historical works of the first centuries of the Hijra, which are known to us only by name. The development of historical literature among the Arabs has often been described[2]; here it will be sufficient to note that historical treatises were written already in the Umayyad period. The diffusion of culture under the 'Abbāsids led to such a development of literature | in all branches of knowledge that by the end of the tenth century A. D. it was possible for the vast bibliographical work of Abu'l-Faraj Muḥammad b. Isḥāq an-Nadīm, called *Fihrist al-'Ulūm* (literally "Index of the Sciences"), to appear. An-Nadīm's work, published by Flügel and Roediger[3], will always remain the reference-book for every student of any branch whatever of Arabic literature. In addition to this we find in it some valuable general historical information which is not in the other sources. A list of Arabic historians is found also in the famous encyclopaedia of Mas'ūdī (Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Ḥusayn, d. 345/956), the *Golden Meadows* (Murūj adh-dhahab), published in the original with a French translation by Barbier de Meynard[4]. Mas'ūdī gives us some names of such which do not appear in the *Fihrist*. Ibn Qutayba (Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muslim, d. 276/839) gives some informa-

[1] Published in the original and a French translation in *Notices et Extraits*, tomes xvi–xxi.

[2] Cf. von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, Wien, 1877, ii, 414–25; now also on the early Arabic historians the preface by E. Sachau to his edition of Ibn Sa'd (Band III) and his article in *Mitt. des Seminars fur orient. Sprachen*, Band VII (1904).

[3] *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, herausg. von G. Flügel und Dr. J. Roediger, Leipzig, 1871; Brockelmann, i, 147 sq. Short notice on the author in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, vi, 408.

[4] Maçoudi, *Les prairies d'or*, texte arabe et trad. franç. par C. Barbier de Meynard et Pavet-de-Courteille, Paris, 1861–77, i, 10 sq.; Brockelmann, i, 143 sq. Cf. Marquart's unfavourable criticism of Mas'ūdī in the preface to his *Osteuropäische u. ostasiatische Streifzuge*, Leipzig, 1903, p. xxxv ("the forerunner of the reporters and globe-trotters of to-day").

tion on the early Arabic historians in his short encyclopaedia published by Wüstenfeld[1].

Of the books mentioned in the *Fihrist* those of special importance for us would be the works of al-Madā'inī[2] (Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad, d. 215/830 or 225/840), who, according to the Arabs themselves[3], wrote in greater detail than others on the history of Khurāsān, India, and Fārs. In fact, Ṭabarī, when he speaks of events that occurred in the eastern regions, most frequently quotes Madā'inī through Abū Zayd 'Omar b. Shabba an-Numayrī, who died in 262/875, 90 years of age[4]. Among Madā'inī's works mentioned in the *Fihrist* is a biography of the Caliphs down to Mu'tasim (A. D. 833–42) inclusive. Of his other books the following would have been of the first importance to us: (1) Book on the conquests in Khurāsān; (2) Book on the government of Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī; (3) Book on the government of Naṣr b. Sayyār; (4) Book of anecdotes on Qutayba b. Muslim. Madā'inī, of course, made use of | much 6 earlier works, amongst others of those of the famous biographer of the Prophet, Ibn Isḥāq (Muḥammad b. Isḥāq b. Yasar, d. 150 or 151/767–8), who wrote also a history of the Caliphs[5]. Ibn Isḥāq's work was used by another historian, whom Madā'inī quotes at first hand, namely, 'Alī b. Mujāhid. This writer is not mentioned in the *Fihrist*, but is named in Mas'ūdī[6] as the author of "The book of histories concerning the Umayyads".

For the history of 'Irāq by far the most authoritative writer is considered to be Abū Mikhnaf[7] (Lūṭ b. Yaḥyā al-'Āmirī al-Azdī, d. 157/773). Khurāsān, as is well known, was for long incorporated in the Governorship of 'Irāq; this explains why Ṭabarī in relating the events which took place in Khurāsān also very frequently quotes Abū Mikhnaf.

These sources of Ṭabarī's have not come down to us. In a few works of the third century of the Hijra, which have been preserved, and by now in part published, the events which occurred in the eastern part of the Muslim Empire are dealt with even more briefly than in Ṭabarī, although we sometimes find in these authors isolated scraps of information which are not given in Ṭabarī. Of these works the first to be mentioned

[1] Ibn Coteiba's *Handbuch der Geschichte*, herausg. von F. Wüstenfeld, Gött. 1850, pp. 265 sq. The same scholar made an attempt to collect information on the Arabic historians in his article "Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber und ihre Werke" (*Abhandlungen der K. Ges. der Wiss. zu Gottingen*, xxviii),

[2] *Fihrist*, pp. 100–3; biography in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, v. 309–18. According to Ṭabarī, iii, 1330, he died in 228.

[3] *Fihrist*, p. 93. This view is ascribed to an individual who died in 258/872 (*ibid.*, p. 105).

[4] On him see *Fihrist*, pp. 111–13, and *Prairies d'or*, i, 11, also *Irshād*, vi, 48.

[5] *Fihrist*, p. 92. [6] *Prairies d'or*, i, 2.

[7] *Fihrist*, p. 93; *Prairies d'or*, i, 10; *Ibn Coteiba*, p. 267; *Irshād*, vi, 220 sq.; Wüstenfeld, *Der Tod des Husein ben Ali*, Gött. 1883, pp. iii–iv; cf. my article in *Zapiski*, xvii, 0147–9.

is the *History of the Conquests*, by Balādhurī[1] (Abu'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā, or by another account Abū Ja'far, d. 279/892). This work, which, in Mas'ūdī's opinion, is the best book on the history of the Arab conquests, has been edited by the late Dutch Orientalist, Prof. de Goeje[2]. Of Balādhurī's sources by far the most important work for us would be that of Abū 'Ubayda[3] (Ma'mar b. Muthannā, d. between 207–11/822–6). From Abū 'Ubayda, who was considered to be one of the best authorities on Arabic history, Balādhurī took some information which is not contained in the other sources. Thus Abū 'Ubayda, in contrast to our other sources, maintains that the first expedition of the
7 Arabs across | the Oxus was undertaken as early as in the Caliphate of 'Othmān, when 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir was governor of Khurāsān[4]; and as a matter of fact we find in the Chinese sources[5] the statement that the Arabs devastated the province of Māymurgh (S.E. of Samarqand) between 650 and 655.

The universal history of Ya'qūbī (Aḥmad b. Abī Ya'qūb b. Ja'far b. Wahb b. Wāḍih, d. 284/897), published by Prof. Houtsma[6], also merits much attention. This work was written in the second half of the third century of the Hijra, and was brought down to 258/872. According to the editor[7], Ya'qūbī has nothing in common with Ṭabarī. His sources belong to another group, to which Mas'ūdī, al-Makīn, Eutychius[8], and others may also be referred. In relating the history of Khurāsān, however, Ya'qūbī made use of Ṭabarī's chief source, the works of Madā'inī[9]; nevertheless we sometimes find in him interesting details which are not in Ṭabarī.

Finally, we may mention the work of Abū Ḥanīfa (Aḥmad b. Dāwud ad-Dīnawarī, d. 288/901), published by Guirgass[10]. In spite of its brevity this work, which is brought down only as far as 227/842, is not useless for our purpose.

Together with historical literature there had already come into existence in the third century A.H. a geographical literature.

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 113; *Prairies d'or*, i, 14; von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii, 420.

[2] Beladsori, *Liber expugnationis regionum*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Lugd. Batav. 1866; Brockelmann, i, 141.

[3] *Fihrist*, pp. 53–4; *Ibn Coteiba*, p. 269; *Ibn Khallikan*, No. 741 (de Slane's trans. iii, 388 sq.). There is a detailed character-sketch of Abū 'Ubayda in Goldziher's *Muhammedanische Studien* (Halle, 1888), i, 194–206.

[4] Beladsori, p. 408.

[5] Iakinth, *Sobranie svyedyenii o narodakh, &c.*, St. P. 1851, iii, 245; Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, p. 144. Perhaps, however, Mi stands in the Chinese here by mistake for Merv.

[6] *Ibn Wadhih qui dicitur al-Ja'qubi Historiae*, Lugd. Batav. 1883; Brock. i, 226; *Irshād*, ii, 156 sq.

[7] i, p. viii.

[8] Patriarch of Alexandria, d. 328/940. His work, which is of no importance for us, was published and translated into Latin in the seventeenth century, and latterly republished in the collection of "Scriptores Orientis Christiani."

[9] *Ja'qubi Historiae*, ii, 4.

[10] *Abû-Hanîfa ad-Dînaweri, Kitâb al-Akhbâr at-tiwâl*, publié par Wladimir Guirgass, Leide, 1888; Brock. i, 123; I. Kratchkowsky, *Préface et Index, &c.*, Leide, 1918, and review by C. Seybold in *Z.D.M.G.*, lxviii.

In this category may be included both the narratives of travellers, who desired to satisfy public curiosity by accounts of little-known lands, and official guide-books and statistical works on the revenues of the various provinces written for the requirements of the government.

Works of this sort had been written in the eastern half of the Empire as early as in the second century of the Hijra. Thus there is mention of *The Book on the Taxes of Khurāsān* of Ḥafṣ b. Manṣūr Marwazī, the secretary of 'Alī b. 'Isā, governor of Khurāsān (180–91/796–807)[1]. The geographical works written in the third and fourth centuries which have come down to us have been edited by de Goeje under the general title of *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*. The oldest of these is that of Ibn Khurdādhbih[2] ('Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. Khurdādhbih). The first edition of this was written, it is believed, about 232/847; the second, more complete, about 272/885–6. The next in point of time was written in 278/891 by Ya'qūbī[3], already mentioned as an historian. To the opening years of the tenth century A.D. may be referred the works of Ibn Rusta[4] (Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. 'Omar) and Ibn al-Faqīh Hamadhānī[5].

The disintegration of the Caliphate, begun in the ninth century A.D., had already become an accomplished fact in the tenth. In the various provinces there arose independent dynasties, who were frequently at war with one another. Each sovereign endeavoured to impart the greatest possible brilliance to his capital and his court, and with this object patronized poets and scholars, so that the break-up of the Muslim Empire must have contributed to the development of science and literature, quantitatively at least. Of the tenth-century dynasties, those of special importance for us are the Būyids, the rulers of 'Irāq and Western Persia, and the Sāmānids, who possessed Transoxania and Eastern Persia.

With the intimate relations (friendly and inimical) existing between the Būyids and the Sāmānids the historical treatises written at the court of the former would have been of importance also for the study of the history of Central Asia. Unfortunately these works must so far be considered lost. Amongst them the first place belongs to the work of Abu'l-Ḥasan Thābit b. Sinān as-Sābi'[6] (the Sabaean) (d. 365/976), court physician to the

[1] Texts (*i.e.* W. Barthold, *Turkestan, &c.*, Chast' pervaya, Teksty, St. P. 1898), p. 2 (from Gardīzī).

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi; Brock. i, 225. On the date of this geographical treatise see pref., pp. xviii–xx. Cf., however, Marquart's view (*Osteur. u. ostas. Streifzüge*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 390) that there was only one edition written *circa* A.H. 272.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii.

[4] *Ibid.*; Brock. i, 227.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, v; Brock., *loc. cit.* Very brief notice in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, ii. 63.

[6] See Chwolson, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, St. P. 1856, i, 578 sq.; *Fihrist*, p. 302; *Ibn al-Athīr*, viii, 476, 491; *Irshād*, ii, 397.

Būyid Mu'izz ad-Dawla. Thābit's work embraces the period from 295 (the accession of the Caliph Muqtadir) to 363 A. H.

In continuation of this book appeared the work of his nephew Abu'l-Ḥusayn Ḥilāl b. al-Muḥassin[1] (d. 448/1065), which was brought down to 447. A small fragment of this chronicle, embracing only three years (390–2), has been preserved in a
9 single manuscript | in the British Museum (Cod. Add. 19,360). It contains an interesting account of the occupation of Bukhārā by the Qārā-Khānids, which was published in the original and translated by Baron V. R. Rosen[2]. Ḥilāl's son, Ghars an-Ni'ma Muḥammad b. Ḥilāl, continued his father's work down to 476[3].

Other works are mentioned alongside these; thus in the dictionary of Sam'ānī (on whom see below) the chronicle of Khuṭabī (Muḥammad Ismā'īl b. 'Alī, d. 350/961) is referred to, and Sam'ānī calls it a trustworthy source[4].

To the same family as Thābit and Ḥilāl belonged Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Ḥilāl[5] (d. 384/994), who wrote about the year 371 for the Būyid 'Aḍud ad-Dawla a history of the Būyids under the title of "Kitāb at-Tāj fi dawlat ad-Daylam." This work is often quoted by the later authors, and was regarded as a model of style, though it was scarcely distinguished by historical accuracy, as its immediate object was the glorification of the Būyids, and the author himself acknowledged that to attain his purpose he filled his book with tendentious untruths[6].

Finally, the historian Juwaynī[7], who wrote in the thirteenth century, at the capture of Alamūt, the capital of the Ismā'īlīs, by the Mongols (in 1256), found in the library of the chiefs of this sect a "History of Gīlān and Daylam" (Ta'rīkh-i Jīl wa Daylam) by an unknown author, written for the Būyid Fakhr ad-Dawla (d. 387/997)[8].

[1] Chwolson, *op. cit.*, i. 606 sq.

[2] *Zapiski*, ii, 272 sq.; Brock. i, 323. The extract from Ḥilāl has been published separately by Amedroz and again in *The Eclipse of the Abbasids*, vol. iii, trans. (by Prof. Margoliouth) in vol. vi.

[3] This book was continued subsequently by various authors down to 616; see Haji-Khalfa, *Lex. bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum*, ed. Flügel, ii, p. 123. The notices in this work are taken from Qifṭī's *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā*, ed. Lippert, 110 sq.

[4] Sam'ānī, facs. ed. Margoliouth, s.v. الخطبي; *Irshād*, ii, 349.

[5] Chwolson, *Die Ssabier*, i, 588 sq.; *Ibn al-Athīr*, viii, 397; ix, 11, 74; Brock. i, 96; biography in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, i, 324–58, with extracts from the work of his daughter's son, Ḥilāl.

[6] Cf. Goldziher, *Muh. Studien*, i, 159.

[7] MS. Pub. Lib. (Petrograd), iv. 2, 34, f. 275; the reading جيل instead of جبال is taken from the Khanykov MS. 71.

[8] The work of (Ibn) Miskawayh and his continuators is dealt with below (p. 32). Many extracts from lost works on the history of the Būyids are found in Yāqūt's *Irshād*; unfortunately this text (edited by D. S. Margoliouth for the Gibb Mem. Series, No. vi) is still incomplete and lacking indexes. Cf. the mention of a Ta'rīkh of the wazīr 'Abū Ṣa'd Manṣūr b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ābī, d. 421 (ii, 304 and v, 355), mentioned also several times in Yāqūt's *Mu'jam* (Index, vi, 730), and the biography of Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawhīdī (v, 380–407), in which his diatribe against two wazīrs,

The rulers of the East, the Sāmānids, patronized writers and scholars no less than the Būyids. The Sāmānids themselves were Persians, and patronized chiefly Persian poetry, but along with these there were at their court many poets who wrote in the Arabic language. We are given detailed accounts of these in the anthology of Tha'ālibī (Abū Manṣūr 'Abdal-malik b. Muḥammad, d. 429 or 430/1037–9). The fourth and last section of the anthology is devoted to the poets of Khurāsān and Transoxania; with some of these the author, who had visited Bukhārā in 382/992, | was personally acquainted. Amongst the 10
biographical accounts of the poets of those times there are interesting statements describing the conditions of life in the Sāmānid kingdom. Tha'ālibī's book (the full title of which is "The Solitaire of the Age in regard to the merits of Contemporaries") has been published in the East[1]; extracts from the last section in a French translation were published by Barbier de Meynard in the *Journal Asiatique*[2].

According to Tha'ālibī[3], Bukhārā under the Sāmānids was "the home of glory, the Ka'aba of sovereignty, the place of assembly of the eminent people of the age." The library of the Sāmānids is described in his autobiography[4] as follows by the famous Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā), who made use of it in the reign of Nūḥ b Manṣūr (d. 387/997): "I entered a house with many chambers; in each chamber were coffers of books, piled up one upon another. In one chamber were Arabic books and books of poetry, in another books on law, and so on, in each chamber books on one of the sciences. I read a list of books of ancient authors, and asked for those I needed. I saw books whose very names are unknown to many people; I have never seen such

Abu'l-Faḍl b. al-'Amīd and Ismā'īl b. 'Abbād, is mentioned several times. Quotations from this book are introduced also into the biography of the latter (1, 273–343). Most valuable information about the government and official terms of the Persian kingdoms of the tenth century are given in *Mafātīh al-'Olūm* by Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Khwārizmī, ed. G. van Vloten, 1895; cf. Brock. i, 244.

[1] At Bayrūt in 1873. There is some interesting matter in another treatise of the same author, devoted to the apophthegms of famous rulers, ministers, and writers. This work was published in the original and a Latin translation by Valeton (*Specimen e litteris orientalibus exhibens Taalibi Syntagma*, Lugd. Batav. 1844).

[2] V^e série, tt. 1 et 3. Extracts from other sections of Tha'ālibī's work may be found in the books of F. Dieterici, *Mutanabbi und Seifuddaula; aus der Edelperle des Tsaâlibi* (Leipz. 1847), and Dr. R. Dvořak, *Abû Firâs* (Leiden, 1895). The former quotes a list of all the poets mentioned in Tha'ālibī. Dieterici's doctoral dissertation (Berolini, 1846) is also devoted to Tha'ālibī's anthology. The same Tha'ālibī is also the author of *Latā'if al-ma'ārif* (ed P. Jong, 1867), in which there is some valuable information about the paper of Samarqand (p. 126) and other articles of trade. See also Brock. i, 284 sq.

[3] Eastern ed. iv, 33, *Journ. Asiat.*, iii, 291.

[4] *Ibn Abi Useibia*, ed. A. Müller, Königsberg, 1884, ii, 4, also Qiftī, *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā*, p. 416. Cf. Ibn Khallikān, No. 308 (de Slane's trans. i, 441), where it is further added that the library was soon afterwards burnt, and there were rumours that Avicenna had himself set it on fire, wishing to be the sole possessor of the knowledge he had acquired.

a collection of books either before or since. I read these books, profited by them, and learned the relative importance of each man in his own science."

Nevertheless historical literature in the Sāmānid kingdom was not so highly developed as in the Būyid kingdom. In 352/963 Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Bal'amī (d. 363/974) [1], wazīr under 'Abdal-malik and Manṣūr, translated Ṭabarī's compilation
11 into Persian, but did not continue | the text down to his own time. Bal'amī's book has been translated into French by M. Zotenberg [2]. With this work (which, after the publication of the Arabic original of Ṭabarī, has lost practically all historical importance) may be named only the Arabic "History of the Rulers of Khurāsān" of Abu'l-Ḥusayn 'Alī [3] b. Ahmad as-Sallāmī. The author is mentioned by Tha'ālibī in his book [4], which, however, gives scarcely any details about him; we know only that he was on terms of intimacy with Abū Bakr b. Muhtāj Chaghānī (i. e. of Ṣaghāniyān) and his son Abū 'Alī, and shared their fortunes. As is well known, Abū 'Alī revolted several times against Nūḥ b. Naṣr, and not long before his death, which occurred in 344/955, against 'Abdal-malik as well. As we shall see later, Sallāmī's book undoubtedly served as the main source for those authors in whose works we find the most detailed accounts of the history of Khurāsān and Transoxania, namely, Gardīzī and Ibn al-Athīr. Not only Ibn al-Athīr, but also Juwaynī [5], and especially Ibn Khallikān [6], made use in the thirteenth century of Sallāmī's work. While relating the history of Khurāsān in detail, the author evidently tried to conceal the "dark deeds" of the rulers of the province. Thus he makes no mention of the story of Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn, nor probably of that of the heresy of Naṣr b. Aḥmad. Of the latter event we find

[1] This date is given by Gardīzī (Cod. Bodl. Ouseley 240, fol. 129). Dr. Rieu mistakenly gives 386 (*Catologue of the Persian Manuscripts*, i, 70), referring for this to *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 363, where, however, it is not Bal'amī but Abū 'Alī Sīmjūrī that is spoken of. On the other hand 'Abū 'Alī Bal'amī is mentioned by the historian 'Utbī as still living and in office about the year 382; see the Eastern ed. 1286, p. 170; MS. As. Mus. (Petr.) 510. fol. 32, and Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 159.

[2] *Chronique de Tabari*, trad. sur la version persane de Bel'amī par M. H. Zotenberg, Paris, 1867–74. The Persian original has been lithographed in Persia.

[3] Thus in Ibn Khallikān, but it should be Abū 'Alī Ḥusayn; see my article in *Festschrift Noldeke*, p. 174 sq.

[4] Eastern ed. iv, 29; *J.A.*, i, 212.

[5] Ref. to Sallāmī, *MS. Pub. Lib.*, iv, 2, 34, f. 275.

[6] In the accounts of (1) Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn (no. 308); (2) 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir (no. 350); (3) Faḍl b. Sahl (no. 540); (4) Qutayba b. Muslim (no. 553); (5) Muhallab b. Abī Sufrā (no. 764); (6) the Ṣaffārids (no. 838). Sallāmī's work is quoted several times in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, e.g. biography of Jayhānī, vi, 293. It was used also by Ibn Mākūlā (Sam'ānī, facs. s.v. البقلي), i.e. Abu Naṣr 'Alī b. al-Wazīr Abu 'l-Qāsim Haybatallāh (d. 473/1080–1), author of the *Book of Improvement* (Kitāb al-Ikmāl; cf. Wilken, Mirchond's *Geschichte der Sultane aus dem Geschlechte Buyeh*, s. 108; Wüstenfeld, *Die Geschichtsschreiber*, s. 72). Ibn Mākūlā's biography in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, v, 435–40, where another historical work of his, *Kitāb al-Wuzarā* (Book of the Wazīrs), is mentioned.

no mention at all in those works of general history that may be regarded as under the influence (not always, of course, immediate) of Sallāmī, although the fact itself, as we shall endeavour to prove in our survey of the history of the Sāmānids, admits of no doubt whatever[1]. Among Sallāmī's predecessors may be mentioned Abu'l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad al-Balkhī al-Ka'bī (d. 319/931), author of the books called "The Good Deeds of the Ṭāhirids" and "The Subjects of Pride of Khurāsān[2]." |

Geographical literature[3] was apparently more highly deve- 12
loped in the Sāmānid kingdom than historical literature. Within their territories, at Balkh, lived the geographer Abū Zayd Aḥmad b. Sahl al-Balkhī[4] (d. A.D. 934). According to the later geographer Maqdisī, Balkhī's work for the most part took the form of commentaries on maps made by him; for this reason his treatise was too short, and many details were not mentioned, especially in the descriptions of the towns[5]. The work has come down to us only in a supplemented edition from the pen of Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Fārsī al-Iṣṭakhrī[6] (*c.* A.D. 951), which was itself supplemented subsequently by Abu'l-Qāsim Ibn Ḥawqal[7] (*c.* A.D. 976). Both Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal were natives of western countries, but visited Transoxania, and described it in detail. Another such traveller was Maqdisī[8] (Shāms ad-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *c.* A.D. 985), one of the greatest geographers of all time; in von Kremer's opinion[9] (based on Sprenger's words) "his information on the climate, products, trade, currencies, weights and measures, manners, taxes and contributions of each country belong to the most important data for the history of Eastern culture."

[1] In *Irshād* (II, 60) there is mentioned a (perhaps somewhat later) work on the history of Khūrāsān (فريد التأريخ في اخبار خراسان) by Abu 'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Sulaymān.

[2] H.-Khalfa, v, 412; vi, 7. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtssch.*, 33.

[3] Many facts relative to this literature and to the knowledge of the Arabs about China and Indo-China have now been collected by G. Ferrand, *Relations de voyages et Textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIII^e au XVIII^e siècles*, tt. i. (1913) et ii. (1914), with continuous pagination for the two volumes. In the second volume (pp. 627 sq.) are included also "textes chinois, japonais, tamoul, kawi, et malais."

[4] On him and the editions of his works see the monograph of de Goeje in *Z.D M.G.*, xxv. 42–58. In spite of this Brockelmann (i. 229) repeats once more the erroneous statement that the work preserved in the Berlin library is that of Balkhī. On new MSS. see Kratchkowski, *Préface et Index*, p. 24 and Seybold's review in *Z.D.M.G.*, lxvii, 541.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 4; a translation of this passage in de Goeje, *loc. cit.*, p. 56

[6] *Ibid.*, i. [7] *Ibid.*, ii.

[8] *Ibid*, iii; second edition 1906, with hardly any emendations. On the question of the pronunciation of the name as Maqdisī or Muqaddasī see de Goeje in *J.A.*, 9, xiv, 367, and in the preface to the 1906 edition, with the reply of A. Fischer in *Z.D.M.G.*, lx, 404 sq., also Schwarz in *Iran im Mittelalter*, ii, preface. In Sam'ānī's dictionary (facs. Margoliouth, f. 539 b) the name is given only in the form Maqdisī.

[9] *Culturgeschichte*, II, 433.

The patron of Abū Zayd Balkhī was the Sāmānid wazīr Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Jayhānī[1], who governed the kingdom during the minority of Naṣr b. Aḥmad (from A.D. 914). According to Gardīzī[2], Jayhānī was "the author of many works in all branches of learning." One of these works was a geographical treatise entitled (like other works of the kind) "The Book of Roads and Kingdoms." On this work Maqdisī[3] makes the following statement: "The author assembled foreigners, questioned them on the kingdoms, their revenues, what roads
13 there were | to them, also on the height of the stars and the length of the shadows in their land, in order in this wise to facilitate the conquest of provinces, to know their revenues, and in order to be well acquainted with the stars and the rotary motion of the vault of heaven. It is known that he divided the world into seven climes (zones), and assigned a star to each. Now he speaks of stars and geometry, anon of matters which are of no use to the mass of people; now he describes Indian idols, now he relates the wonders of Sind, now he enumerates taxes and revenues. I myself have seen that he mentions also little-known stations and far-distant halting-places. He does not enumerate provinces, nor mention the distribution of military forces; he does not describe towns nor give a detailed account of them; on the other hand, he speaks of the roads to east, west, north, and south, together with a description of the plains, mountains, valleys, hillocks, forests, and rivers found thereon. Consequently the book is long, yet he neglected most of the military roads, as well as the description of the chief towns." In one edition of his geography Maqdisī adds further: "I saw his book in seven volumes in the library of 'Aḍud ad-Dawla (975–83) without the author's name. In Nīshāpūr I saw two abridged editions, of which one was attributed to Jayhānī, the other to Ibn Khūrdādhbih; the contents of both were identical, only somewhat extended in Jayhānī."

From this we may conclude that Jayhānī wrote his work on the basis of the data personally collected by him, but used also, and that to a considerable extent, the work of Ibn Khurdādhbih. The quotations which we find from the latter in Gardīzī and in the extracts from Jayhānī do not agree with the published text; but since, according to de Goeje's researches[4], no complete copy of Ibn Khurdādhbih's geography has yet been found, it is difficult to say whether the book in question is this or another more extensive work of the same author, entitled "The Book of the Genealogies of the Persians and their Colonies[5]." There

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 138, where by mistake the later Abū 'Alī, the son of Abū 'Abdallāh, is mentioned.
[2] *Texts*, p. 6.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 3–4.
[4] *B.G.A.*, vi, pp. xv–xvii.
[5] *Fihrist*, p. 149; *B.G.A.*, vi, p. x.

is ample ground for hoping that in Central Asia or India there may in time come to light manuscripts not only of the work of Jayhānī, but also of the work of Ibn Khurdādhbih which served | as his source, at any rate in the Persian translation [1]. 14

Gardīzī names the works of Ibn Khūrdādhbih and Jayhānī in the list of the principal sources of which he made use in composing his chapters on the Turks [2]. The same sources were undoubtedly utilized also by the unknown author of the geographical treatise entitled "The Frontiers of the World," written in 372/982–3 in the Persian language for one of the vassals of the Sāmānids, Abu'l-Ḥārith Muhammad b. Aḥmad b. Farīghūn, ruler of Gūzgān. The only known manuscript up to the present of this extremely interesting work was found in Bukhārā in 1892, and belonged to the late A. G. Tumansky [3]. Its chief importance lies in the fact that it contains a very much more detailed account of the Turkish territories and of the non-Muslim lands of Central Asia in general than is to be found in the Arabic geographical treatises that have come down to us.

In the Sāmānid period there were published also treatises to the history of individual towns. Not one of such works dealing with Central Asia has come down to us in the original. Judging from the descriptions of these works and the citations from them found in various works (especially in Sam'ānī's dictionary) they ought, with few exceptions, to be described as theological rather than historical. The author quotes a series of sayings on the merits of his town ascribed to Muḥammad or his Companions; thereafter he enumerates the shaykhs and other holy men who were natives of the town, and for the history of the other events in its existence there remains but little space.

A history of the capital of the Sāmānids, Bukhārā, was written by Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Sulaymān al-Bukhārī [4] (d. 312/924). | Somewhat later, in 332/943–4, Abū 15

[1] The statement made in the Russian edition (based on quotations in the *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 961–2), that a MS. of the Persian translation of Ibn Khurdādhbih had apparently come into the hands of the late Major Raverty, has not been confirmed. Since his death in 1907 only a few of his MSS. have been offered for sale, and these did not include either of the above books (communicated by Prof. E. G. Browne in letter of Jan. 2, 1923).

[2] Cf. my *Otchet o poyezdkye v Srednyuyu Aziyu* (Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk po Ist.-Phil. Otd., i, No. 4), p. 126.

[3] Tumansky undertook to publish it in due course (see his article in *Zapiski*, x, 121 sq.) but had not done so at the time of his death (Dec. 1, 1920). There is a copy of the *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam*, made by the late Baron Rosen, in the Asiatic Museum at Petrograd.

[4] *H.-Khalfa*, II, 117; vii, 654; Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtsschreiber*, 33. Perhaps the same as al-Ghunjār; it is quite possible that the separate mention of Abū 'Abdallāh al-Bukhārī and al Ghunjār is to be explained by Ḥājjī Khalīfa's making use of some MS. in which, in the account of the latter, the author's second surname was omitted and his death incorrectly referred to the year 312 instead of 412. The similarity of the names as well as of the dates indicates this; according to Ḥājjī Khalīfa

Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja'far an-Narshakhī[1] (d. 348/959) presented to Nūḥ b. Naṣr a "History of Bukhārā," written in Arabic "in a most eloquent style." In this book mention is made "of the condition of Bukhārā, its merits and charms, of all the amenities of life that are to be found in Bukhārā and its neighbourhood, and of all matters in general relating to it," and there are quoted also *ḥadīths* on the superiority of this town from the Prophet and his disciples. In the thirteenth century, when the people "for the greater part nourished no inclination towards the study of Arabic books," Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muhammad al-Qubāwī by request of his friends (and apparently without presenting it to the reigning prince) translated the book into Persian, having somewhat abridged it, as in the Arabic original there were narratives "the reading of which induced weariness." Qubāwī's work was completed in 522/1128–9. In 574/1178–9 Muḥammad b. Ẓufar subjected it to fresh curtailment, and presented it in this form to the then ruler of Bukhārā, the Ṣadr (head of the priesthood) 'Abd al-'Azīz. Another unknown author continued the work down to the period of the Mongol invasion; in this form it has come down to us, and was published in 1892 by the late Ch. Schefer[2]. The French translation with detailed notes promised by the same scholar[3] has not seen the light. In 1897 the book was translated into Russian at Tashkent by N. S. Lykoshin under my supervision[4].

Narshakhī's work, written for a temporal ruler, and that at a time when the pietist movement had not yet attained complete mastery, contained in the original more general historical information than other town chronicles. The campaigns of the Arabs are sometimes related more fully in Narshakhī than in Ṭabarī, and the author evidently made use of Arabic historical works which have not come down to us. In one passage even
16 he apparently quotes Madā'inī[5]. The Persian translator, | having cut out of the book all that appeared to him wearisome and useless, at the same time incorporated in it some additional matter from other sources. Of these the most important for us

al-Bukhārī's name was Abū 'Abdallāh Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Sulaymān, while al-Ghunjār's name was Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān (see *Texts*, p. 63; Sam'ānī fasc. fol. 411 b).

[1] On whom see Lerch, *Sur les monnaies des Boukhâr-Khoudahs*, p. 8 (= *Travaux de la 3e session du Congrès international des Orientalistes*, St. P., 1879, ii, 424).

[2] *Description topographique et historique de Boukhara*, par Mohammed Nerchakhy, suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane, publ. par Ch. Schefer, Paris, 1892 (Publ. de l'École des langues orient. vivantes, IIIe sér., vol. xiii). The book has also been lithographed in Bukhara.

[3] *Description*, &c., p. iv.

[4] Muhammed Narshakhī, *Istoriya Bukhary*, perev. s'pers. N. Lykoshin, Tashkent, 1897.

[5] *Description*, &c., p. 58, where مدائنى should probably be read instead of ميدانى.

are the accounts of the ancient history of Bukhārā, taken from the book called "The Treasuries of the Sciences," by Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad an-Nīshāpūrī, and the account of Muqanna' taken from the work of a certain Ibrāhīm. The writer in question is probably Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. al-'Abbās aṣ-Ṣūlī, the famous poet[1] (d. 243/857), who wrote also some historical works. The author of the *Fihrist*[2] refers to a book of this Ṣūlī in the account of another religious sect.

Abū 'Abdallāh Muhammad b. Aḥmad al-Bukhārī al-Ghunjār[3] (d. 412/1021), a paper manufacturer or librarian (al-warrāq), wrote a "History of Bukhārā," from which Sam'ānī (through the work of Mustaghfirī) borrowed a chronological summary of the Sāmānid dynasty. Sam'ānī mentions also a "History of Bukhārā" of Abū Bakr Manṣūr Barsakhī[4].

Abū Sa'īd 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Idrīsī (d. 405/1015), who belonged to Astrābād, but lived in Samarqand, wrote a history of both towns[5]. His history of Samarqand was continued down to the twelfth century by the famous theologian Abū Ḥafṣ 'Omar b. Muḥammad an-Nasafī (d. 537/1142–3). This work was known by the name of "Qand" or "Qandīya[6]." Extracts were made from it by Nasafī's pupil Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Jalīl as-Samarqandī[7]. All that has come down to us apparently is this abridged edition in a Persian translation; some manuscripts of this composition are preserved in the library of Petrograd University, and in the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences[8]. In it we are given some accounts of the pre-Islamic period, traditions of the Arab conquest, accounts of some buildings, and of the organization of the irrigation, but by far the greater space is taken up

[1] On whom see *Fihrist*, p. 122 and ii, 157; Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, i. 114. His biography in *Irshād*, 1, 260–77. Not to be confused with the historian Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Yaḥyā aṣ-Ṣūlī (on whom see Brock., i, 143; W. Barthold in *Zapiski*, xviii, 0148 sq and I. Kratchkowsky in *Zapiski*, xviii, 77 sq., xxi, 98 sq.).

[2] *Fihrist*, p. 344.

[3] Biography in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, vi, 329, where two different dates (410 and 422) are mentioned.

[4] *s v.* البرسخى (f. 746); but perhaps the same as Abū Bakr Muḥ. Narshakhī.

[5] *s.v.* الادريسى. The title of his book on the history of Samarqand is also mentioned by Sam'ānī (*s.v.* الخيذشترى, f. 215 a), كتاب الاكمال لمعرفة الرجال.

[6] More fully "Kitāb al-Qand fī Ta'rīkhi Samarqand" (literally "The Candy Book on the History of Samarqand"). Its original title, according to Sam'ānī (*s v.* الشكانى), was كتاب القند فى معرفة علماء سمرقند.

[7] *Haji-Khalfa*, ii, 133.

[8] *Texts*, p. 48. The book has now been translated into Russian by W. Vyatkin; see *Spravoch. Knizh. Sam.*, viii, and the review by W. Barthold in *Zapiski*, xviii, 0182–90. The latest author whose statements are found in the book which has come down to us is Sayyid Aḥmad b. Amīr Walī, who wrote not earlier than towards the end of the fifteenth century.

by ḥadīths, biographies of saints, and the enumeration of their
17 graves, with detailed indications | as to when and how to venerate them. Ḥājjī-Khalīfa mentions also a "History of Samarqand" of Mustaghfirī, the author of the history of Nasaf.

The valley of the Kashka-Darya was specially dealt with in the "Book of the Rivalry (mufākharah) of the people of Kish and Nasaf," written by Abu'l-Ḥārith Asad b. Hamdūya al-Warthīnī[1] (d. 315/927), whose native village of Warthīn was situated in the environs of Nasaf. Another work on the history of Kish and Nasaf was written by Abu'l-'Abbās Ja'far b. Muḥammad al-Mustaghfirī (d. 405–1014), who collected in two thick volumes accounts of the important people of the town of Nasaf, and enumerated as many as eighty categories of these persons.

Ḥakīm Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh al-Bayyi' (البيّع) an-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1041) wrote a history of the 'ulamā of the town of Nīshāpūr in eight thick volumes[2]. A copy of this book was apparently in the possession of the Turkish bibliographer Ḥājjī Khalīfa (d. 1658), who quotes the beginning and the end of the book, and then adds[3]: "My eyes have never seen a more excellent chronicle; I place it first among books referring to individual provinces. The majority of the persons mentioned are his shaykhs (teachers) or the shaykhs of his shaykhs. He mentions also the Companions and Followers (of the Prophet) who came to Khurāsān and settled there, and gives a brief account of their origin and their history. Next (he enumerates) the second generation of Followers, then the third and fourth generations. He divided them all into six categories; the men of each generation were enumerated in alphabetical order, and the sixth and last category included those persons who transmitted ḥadīths between the years 320 and 380." 'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Ismā'īl al-Fārisī[4] continued this work down to 518, and an abridged edition of al-Bayyi's work was made by the compiler Dhahabī (d. 748/1348).

In spite of the specialized nature of its contents, Bayyi's book would have been of considerable interest to us, judging from his account of the history of the Sīmjūrids, inserted in Sam'ānī's dictionary[5]. From this narrative we learn that the Sīmjūrids,

[1] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الورثينى.

[2] *Ibid.*, *s.v.* البيّع and النيسابورى. According to Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī, al-Bayyi's work formed twelve volumes (Rieu, *Supplement to Cat. of Persian MSS*, p. 61).

[3] H.-Khalfa, ii, 155–6.

[4] 'Abd al-Ghāfir's work is quoted by Yāqūt, *Irshād*, ii, 107, for the biography of a learned man who died in Ramaḍān 518. My friend Aḥmed Zakī Walidī has seen a copy of this work in Constantinople.

[5] *s.v.* السيمجورى.

when they came into | open conflict with the Sāmānid dynasty, 18
enjoyed the undisguised sympathy of the priesthood, who in the struggle between the bureaucratic administration and the military aristocracy generally espoused the cause of the latter. It is possible that Bayyi's work was the source of Gardīzī[1], 'Awfī[2], and Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī[3], who represent the conflict between the wazīr Abu'l-Ḥusayn 'Utbī and the Sīmjūrids in another light (less flattering to the wazīr) than the historian Abū Naṣr 'Utbī (the source of Ibn al-Athīr, Rashīd ad-Dīn, Mīrkhwānd, and others)[4].

The history of Khorezmia was dealt with in the work of Abū Aḥmad b. Sa'īd al-Qāḍī (d. 346/957) entitled *al-Kāfī*[5].

The period of the rule of the Turkish Qarā-Khānid dynasty was without doubt a period of cultural retrogression for Transoxania. In spite of the good intentions of individual rulers, the view that the kingdom formed the personal property of the Khān's family, and the system of appanages resulting from this view with its inevitable quarrels, must have been followed by the decay of agriculture, commerce, and industry no less than of intellectual culture. Even by name we know but very few treatises devoted to the Qarā-Khānids. Amongst these are the "History of Turkestan" and "History of Khiṭāy" of Majd ad-Dīn Muhammad b. 'Adnān, written for Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn[6] (d. after 597/1201). The first of these dealt with the "Turkish peoples and the marvels of Turkestan", and also, according to 'Awfī, with the "former emperors" of the Turks, the second with the Emperors of Khiṭāy. By the latter term the author, writing in the sixth century A. H., must have understood not the whole of China (as in modern times), but at most only the country of the Khiṭāy, who were at that time ruling in the northern part of the Middle kingdom, or more probably the empire of the Qarā-Khiṭāy or Western Liao. His history of Turkestan is used by 'Awfī, who quotes from it a fantastic legend, evidently of bookish origin, on the ancestor of the dynasty, who received the surname of Qarā-Khān[7]. The history | of Khiṭāy is mentioned again in the "Beauty of 19

[1] *Texts*, pp. 11–12. [2] *Ibid*, pp. 91–3.

[3] Ed. Browne, p. 385 sq.; Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 105.

[4] See also the extract from al-Bayyi' published by me in *Zapiski*, xviii, 0147, from the كتاب المنتظم of Ibn al-Jawzī (MS. Cairo تاريخ 306; on Ibn al-Jawzī see Brock., i, 502).

[5] H.-Khalfa, ii, 129. On the chronicles of Merv see Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, St. P., 1894 (= *Materialy po arkheologii Rossii*, published by the Imp. Archaeological Commission, No. 16), p. 2. On the chronicles of Balkh, see Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane* (Publications, &c., II[e] ser., vii), i, 62–3.

[6] H.-Khalfa, ii, 122, 127, 143. The author is mentioned by 'Awfī (*Lubāb al-Albāb*, i, 179 sq.; ii, 378) as his maternal uncle.

[7] *Texts*, pp. 100–1.

Chronicles" (Bahjat at-Tawārīkh) of Shukrallāh Zakī[1] (*c.* 861/1457); in addition to this Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Kūshī translated Muḥammad b. 'Adnān's book into Turkish.

There has come down to us, apparently, only one historical work written in Transoxania under the Qarā-Khānids, namely "Examples of Diplomacy in the Aims of Government," by Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Kātib as-Samarqandī[2]. The book was written for Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd b. 'Alī, who reigned in the second half of the twelfth century. The author is better known as the author of the prosaic Persian verses "The Great Book of Sindbād[3]." His historical work, preserved, so far as is known, only in a single manuscript[4], consists of the biographies of various sovereigns down to and including Sultan Sinjar. His narratives are largely anecdotal in character, and of little interest on the whole, with the exception of the narrative of contemporary events during the reign of Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān[5] inserted at the end of the book.

Of the scholars contemporary with the Qarā-Khānids, and living in Eastern Turkestan, we know only of one historian, Abu'l-Futūḥ 'Abd al-Ghafīr (or 'Abd al-Ghaffār) b. Ḥusayn al-Alma'ī, who lived in the fifth century of the Hijra (his father, having survived his son, died in 486/1093) in Kāshghar, and wrote the history of that town. Judging from an extract from it quoted in Jamāl Qarshī (on whom see below) the book contained much legendary matter, and many errors in chronology. Another work by the same author, a Dictionary of Shaykhs (Mu'jam ash-Shuyūkh), is mentioned by Sam'ānī[6].

The decline of culture in the Qarā-Khānid kingdom can alone explain the fact that even Muslim compilers, to say nothing of European investigators, borrow their accounts of the events which occurred at this time in Transoxania exclusively from works written in Persia. First of all, | of course, we must treat of the works of the historians who wrote at the court of the Ghaznevid sultans, the direct successors of the Sāmānids in the provinces south of the Amu-Darya.

The historical literature of the Ghaznevid period is fairly extensive. The earliest historical work is that of Abū Manṣūr Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Tha'ālibī (a contemporary of the 'Abdal-

[1] Ethé, *Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford, p. 25.

[2] H.-Khalfa, 1, 368. The book is quoted several times by 'Awfī in his *Jawāmi' al-Ḥikāyāt* (verbal communication from H. M. Nizāmuddīn).

[3] Cf. *al-Muzaffariya* (Sbornik statei uchenikov bar. V. R. Rozena), St. P., 1897, pp. 255 sq.

[4] Cod. Lugd. 904 (*Cat. cod. or. bibl. Acad. Lugd. Batav.*, iii, 14).

[5] *Texts*, pp. 71–2.

[6] *s v.* الألمعى and الكاجغرى.

malik b. Muḥammad Tha'ālibī mentioned on p. 9)[1], and was written for Maḥmūd's brother, Abu'l-Muẓaffar Naṣr (d. 412/1021). The work was divided into four volumes, and brought down to the reign of Maḥmūd; of these only the first two have come down to us, containing the history of the pre-Islamic period and the history of Muḥammad. The title of the book is "The book of Lightning-flashes (al-ghurar) on the lives of the Kings and their history[2]."

A little later, after the death of Naṣr, there was written, and brought down to this event, the book called "Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī" by Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbār 'Utbī, in Arabic. In this work we find the fullest review of the events of the years 365–412, and for the history of this period it formed the chief source of Ibn al-Athīr and other compilers. In spite of the superfluity of rhetorical figures, which add considerable difficulty to the study of 'Utbī's work in the original, the author, as remarked by A. Müller[3], expresses his opinion on events with greater freedom than might have been expected from a court historian. In his autobiography the author himself admits that he wrote the book with the object of "extolling" Maḥmūd, and thereby obtained the goodwill of the wazīr. Nevertheless, he does not conceal the dark sides of this brilliant reign, and the misery of the people ruined by taxes which it was beyond their power to pay. Belonging to a family which had provided two wazīrs during the Sāmānid period, and himself in administrative service under Mahmūd, 'Utbī was of course imbued with ideas of bureaucratic absolutism, and refers in the most hostile terms to the opposition of the priesthood, and in general to the elements hostile to the domination of the bureaucracy. The Arabic original | was published by Sprenger at Delhi in 1847 21
(in Petrograd, apparently, there is not a single copy of this edition); another edition was printed in Cairo in 1286/1869, together with a philological commentary by Shaykh Manīnī, and again in 1301/1883 'Utbī's text was published in Cairo, together with Ibn al-Athīr's text (from vol. X) in the margins. In the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences at Petrograd

[1] Khwāndamīr, however, attributes the composition of this work to 'Abdal-malik (حبيب السير, Teheran ed., 1271, ii, 140). As the author's name is not in the MS. belonging to the Paris library, it is possible that it is incorrectly quoted in Ḥājjī-Khalīfa, and that the author of the history and the author of the anthology are one and the same person. Against this view, however, it may be advanced that, according to Ḥ.-Khalīfa, the author of the history was a native of Mar'ash, while the author of the anthology was a native of Nīshāpūr. In Ibn Mu'īn's book (MS. Dorn 267, f. 422 a) the historian Tha'ālibī is called 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl.

[2] de Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibl. Nationale*, Paris, 1893–5, p. 284 (Supplement, 742 A).

[3] *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland*, ii, 62.

there is a superb manuscript of the *Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī*, written in 663/1265[1].

'Utbī's work was translated into Persian in the year 602/1205–6 by Abu'sh-Sharaf Nāṣiḥ b. Ja'far al-Jurbādhaqānī; this translation was used by the Persian compilers, who for the most part copied Jurbādhaqānī's text word for word. A lithographed edition of this translation appeared at Teheran in 1274/1857–8. The chapters which refer to the history of the Sāmānids were published by Schefer as a supplement to his edition of the Ta'rīkh-i Narshakhī (see above, p. 14). An English translation of Jurbādhaqānī's work was published by Reynolds in 1858[2], but this translation, as has been justly remarked by Schefer and Dr. Rieu[3], is not distinguished by great accuracy. The Persian author translated the Arabic text fairly accurately on the whole, with a few omissions, but he omitted to translate the autobiography of 'Utbī, appended by the latter to his history.

Contemporary with 'Utbī was Abū Rayḥān Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Bīrūnī (d. *c.* 1048), perhaps the greatest of Muslim scholars[4]. His special studies were in mathematics and astronomy, but he also wrote historical works. His "History of Khorezmia" has not come down to us; from it Bayhaqī took the account of the conquest of Khorezmia by Maḥmūd. There is some valuable historical information, on the history of Khorezmia amongst others, in Bīrūnī's chronological work, published in the original and an English translation by Prof. Sachau. The same scholar worked up these accounts in his pamphlet *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwârizm*[5]. |

22 About 1050 Abū Sa'īd 'Abd al-Ḥayy b. Dahhāk Gardīzī wrote in Persian his "Adornment of Narratives" (Zayn al-Akhbār). In addition to a chapter on the Turks (on which see above, p. 13), and one on India[6], this work includes the history of the Caliphs down to 423/1032, and that of Khurāsān down to the battle at Dīnawar between Mawdūd and Muḥammad (432/1041). Owing to the loss of Sallāmī's work, Gardīzī's book,

[1] MS. No. 510, cf. Rosen, *Notices sommaires des manuscrits arabes du musée asiatique*, St. P., 1881, p 94. The Persian translation is discussed very fully in *Not. et Ext.*, iv. On the Arabic and Persian versions see Browne, *Lit. Hist.*, ii, 471. All references to 'Utbī below will be quoted from the edition of Shaykh Manīnī, under 'Utbī-Manīnī, in place of the quotations from the MS. of the As. Mus. in the original Russian edition.

[2] Reynolds, *The Kitab-i-Yamini*, Lond., 1858 (Or. Trans. Fund).

[3] *Catalogue*, p. 157.

[4] On him see Rosen's article in *Zapiski*, iii, 147 sq.

[5] See above, p. 1, n. 3. On a new (and more complete) MS. of Bīrūnī's work see C. Salemann in *Bulletin de l'Acad. de St. P.*, 1912, 861 sq. Biography of Bīrūnī in *Irshād*, vi, 308–14.

[6] Reff. to this in Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Lond., 1888 (Trübner's Oriental Series), ii, 360, 397. I am indebted for this reference to S. Th. Oldenburg.

which unfortunately is as yet known only in two manuscripts[1], both of which are very late, must be regarded as the chief source for the study of the history of Khurāsān down to and including the Sāmānid period. Gardīzī's text is sometimes very close to that of Ibn al-Athīr, and in certain passages presents an almost literal translation of it[2], which can, of course, be explained only by the fact that both authors made use of one and the same source. This source was undoubtedly Sallāmī's work. In Ibn al-Athīr we find detailed accounts of the history of the Sāmānids down to the death of Abū 'Alī Chaghānī, and to this event, in all probability (see p. 10), Sallāmī's work was brought down. Of the events between 344 and 365, of which we find scarcely any account in Ibn al-Athīr, Gardīzī treats with a fair amount of detail, on the basis of some other source which remained unknown to Ibn al-Athīr. Gardīzī's dependence on Sallāmī is confirmed by the fact that Gardīzī's narratives of 'Amr b. Layth are repeated word for word in the extracts from Sallāmī inserted in Ibn Khallikān's dictionary[3].

In 450/1058 Mahmūd Warrāq completed a work embracing the history of "several millenia" down to 409. Our knowledge of this book is derived solely from the historian Bayhaqī[4], who quotes from it an account of the rebuilding of the town of Ghazna by 'Amr b. Layth. Bayhaqī wished to give us more detailed accounts of Maḥmūd, whom he calls a reliable historian, but owing to circumstances over which he had no control he was unable to do so: "I had prepared a long eulogy on him; 23
I had seen from ten to fifteen noteworthy compositions of his in various branches. When news of this reached his sons they made an outcry against me, and said: We, his sons, do not consent that thou shouldest deal arbitrarily with the words of our father (lit. 'raise and lower the words,' &c.) before he has

[1] In the first edition the author repeated the mistake of Ethé (*Catalogue*, p. 11), in considering the Oxford MS. as the only known copy of Gardīzī's treatise, whereas there is still another MS. of this work in existence, at Cambridge (King's Coll. Lib., no. 213), see the description of the MSS. of King's Coll. in *J.R.A.S.*, New Ser., iii (1868), 105-31 (by Palmer, not by Morley, as I stated in error in *Festschrift Noldeke*, p. 173, n. 5); Gardīzī's work is mentioned on p. 120. The date is not quite clear, but is apparently given as 930 (1524), to which the calligraphy and external appearance of the MS. fully correspond. There is reason to think that the Oxford MS. was copied from that at Cambridge. Exactly the same mistakes are pretty frequently met with in both MSS. (e.g. the sequence of the words عمرو دختر, cf. *Texts*, p. 6, n. 11); but in some cases the reading of the Oxford MS. can be corrected from the Cambridge MS. The Oxford MS. is mentioned as the "only known" one even in Browne's *Lit. Hist.*, ii, 288 (1906). It is not known what MS. of Gardīzī was used by Raverty in his citations from this work in the notes to the *Tabakat-i Nasiri* (p. 901).

[2] Especially in the extracts on Aḥmad b. Sahl (cf. *Texts*, p. 6 and Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 86).

[3] No. 838; de Slane, *Biographical Dictionary*, iv, 322, 326. Cf. *Texts*, p. 5.

[4] The *Tarikh-i Baihaki*, ed. Morley, Calcutta, 1862, p. 317.

spoken them (i.e. before the publication of his works). With reluctance I abandoned my intention." Maḥmūd Warrāq brought his work to a close at the year 409 precisely because it was with the events of this year that Bayhaqī began his narrative.

The work of Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Bayhaqī (d. 470/1077–8) occupies a unique place in Muslim historical literature, at least among such productions as have come down to us. The author quite consciously[1] contrasts his book with those "chronicles, where all that may be read is that a certain Sultan sent such and such a general to some war or other; on a certain day they fought or made peace; this one beat that or that one this; they proceeded there." In contrast to these historians the author relates in detail all the events of which he was a witness. We have seen that Bayhaqī began his narrative with the events of 409[2], but only a small part of his vast work has come down to us, devoted to the reign of Sultan Mas'ūd (1030–41), namely, the second half of the sixth volume, vols. 7, 8, 9, and part of the tenth. The part of his work which has been preserved was published in Calcutta by Morley; it was written in 450 and 451 (1058–59). Down to what year Bayhaqī's work was brought is not known; we know only that it extended to as many as thirty volumes[3]. Short extracts from the early volumes are quoted by the thirteenth-century historian Jūzjānī[4], and the fifteenth-century compiler Ḥāfiz-i Abrū[5]; but no extracts have been found from the last twenty volumes. |

24 A. Müller[6] somewhat inaccurately called Bayhaqī's work "the

[1] *Tarikh-i Baihaki*, p. 438.

[2] In consequence of this we must regard as erroneous Dr. Rieu's statement (*Catalogue*, 1, 159) that Bayhaqī's treatise began with the rise of the Ghaznevid dynasty. In the extracts from Bayhaqī quoted by the historian Jūzjānī (see below), Sabuktagīn is indeed mentioned, but this passage is evidently taken from the history of Maḥmūd, and represents one of the author's frequent digressions. Digressions devoted to Sabuktagīn are found also in the history of Mas'ūd (cf. *Baihaki*, p. 557). Besides Morley's edition there exists also a Teheran edition of A.H. 1307 from a MS. of A.D. 1305; several copies of this were acquired by Prof. Zhukovsky in 1899 for the library of Petrograd University. It includes the same portion of the work as Morley's edition, but begins a few pages earlier. Interesting biographical data concerning Abu'l-Faḍl Bayhaqī are given by Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī in the "History of Bayhaq" (MS. Brit. Mus. pub. 3585, foll 101 b–103 b), which communicates also some facts about his work. It is stated here that Bayhaqī's work included more than thirty volumes and embraced the period from the beginning of the reign of Sabuktagīn to the beginning of the reign of Ibrāhīm (it is evident that Maḥmūd Warrāq's work was reckoned in with it); the author died in Safar 470 (Aug.-Sept. 1077). Abu'l-Ḥasan saw separate parts of the work in various libraries, but he did not see a complete copy. Cf. now my article "Baihaḳī" in the *Encyc. of Islām*.

[3] Thus according to the fifteenth-century compiler Faṣīḥ (MS. As. Mus. 581 *a*, f. 263) and according to Mīrkhwānd.

[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 68.

[5] *Texts*, p. 157.

[6] *Der Islam*, II, 194.

diary of a Persian official;" with more reason it may be called, as suggested by Prof. Sachau[1], his "memoirs." The author wrote his book in old age, after leaving the government service. He was born about 386/996[2], entered the service about 412/1021, and spent nineteen years in the office for the composition of diplomatic documents (dīwān ar-rasā'il) under the direction of Abū Naṣr Mishkān, who died in 431/1039[3]. After Abū Naṣr's death Sultan Mas'ūd continued to extend his patronage to our author, but after Mas'ūd's death his position changed; for some time he was in disgrace, and admits that he himself was partly to blame for it[4]. Subsequently he was readmitted to the service, and under Sultan 'Abd ar-Rashīd (1049–53) was at the head of the office[5].

As an official having access to the court, the author naturally dwells chiefly on the events of court life and officialdom, the intrigues of the court and bureaucracy, and the rivalry of various persons who sought to influence the sovereign in one direction or another. In addition to this, we find that he gives us fairly detailed accounts of external relations; the official letters to various rulers were for the most part written by himself, but this circumstance unfortunately did not enable him to communicate to us the original text of these documents, as his papers were forcibly taken from him, probably on his dismissal. "The correspondence with the government of the Caliph, with the Khāns of Turkestan, and with the lesser rulers was all carried on by me; all the documents were in my hands, but these were deliberately destroyed. Alas, alas, that these gardens of paradise are not on the spot! They would make this history really valuable. I do not give up hope that by the mercy of God the papers will again be found by me; then all will be written[6].' The absence of the original documents did not, however, prevent the author from giving us a "really valuable" work. The picture of court life, as Prof. Sachau has justly remarked, is drawn | by him with great candour; notwith- 25
standing all his reverence for the throne he does not consider himself justified in hiding the evil deeds of his sovereign[7]. The author himself declares[8] that after his dismissal he settled all accounts with his former adversaries, and endeavoured to represent events without any prejudice; and, in fact, his accounts of the intrigues at the court is written from the point of view of an unbiased observer.

Bayhaqī's work has up to the present been used very much less than it deserves; particularly characteristic is the fact that

[1] *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwârizm*, ii, 5.
[2] *Baihaki*, p. 246. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 749. [4] *Ibid*, p. 754.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 122. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 573. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

not one of the scholars who have written on the Qarā-Khānids [1] has taken advantage of it to any appreciable degree [2], although it is just from him that we find the most detailed and accurate information upon this dynasty for a considerable space of time. This is to be explained partly by the defects of Morley's edition (indistinct type, absence of table of contents and index, &c.). A detailed summary (in French) of the contents of the *Ta'rīkh-i Bayhaqī* was inserted by A. Biberstein-Kasimirsky in the introduction to his edition of the diwan of the poet Minūchihrī [3], but the author of the summary did not always understand correctly the text of the Persian historian; for example, the statement quoted above about the official documents is referred to the "historical compositions" of Bayhaqī [4].

The thirteenth-century historian Jūzjānī [5] cites yet another treatise of unknown date on the history of the Ghaznevids, namely, "The correctly classified history" (Ta'rīkh-i Mujadwal) of Abu'l-Qāsim Muḥammad b. 'Alī 'Imādī. This book included the history of the Prophets, the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid Caliphs, the ancient Persian kings, and the Ghaznevids down to Maḥmūd, i. e. it corresponded in its content approximately to Tha'ālibī's work (see above, p. 18). The author of the "Digest of Chronicles," written in 520/1126 (on which see below), in his
26 account of the history of the Ghaznevids quotes his | contemporary, the Amīr Maḥmūd 'Imādī, son of the Imām as-Sinjarī al-Ghaznawī [6]; this may possibly be the same person as Muḥammad b. 'Alī 'Imādī.

After the battle of Dandānqān (in May 1040) the possession of Eastern Persia passed from the Ghaznevids to the Saljūqids. In the reign of Alp-Arslān (1063–72) the Saljūqids began to invade Transoxania, and under his son Malik-shāh (1072–92) the Qarā-Khānids became the vassals of the Saljūqid sultans. Naturally, therefore, the historical treatises written in the Saljūqid kingdom are of great importance also for the study of the history of Transoxania.

[1] Grigor'ev, *Karakhanidy v Maverannagrye*, St. P., 1874 (= *Trudy Vost. Ota.*, part XVII); Sachau, *Zur Geschichte, &c.*, II, 35–46; Dorn, *Mélanges Asiatiques*, tt. VI, IX; Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 900–10; Radloff, *Das Kudatku-Bilik in Transcription herausgegeben*, St. P., 1891, Einleitung, pp. lxxviii–lxxx (Radloff, *K voprosu ob uigurakh*, St. P., 1893, pp. 122–5).

[2] Isolated quotations are found in Sachau and Raverty.

[3] *Menoutchehri, Poète persan du onzième siècle*, Paris, 1887, pp. 17–131.

[4] *Ibid.*, preface, p. v.

[5] Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. xxxii–xxxiii, 69.

[6] Cod. Paris Ancien Fonds Persan 62, f. 263: ومرا این تواریخ از املاء امیر عمادی محمود بن الامام السنجری الغزنوی حفظه الله معلوم شد وآنرا بمحلّ اعتماد توان نوشت ♦

So far as is known there were no compositions written in the eleventh century on the Saljūqid sultans that can properly be called historical; but some idea of the organization of the state and the general conditions of life at this period is given us in the "Book on the Administration of the State" (Siyāsat-nāmah) of the famous wazīr Nizām al-Mulk[1] (Abū 'Alī Ḥasan b. 'Alī Ṭūsī, d. 1092). In 1091 the sultan Malik-shāh instructed some of the high officials to draw up a report on the state of the kingdom, indicating all defects and possible improvements. Of the works presented to him the sultan approved only of the treatise of Niẓām al-Mulk, which consisted of thirty-nine chapters, and decided to adopt it as a guide[2]. It deals with the duties of the various officials, and gives advice on all branches of the administration. In 1092, before his last journey to Baghdād, the Wazīr gave to the copyist of the sultan's personal books, Muhammad Maghribī[3], another eleven supplementary chapters, which he was to deliver to the sultan only after the author's death. As the copyist justly observes, these chapters were written by the author "on account of the distress which was occasioned to him by the enemies of the Empire;" for this reason the author's tone in these sections | is much more bitter and unguarded than 27
in the rest of the book. Whatever we may think of the ideals of this leader of the Persian bureaucracy, it cannot but be realized that in his words is to be heard the voice of a man of deep convictions, going to his death for their sake. He knows that his hostility to the Ismailites will cost him his life, but he believes that after his death his views will triumph[4]: "My words will be remembered when they (the Ismailites) begin to throw into the pit the distinguished and the great, when the ears re-echo with the sound of their drums, and when their secrets are laid bare. At the time of this misfortune he (the Sultan) will realize[5] that I was right in all that I said."

Nizām al-Mulk's composition is incontestably the chief source for the study of the political structure of the Eastern Muslim states. The last chapters, devoted to the Ismailites, afford moreover rich historical material. Prof. Noldeke, in his review of Schefer's edition[6], doubts the trustworthiness of this material, especially the story that the Ismailites converted the Sāmānid Naṣr b. Aḥmad to their heresy; but confirmation of this inci-

[1] The book was published by Schefer in the original and a French translation (*Siasset Namèh*, texte persan, Paris, 1891 = *P.E.L.O.V.*, III[e] sér., vol. vii; *Siasset Namèh*, traduction, Paris, 1893 = *Ibid.*, vol. viii). The book bears also the title: *The habits of Kings* (Siyar al-mulūk).

[2] Texte, p. 2; Traduction, pp. 3-4.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 210; his name omitted in Schefer's trans. (p. 307).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 205; Traduction, p. 299.

[5] In the translation "que le prince sache," which is hardly justified by the original.

[6] *Z.D.M.G.*, xlvi, 767.

dent, of which in fact the historians make no mention at all (cf. above, p. 10), is to be found in the *Fihrist*[1]. Schefer's translation, as is already evident from our observation on the extract we have quoted, is not always quite accurate, but it seldom goes as far as actual mutilation of the sense of the original[2].

In the eleventh century there appeared also special treatises on the history of religion, to which considerable space had already been assigned in the *Fihrist* of an-Nadīm. "The History of Religious and Philosophical Teachings" (Kitāb al-milal wa'n-niḥal) was written by the Spaniard Ibn Ḥazm[3] (d. 456/1064); this treatise, which has been preserved in several manuscripts, was used by Dozy, von Kremer, and Goldziher, and lengthy extracts from it have also been published by M. Schreiner[4]. Somewhat later, in 485/1092, there was written in Ghazna the work of Abū Ma'ālī Muhammad b. 'Ubaydallāh, "The Explanation of Religions" (Bayān al-Adyān); extracts
28 from this are inserted | in the *Chrestomathie* of Schefer, to whom belonged apparently the only manuscript of this work[5], and in 1915 a Danish translation was published by A. Christensen[6].

Of twelfth-century writings we must mention in the first place the "Digest of Chronicles and Narratives" (Mujmil at-Tawārīkh wa'l-Qiṣaṣ) by an unknown author. This work was written in 520/1126, and is preserved only in a single manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The history of the Muhammadan dynasties, not excluding the Saljūqs, is related very briefly in it, but the chapters on the ancient Persian kings[7], on India[8], and on the Turkish peoples are of greater importance. Especially valuable is the list of the titles of the Eastern rulers, in which we find a whole series of titles not mentioned in any other source. The traditions on the origin of the Turkish tribes and on their eponymous heroes differ to some extent from those related in Gardīzī. Amongst other matters we find in it the most ancient version of the legend which places the birthplace

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 188.

[2] Other instances noted below; see also the remarks of Prof. E. G. Browne in his *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, II, 212 sq., on the work and the edition ("much-needed corrections", p. 214 "excellent French translation").

[3] On whom see *Zapiski*, VIII, 179–80; on his treatise Flugel, *Die arab., &c., Handschr. der Kais.-Kon. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, II, 197–9.

[4] *Z.D.M.G.*, LII, 465–7, 475–86. The work has now been published in Cairo in five parts, A.H. 1317–21.

[5] *Chrest. pers.*, I, 132–71; Notes, pp. 132–3. The MS. is now in Paris (Suppl. pers. 1356, No. 7 (ff. 195 v–224); cf. Blochet, *Catalogue . . . Schefer*, Paris, 1900, p. 76).

[6] *Studier fra sprog- og oldtidsforsning udgivne af aet Filologisk-historiske Samfund*, N. 101; Abu l-Ma ali, *Fremstillung af Religionerne*, Oversat af Arthur Christensen.

[7] *Journ. As.*, 3e sér., tt. xi, xii, xiv; 4e sér, t. i.

[8] Reinaud, *Fragments arabes et persanes inédits relatifs à l'Inde*, Paris, 1845, pp. 1–54.

of Turk the son of Japhet in the neighbourhood of Issyk-kul[1]. The manuscript concludes with an account of the destruction of Nīshāpūr by the Ghuzz after the capture of Sultan Sinjar (in 1153); this account was evidently added subsequently either by the author himself or by some other person.

About the same period Abu'l-Futūḥ Barakāt b. Mubārak b. Ismā'īl (d. 525/1131 in Nīshāpūr) wrote in Arabic his book (which has not come down to us) called "The Lightning-flash of Chronicles" (Lam' at-Tawārīkh)[2]. The author was born at Ghazna after 460/1068, and his chronicle was brought down to 500/1106–7.

To the same century belongs also the *History of the Saljūqid family* (Ta'rīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq), whose author, Abū Ṭāhir Khatūnī, is mentioned in Dawlatshāh's anthology. Prof. Browne[3] mentions him only as the author of an anthology of poets (Manāqib ash-Shu'arā), and remarks that the *History of the Saljūqid family* is so vaguely quoted by Dawlatshāh that we do not know what treatise is meant. From Dawlatshāh's quotations from this book, however, in the biography of the poet 'Am'aq Bukhārī[4], it is clearly evident that its author was Abū Ṭāhir Khatūnī, a contemporary of Sultan Sinjar[5].

Sharaf ad-Dīn Abū Naṣr Anūshirwān b. Khālid Kāshānī[6] (d. 533/1138–9), the wazīr of the Caliph Mustarshid, and afterwards of the Saljūq Sultan Mas'ūd, at the end of his life wrote in Persian his memoirs, under the characteristic title of "Decline of the times of Ministers and Ministers of the times of Decline." The | memoirs were devoted to the events of the years 1072–1134, 29
and have come down to us only in the Arabic revision of 'Imād ad-Dīn Isfahānī. The Arabic translator accuses the author of partiality, and of a desire to avenge himself on his enemies. Prof. Houtsma disagrees with this view, and sees in Kāshānī's work only such expressions of the author's personality as are inseparable from productions of this type of literature, and even form their entire charm.

'Imād ad-Dīn Isfahānī (Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad), who wrote in 579/1183, translated and supplemented

[1] *Texts*, pp. 19–20; cf. *Aboul-Ghâzi, Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares, publ. par le baron Desmaisons*, St. P., 1871–4, t. II (traduction), p. 9.

[2] *Texts*, p. 70.

[3] "The Sources of Dawlatshāh," *J.R.A.S.*, 1899, p. 42.

[4] No. 15; in Browne's edition, pp. 64–5.

[5] The same Abū Ṭāhir is mentioned in Houtsma's *Recueil* (cf. below), ii, 89 (another work of his, a diatribe against a wazīr), and 105 sq. Cf. Browne, *Lit. Hist.*, ii, 183 sq., 326 sq., and the information on Abū Ṭāhir collected by the editors of 'Awfī's Lubāb al-Albāb (part I, p. 6 sq.). He was called Khatūnī because he was the financial administrator (mustawfī) of Jawhar Khātūn, the wife of Sultan Muhammad b. Malikshāh. Cf. *Rāḥat as-Sudūr* by Rāwandī, ed. Mīrzā Iqbāl, pp. 131, 136.

[6] On him and the two following authors, see M. Th. Houtsma, *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides*, vol. ii, Lugd. Batav., 1889; also *Zapiski*, I, 190–1.

(in some passages, as Prof. Houtsma thinks, abridged) Kāshānī's work, incorporated it in a sketch of the history of the Saljūqs as far as 1072, and carried the history down to Shawwāl, 575/1180. His work (called نصرة الفترة وعصرة الفطرة "Help in Weariness and Refuge of Creation") has been preserved, so far as is known, in one manuscript only, which belongs to the eighteenth century, and is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris[1]. An abridged edition of the same work, written by Bundārī (Fath b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad, wrote in 623/1226) under the title "Cream of the book 'Help' and Selection from the book 'Refuge'," has been published by Prof. Houtsma. The author endeavoured to preserve "all the facts, all the historical features, and even the best pearls of eloquence" of 'Imād ad-Dīn. Sometimes Bundārī incorporates in 'Imād ad-Dīn's text a few words on the events of the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh centuries A.H. Even in Bundārī's revision the book is very difficult to read, owing to the number of rhetorical figures, rare words, and turns of phraseology with which it is garnished, but it possesses great importance as the fullest source (and for the history of events after 520 also the oldest) for the history of the Saljūqs. We obtain from it many facts which are not in other sources, even relating to the history of the eastern part of the Saljūqid empire and its neighbouring province of Transoxania, though the author's attention is naturally concentrated rather on those provinces in which he passed his life, i.e. Western Persia, 'Irāq, and Syria.

The same 'Imād ad-Dīn wrote also an anthology in Arabic, in which we find short biographical notices of many writers, and specimens of their productions, | including amongst others historical treatises[2]. The book bears the title *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr wa Jarīdat al-'Aṣr* (translated by Schefer as *The fairest Maiden of the Castle and Memoir of the Age*); an extract from it, containing the history of one of the Saljūqid wazīrs, has been published by Schefer[3].

At the very end of the twelfth century, after 1194/590, the amīr Ṣadr ad-Dīn Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Nāṣir al-Ḥusaynī, who was in the service of the Khwārazm-shāh Takash, wrote a book entitled "Cream of Chronicles" which included the history of the Saljūqs. The only known copy is preserved in the British Museum[4]. According to Prof. Houtsma, Ḥusaynī's work is in

[1] Supplement Arabe, No. 772; cf. de Slane, *Catalogue*, No. 2145. On the author and his works, Brock., i, 314 sq.; on Bundārī and Ḥusaynī, *ibid.*, i, 321 sq.

[2] *Catalogus codicum orientalium bibl. Lugdun. Batav.*, ii, 208–88. Cf. *Texts*, p. 70.

[3] *Siasset Namèh*, supplement, Paris, 1897 (= *P.E.L.O.V.*, 3e sér., vol. vii, 2e partie), pp. 115–22.

[4] Stowe, *Orient.*, 7. On this MS. see Rieu, *Arabic MSS.*, pp. 342–4; Houtsma,

the main an abridgement of 'Imād ad-Dīn's; it is only in his account of the history of the first Saljūqids that the author has made use of other chronicles. He very rarely cites his sources, and probably transcribes them word for word. Of greater importance is the author's account of the events of which he was a contemporary; here he gives us "a number of details almost entirely unknown from other sources."

In the beginning of the thirteenth century, in 599/1202–3, there was written in Asia Minor the work of Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Alī ar-Rāwandī called "Solace of the heart and token of joy." Rāwandī's account is distinguished by brevity, and gives few new facts. Only one manuscript of the Persian original is known[1]. This formerly belonged to the late Ch. Schefer, who published from it the text with a French translation[2] of the history of the reign of Sinjar, and subsequently also that of the first Saljūqid sultans down to and including Malikshāh[3] (text only). The whole book has now been edited by Muhammad Iqbāl and published in England[4]. In the reign of Sultan Murād II (1421–51) Rāwandī's book was translated | into Turkish; there is a copy of this translation in the 31
Asiatic Museum[5]. The portion of the Turkish text relating to the Saljūqs of Asia Minor (whose history was continued by the translator down to 1225) has been published by Prof. Houtsma[6].

Recueil, i, p. x; ii, p. xxxvi; *Zapiski*, i, 243 sq., where extracts referring to Alp-Arslan's war with Romanus Diogenes are quoted in the original and Russian translation. Immediately after its acquisition by the British Museum the MS. was copied by Prof. Wright, with the intention of publishing it later on; the same promise was made afterwards by K. Sussheim (*Prolegomena zu einen Ausgabe der im British Museum zu London verwahrten Chronik des Seldschukischen Reiches*, Lpz., 1911), but the edition has not so far (1925) appeared. According to Sussheim the "Zubdat at-Tawārīkh" was only one of the sources of the anonymous chronicle preserved in MS. Stowe, Or. 7.

[1] Now in the Bibl. Nationale, Suppl. pers. 1314; cf. Blochet, *Catalogue . . . Schefer*, p. 65.

[2] *Nouveaux mélanges orientaux*, Paris, 1886 (= *P.E.L.O.V.*, II[e] sér., tome xix), pp. 3–47. The translation unfortunately abounds in errors which entirely alter the sense; it is sufficient to state that the phrase "dar sir kas firistādand" (they sent a man secretly) is translated "députa à Serkes," and it is further explained in a note that Serkes is a town in the district of Kish (pp. 19, 35).

[3] *Siasset Namèh*, supplément, pp. 7c–114.

[4] Gibb Memorial Series, New Series, ii.

[5] MS. 590 ba.

[6] *Recueil, &c.*, vol. iii, 1[e] partie, Lugd. Bat., 1891. In the preface the Persian original is attributed to a certain Ibn Bībī, with a quotation from Schefer's article in *Recueil de textes et de traductions publ par les Proff. de l'école des langues orient viv.*, i, 1 sq. (*P.E.L.O.V.*, 3[e] sér. t. v). In the article mentioned it is stated that Nāṣir ad-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-Bībī, wrote a history of the Saljūqs of Asia Minor from 588 to 679, and that there exists a Turkish translation of this book made in the fifteenth century, the MS. of which is in the Dresden library. Behrnauer intended to edit this MS. but did not succeed in doing so. In Fleischer's catalogue there is no mention of this work. The text of the Asiatic Museum MS. 560 ba (which is, so far as is known, a copy from the Leyden MS.) openly refers to Rāwandī's book as the original composition; and a comparison of the Turkish version with the published Persian text leaves no doubt of this. The second part of the book,

The history of the Saljūqs (Ta'rīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq) of Jamāl ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Yusuf al-Qifṭī [1] (d. 646/1248) has not come down to us, nor have some other works the period of whose composition is unknown. Amongst these is the "Book of Kings" (Malik-nāmah or Mulūk-nāmah) of an unknown author, the source of Mīrkhwānd and Abu'l-Faraj [2], and probably also of Ibn al-Athīr. The "Book of the Saljūqs" (Saljūq-nāmah), which was the only source of Rāwandī for the events previous to his own time, was the work of his relative, Ẓahīr ad-Dīn an-Nīshāpūrī [3], who was the tutor (ustād) of the sultans Arslān (1161–77) and Mas'ūd (1133–52), and wrote during the reign of Ṭughrul (1177–94), the last Saljūqid sultan of 'Irāq [4]. The account quoted in the historico-geographical work of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū [5] (fifteenth century) of the elephant stolen from Sultan Mas'ūd's camp is also taken from Zāhīr ad-Dīn; this story is found in Bayhaqī as well [6]. The fourteenth-century compiler Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī mentions also a history of the Saljūqs of a certain Abu'l-'Alā Ahwal [7].

The second half of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century belongs on the whole to the darkest pages of Muslim history. The testimony of the sources which have come down to us is contradictory in the extreme, and the establishment of the chronology even of the most important events presents great difficulties. Yet the events of this period were of marked
32 importance | in the history of the Muhammadan peoples; within it fall the decline of the Saljūq domination, the subjugation of Transoxania to a heathen monarchy, the rise of two new Muslim dynasties, the Khwārazm-shāhs and the Ghūrids, the victory of the Khwārazm-shāhs in the struggle with their Muslim rivals and with the heathen Qarā-Khiṭāys, the union under their rule of the whole Eastern Muslim world, and the formation under their dominion of an empire, to all appearances powerful, but

containing the history of the Saljūqs of Asia Minor, is apparently in reality a translation of Ibn al-Bībī's work.

[1] *H.-Khalfa*, ii, 109.

[2] *Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. Bruns, p. 229; Houtsma, *Receuil, &c.*, i, p. ix.

[3] *H.-Khalfa*, iii, 606.

[4] Perhaps the same work (dedicated to Ṭughrul) is mentioned under No. cxxxviii (p. 133) in Morley's *Cat. of the lib. of the R.A.S.* Unfortunately this MS., as I was told in the library, has been lost.

[5] MS. Pub. Lib Dorn 290, f. 196 a.

[6] *Baihaki*, ed. Morley, pp. 708–9.

[7] Ed. Browne, p. 434, trans. p. 93. Of later works on the history of the Saljūqids, cf. the عراضة فى الحكاية السلجوقة of Muḥ. b. Muḥ. al-Ḥusaynī (fourteenth century); Rieu, *Catalogue*, ii, 848 sq.; Süssheim, *Prolegomena, &c.*, and two editions, Cairo, 1326/1908 and Leyden, 1909; cf. Muḥ. Iqbāl in *Rāhat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, pref., p. xxxiv. The work of Abū Ḥāmid Muḥ. b. Ibrāhīm mentioned by Rashīd ad-Dīn is identical with the *Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr* of Muḥ. b. 'Alī ar-Rāwandī, cf. *ibid.*, xxxv.

whose internal weakness was speedily revealed at the first serious collision with an external foe.

The historical treatises written for the Ghūrids and the Khwārazm-shāhs have not come down to us, and the history of both dynasties is known to us only from the compilers of the thirteenth century, of whom some account will be given in the following section. For the history of the Ghūrids our chief source is Jūzjānī, the author of the *Ṭabaqat-i Nāṣirī*, who made use of the "Qiṣaṣ-i Thānī" of Abu'l-Ḥāsan Hayṣam b. Muḥammad Nābī[1]. The latter work included also the history of the Ṭāhirids, Ṣaffārids, Sāmānids, and Saljūqids[2]. In his account of the history of the Ghūrid sultans Jūzjānī used also the genealogical work of Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārak-shāh Marwarrūdī[3], which was written at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and contains many interesting statements on the language and tribes of the Turks[4].

The history of the Khwārazm-shāhs occupies a considerable part of the "History of the Conqueror of the World" of Juwaynī, who appears in this matter to be the only source of Mīrkhwānd and earlier Persian compilers. Both Juwaynī[5] and Ibn al-Athīr[6] used for the history of the Khwārazm-shāhs a work by Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Zayd[7] Bayhaqī, "Mashārib at-Tajārib wa Ghawārib al-Gharā'ib[8]" (literally "Places of Refreshment of *The Experiences* | and Zenith of *The Marvels*"). 33 This work, according to Juwaynī, was the continuation of another work called "The Experiences of the Nations," by

[1] Or perhaps al-Bāqī; in other passages the author is called Ibn Hayṣam.

[2] Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 11, 19, 26, 56, 116, 320.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 300. Cf. now on the MS. bought by Mr. A. G. Ellis, *J.A.*, 11, i, 521–33 (by E. D. Ross and R. Gauthiot) and *'Ajab-Nāmah* (Oriental Studies presented to Prof. E. G. Browne), 1922, pp. 392–413 (by E. D. Ross). The author died, according to Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 160) in Shawwāl 602 (1206) (cf *'Ajab-Nāmah*, p. 403), but in his work the month Dhu 'l-Qa'da of the same year is mentioned (*ib.*, p 401).

[4] The names of tribes (*'Ajab-Nāmah*, p. 407 sq.) are partly the same as those mentioned by Mahmūd Kāshgharī in the eleventh century, and do not occur in the same form afterwards (cf. قَمِق for قبچى and يَزِغِر for يَزِر or يازير). For the use of the MS. itself (in the London Oriental School) I am indebted to Sir E. D. Ross.

[5] Ed. Muḥ. Qazwīnī, ii, 1.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 249; in this passage the book is quoted in ref. to the events of 568, but it must have been written before 563 as it is quoted in the history of Bayhaq which was finished in that year and whose author died in 565. Perhaps Ibn al-Athīr had in his possession a continuation of the work.

[7] Juwaynī calls him Ibn Funduq.

[8] *H.-Khalfa*, v, 544. To the same author is ascribed a history of his native town of Bayhaq which has come down to us; cf. Pertsch, *Verzeichniss der pers. Handschriften*, Berlin, 1888 (= *Die Handschrift-Verzeichnisse der Kon. Bibl. zu Berlin*, iv), p. 516 (No. 535); Rieu, *Supplement to the Cat of Pers. MSS.*, Lond., 1895, p. 60 sq ; E. Kal', *Persidskiya, arab. i tyurk. rukopisi Turkest. Pub. Bibl.*, Tashkent, 1889, pp 8–9 (No. 9 a), where there is quoted (incorrectly) a reference of the author to the *History of Bayhaq* of 'Alī b. Abī Ṣāliḥ al-Khuwarī and to the *History of Nīshāpūr* of Abū 'Abdallāh al-Bayyi'; cf. Rieu, *Supplement*, p. 61.

which is meant, of course, the book of that name by Miskawayh[1] (Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, d. 421/1030). Juwaynī quotes also the encyclopaedia called "The Collection of Sciences" (جامع العلوم) of the famous theologian Fakhr ad-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Omar ar-Rāzī (606/1210), which was written for the Khwārazm-shāh Takash[2]. For the earlier history of Khorezmia great importance would no doubt have attached to the enormous work (in 80 volumes) of Abū Muḥammad Mahmūd b. Muḥammad b. Arslān al-'Abbāsī al-Khwārazmī (d. 568/1172–3), devoted to Khorezmia and its inhabitants. An abridged edition of this work was made by the fourteenth-century compiler adh-Dhahabī[3], whom we have already mentioned in connexion with al-Bayyi' (p. 16). From Khwārazmī's book Yāqūt[4] borrowed an interesting account of the philosopher Shahristānī, the author of the famous book on religious and philosophical creeds[5]. For the history of the Khwārazm-shāhs, Ḥājjī Khalīfa mentions also a work by the Sayyid Ṣadr ad-Dīn, "Ta'rikh-i Khwārazmshāhī[6]."

[1] Vols. i, v, and vi have been published by Caetani in facsimile for the Gibb Memorial Series, vii; vols. v and vi printed and translated, with the continuation of Abū Shujā and extracts (in notes) from other works, by Amedroz and Margoliouth, under the title of *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, Oxford, 1920–1. An extract referring to the years 198–251 was published by de Goeje (*Frag. Hist Arab*, Lugd. Batav., 1869–71, tom. II). Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, in the preface to his edition (vol. vii, p. 11) tries to prove that the "Ibn" usually prefixed to the name Miskawayh is erroneous. The contrary opinion is maintained by the anonymous author of the article "Ibn Miskawaih" in the *Encyc. of Islam*, where Miskawayh or Mushkōye is said to have been the name of the grandfather of our author. Of the continuators of his work Ḥājjī Khalīfa (ii, 191) mentions only Abū Shujā Muhammad b. Husayn (d. 488/1095), wazīr of the Caliph Mustazhir, and Muh. b. 'Abdal-malik al-Hamadhānī. Bayhaqī himself, though the title of his book contains an evident allusion to that of Miskawayh, speaks of his work as a continuation of the Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī (تاريخ يمينى cod. Brit. Mus. Or. 3587, f. 12 a). Another of Bayhaqī's works, a history of learned men, is preserved in a MS. at Berlin, cf Brock., i, 324, and extracts from the book in *Der Islam*, iii, 43 sq. See also my article on the author in the *Encyc. of Islam*, s v. Baihaḳī, and his biography in Yāqūt's *Irshād*, v, 208–18 (born Sat. 27 Sha'bān 499/5th May 1106, d 565/1169–70).

[2] Cf. Rieu, *Catalogue*, Suppl., p. 102 b; Pertsch, *Verzeichniss*, S. 162–3 (No. 92); a short historical treatise, ascribed by Wüstenfeld (*Die Geschichtsschreiber*, S. 106) to the same author was written at the beginning of the fourteenth century (Elfachri, *Geschichte des islamischen Reiche von Ibn etthiqthaqa*, herausg. von W. Ahlwardt, Gotha, 1860).

[3] *H.-Khalfa*, ii, 129; vii, 655; Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*, S. 90, where in the quotation from Yāqūt 343 should be read instead of 341.

[4] *Jacut's geographisches Worterbuch*, ed. Wüstenfeld, iii, 343. (This edition is quoted hereafter as Yāqūt.)

[5] Yāqūt also mentions the same work (in autograph) of Abū Muḥammad b. Arslān (whom he calls elsewhere (iii, 212) Abū Aḥmad Mahmūd b. Arslān) on the history of Khwārazm in *Irshād*, v, 412 in the biography of Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muh. al-'Umrānī (d. *c.* 560 A.H.), a disciple of Zamakhsharī (on him see Brock, i, 289 sq.) and author of a geographical work mentioned also several times in the Mu'jam (cf. Index, vi. 586).

[6] *H.-Kh.*, ii, 129. This is of course the same as the historian of the Saljūqs

A most important source for the history of the period of the Khwārazm-shāhs is furnished by two collections of official documents. The first, which possesses no title, is preserved in one manuscript, formerly in the Institute of Eastern Languages at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Petrograd, which has been minutely described by Baron V. R. Rosen [1]. A large number of the documents are from the pen of Muntajab ad-Dīn Badī', the secretary of Sultan Sinjar, who is mentioned by Juwaynī [2] in the account of Sinjar's expedition to Khorezmia in 542/1147. An interesting letter to the government of the Caliph in the name of the Khwārazm-shāh Īl-Arslān [3] was written, | as 34
we know from 'Imād ad-Dīn's anthology, by the poet Waṭwāṭ [4] (d. 578/1182), who is probably to be regarded as the author of some other documents as well written in the name of the Khwārazm-shāh. Especially interesting are the letters of Atsiz, both those in which he calls himself Sinjar's loyal subject, and a document containing a series of accusations against the Saljūqid sultan and a justification of the rebellion of Atsiz [5]. In addition to these, the documents which mirror the relations of Sultan Sinjar with the Khāns of Turkestan [6] are of great interest to us.

Another collection, entitled "Search for an opening for business relations" [7] (at-Tawassul ila't-Tarassul), was made by Bahā ad-Dīn Muhammad b. Mu'ayyad al-Baghdādī, who had been in the service of the Khwārazm-shāh Takash. According to Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī [8], he was the brother of the famous shaykh Majd ad-Dīn Baghdādī, who was executed by order of the Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad. The author says of himself in the preface that he lived formerly in the town of Nasā in Khurāsān, until the sovereign summoned him and appointed him head of the chancellory (dīwān al-inshā); unwillingly yielding to the prayers of

mentioned above (p. 28). In a manuscript list (now in the London Oriental School) presented to Sir Gore Ouseley (in Arabic) of lost historical works, for which search ought to be made in the East, there is mentioned (p. 148) a history of Gurgānj (كتاب بلاد جرجانيه) by Hamza Isfahānī, but I have found no mention of this work elsewhere.

[1] *Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des langues orientales*, iii, *Les manuscrits persans*, St. P., 1886, p. 146 sq. In this the titles of the various documents are listed, but by mistake the last title has been omitted; cf. *Texts*, p. 44. This manuscript has now, like all manuscripts of the Institute, been transferred to the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences.

[2] ii, 9. A رسالة of Badī' is quoted by Juwaynī, i, 8.

[3] *Texts*, pp. 30–2.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 70. On Watwāṭ (Rashīd ad-Dīn Muḥ. b 'Alī al-Jalīl) cf. Browne, *Lit. Hist.*, ii, 330 sq., *Grundriss der Iran. Philologie*, ii, 259 sq.

[5] *Texts*, pp. 43–4. [6] *Ibid.*, pp. 23–6.

[7] *H.-Khalfa*, ii, 463; *Catal. Lugd.*, i, 169–72.

[8] *Texts*, p. 153. In Browne's ed. of the Ta'rīkh-i Guzīdah there is a lacuna here (indicated neither in the text, p. 788, nor in the translation, p. 215).

his friends and to the command of the sultan, he publishes the collection of documents written by him in the course of the last year or two. The book was presented to the wazīr [1]. From the text [2] it is evident that the documents refer to 578–9/1182–4, although the events mentioned in them are sometimes put by the historians at very much later dates.

Our meagre historical information is, unfortunately, but little supplemented by the accounts of travellers. After the tenth century Arabic geographical literature was chiefly of a compilatory character; moreover, these compositions were written in the western part of the Muhammadan world. Amongst the few travellers of the twelfth century may be noted Shihāb ad-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh (or Abū Hāmid) Ahmad al-Gharnāṭī, a native of Spain, who, however, visited also the eastern countries, and even went to the far north, to the country of the Bulghārs of the Kama.
35 We find in him a very characteristic account | of the discovery of the so-called tomb of 'Alī in the neighbourhood of Balkh [3].

About the middle of the sixth century A. H. was written the dictionary called "The Book of Genealogies" [4] (Kitāb al-Ansāb) by Sam'ānī (Abū Sa'd [5] 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muhammad, d. 562/1166). The author was born in Merv, and amongst other works wrote a history of that town; two libraries of the Sam'ānī family were seen at Merv by Yāqūt [6]. In his dictionary Sam'ānī aimed at giving an alphabetical list of the appellations under which the various shaykhs and other persons who laboured for the advantage of Islām achieved their fame; in addition, short biographical notices are given of each person. As the appellations of a large number were taken from the names of towns and villages, Sam'ānī's work is of great importance for medieval geography, and was one of Yāqūt's chief sources. In order to collect material for his book the author made extensive travels, and in 550–1/1155–6 [7] visited Transoxania and Khorezmia. He heard lectures on various theological subjects at Bukhārā [8] and Samarqand [9], spent about two months at Nasaf [10], and twelve days at Tirmidh [11]; and not seldom, when mentioning some town or

[1] *Texts*, p. 73. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 21–2. On the author and his work cf Brock, I, 477 sq. [It has now been edited by G. Ferraud in *J.A.*, tome ccvii (G.)]

[4] So in Prof. Zhukovsky's translation (*Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, p. 35), but judging from the contents of the book the word انساب means here rather "family names" (sing. نسبة).

[5] In some manuscripts and printed publications Abū Sa'īd instead of Abū Sa'd (*e.g.* Ibn al-Athīr, XI, 152).

[6] Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny*, pp. 2, 34; cf Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, IV, 509, 21.

[7] Sam'ānī, facs. Margoliouth, *s. v.* الكِندى.

[8] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* الصفّار and الكاشانى. [9] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* الخديمنكنى.

[10] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* النسفى. [11] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* الترمذى.

village visited by him, he gives at the same time a few details about it.

Sam'ānī's work is, of course, of great importance for the history of literature, although the author unfortunately turned his attention almost exclusively to theological literature (one of the rare exceptions is the poet Rūdakī [1]); the name Jayhānī is not mentioned by him at all, while under the word Bal'amī he speaks only of the older wazīr of that name, Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad [2], and omits all mention of his son, the translator of Ṭabarī [3]. | According to Ibn Khallikān [4], Sam'ānī's work con- 36
sisted of eight volumes, and had already become a bibliographical rarity in the thirteenth century; much wider use was made of an abridged edition by the historian Ibn al-Athīr, in three volumes [5]. The original work has now been edited by Prof. D. S. Margoliouth [6] in facsimile from a manuscript in the British Museum, and there is another almost complete manuscript in the library of the Asiatic Museum [7].

The geographical dictionary of Yāqūt [8] (Shihāb ad-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥamawī, d. 626/1229) is so well known that we shall not dwell upon it. Yāqūt collected abundant material, chiefly in the libraries of Merv, and enumerates almost all the towns and the more important villages in the Muslim lands. He endeavoured to establish the correct pronunciation of the names of towns, which in consequence of the peculiarities of the Arabic alphabet are so easily mutilated into unrecognizability. He did not always succeed in this, especially in those cases where the names of towns were known to him only from books; although he made extensive journeys he did not, of course, visit all Muslim countries, and though he had been in Khorezmia, he was never in Transoxania. It is wrong, as de Goeje has justly remarked [9], to rely blindly on the readings which he gives. Yāqūt also compiled a dictionary of learned men, containing extracts from many treatises now lost. This work, so far as it is available, has now been edited by Prof. Margoliouth [10]. Some

[1] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* البنجي and الرودكي. [2] *Ibid.*, *s v.* البلعمي.

[3] Zhukovsky (*Razvaliny*, p. 18) mistakenly confuses father and son.

[4] No. 406; de Slane's trans., ii, 157.

[5] The beginning of this abridgement was published by Wustenfeld (*Specimen el-Lobabi sive Genealogiarum Arabum*, Gottingae, 1835).

[6] Gibb Memorial Series, vol. xx.

[7] Cf. Rosen, *Notices sommaires*, p. 146. On the author and his work see Brock, i, 329 sq.

[8] Published by Wustenfeld. A biographical account of Yāqūt may be found in Von Kremer, *Culturgesch*, ii, 433–6.

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, i, pp. vii–viii.

[10] ارشاد الاريب في معرفة الاديب, Gibb Memorial Series, vi, vols. i, ii, iii, v, and vi. It is now reported that the missing volumes have been found: see the editor's article in *Islamica*, vol. i, fasc. 1.

mention should also be made of the cosmographical and geographical work of Zakarīyā b. Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī (d. 682/1283), also edited by Wüstenfeld [1]. The author uses Yāqūt's work, but in several passages gives information which is not found in the "Mu'jam."

In 610/1214 Ṣafī ad-Dīn Abū Bakr 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar composed in Arabic a description of the town of Balkh, and a sketch of its history. In this work an account is given "of the amenities of the town, of its foundation, canals, trees, fruits, gardens, and flowers; of its mosques and madrasas; of the prosperity of the town; of the 'ulamā, shaykhs, and famous kings; of the multitude of its inhabitants, and of their respect for holy men; of the safety of the roads; of the abundance of the means of existence; of the tranquillity of the inhabitants; and of the punishments suffered by the disturbers of this peace." In 676/1277 this work was translated into Persian by an unknown hand from the
37 author's autograph. The | manuscript of this translation is now in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale (Ancien Fonds persan 115); an extract from it is included in Schefer's *Chrestomathie persane* [2].

About 625/1228 Muhammad 'Awfī's anthology, called *Collections of anecdotes and brilliant tales*, was written in India [3]. The author travelled much in his youth, and had visited Bukhārā [4] and Khorezmia [5]. Of the anecdotes quoted those of the greatest importance for us are the fairly numerous tales about the Qarā-Khānids, especially of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr [6]. In addition to anecdotes, the book contains a chapter of history (part i, ch. 5), and another of geography (part iv, ch. 16); in the latter special interest attaches to his accounts of the Eastern Asiatic and Turkish tribes; for instance, the author is the first Persian writer to mention the Uighūrs [7].

For the Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad (1200–1220) Muḥammad b. Najīb Bakrān wrote in Persian a *Description of the World* (Jahān-Nāmah); so far as is known, this work is preserved in two manuscripts only [8]. We find in it some interesting informa-

[1] عجائب المخلوقات وآثار البلاد (Zakarijja B. Muh. B. Mahmud al-Cazwini's *Kosmographie*, herausg. von F. Wüstenfeld, Gott., 1848–9); cf. Brock., i, 481; Browne, *Lit. Hist.*, ii, 482 sq.

[2] Vol. i, pp. 66–103; Notes, pp. 63–8.

[3] Cf. *Zapiski*, ix, 263 sq. On the author and his work see now Browne, *Lit. Hist*, ii, 477 sq. (other quotations in index); *Grund. d. iran. Phil.*, ii, 213, 330, 332; Extracts and Excursus in Marquart, *Altturk. Dialektstudien*, cf. index *s. v.* Muḥammad i 'Awfī. [A critical study of the *Jawāmi' al-Ḥikāyāt* by H. M. Nizāmuddīn is shortly to be published in the Gibb Memorial Series. (G.)]

[4] *Texts*, p. 93. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 88. [6] *Ibid.*, pp. 84–7.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 99. So far as is known at present, the name ايغور or اويغور is mentioned for the first time in Arabic literature in the ديوان لغات الترك of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (end of eleventh century).

[8] Cf. *Zapiski*, ix, 302–3 and x, 124.

tion on the geography of Transoxania and on the history of the Qarā-Khiṭāys [1].

A sketch of the history of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, the conquerors of Transoxania, is furnished us by the above-mentioned historian Juwaynī, whose narrative in this case contains many errors, obscurities, and contradictions; nevertheless, it was almost the only source of the later compilers. The actual fact of the consolidation of the Qarā-Khiṭāy dominion is related in fullest detail by Ibn al-Athīr [2]. In a supplement to the Ta'rīkh-i Narshakhī [3], Schefer published a chapter on the Qarā-Khānids, and another on the Qarā-Khiṭāys, taken from "the compilations of an unknown author, composed at the end of the sixteenth century." This compilation is | identical with the "Ta'rīkh-i 38
Ḥaydarī," the work of Ḥaydar b. 'Alī Ḥusaynī Rāzī, which was written at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The text published by Schefer agrees word for word with that of the corresponding chapters of the Berlin MS. [4] of the "Ta'rīkh-i Ḥaydarī," as I ascertained during my stay in Berlin in the summer of 1898. Ḥaydar Rāzī's narrative contains some details and some personal names which are not found in Juwaynī.

II. THE MONGOL INVASION

The Mongol invasion was, of course, described by the historians of all the lands conquered or devastated by the Mongols; our references must be made chiefly to the Muslim and Chinese sources, and in rare instances to the Armenian [5] as well. Of the independent Chinese sources we may refer to the report of Meng Hung, who was sent in 1221 as an envoy by the government of the Sung (Southern Chinese) dynasty to conclude an alliance with the Mongols against the Churche [6]. The narratives of some other travellers are collected in Dr. Bretschneider's book [7]; the most interesting is the diary of the journey of the

[1] *Texts*, pp. 81–2. [2] XI, 55 sq.

[3] *Description de Boukhara*, pp ii, 23c–43.

[4] Pertsch, *Verzeichniss*, No. 418 (p. 410). Cf. Rieu, *Catalogue*, Supplement, pp. 2c–21 (in the British Museum MS. here described Ḥaydarī's work has the same title جمع التواريخ as in Schefer's MS.). Cf. also my article in the *Encyc. of Islam*, *s. v.* Ḥaidar b. 'Alī.

[5] According to the translations by Patkanov (*Istoriya mongolov inoka Magakii*, xiii, v, St. P., 1871; *Istoriya mongolov po armyanskim istochnikam*, St. P., 1873–4, 2 parts).

[6] *Trudy Vost. Otd. Arkh. Ob.* (hereafter quoted only as *Trudy*), part iv. The Chinese title of this narrative is "Mong ta pei lu"; Vasil'ev's Russian translation, in Prof. Pelliot's opinion (*J.A.*, II, xv, 130), does not rise above mediocrity.

[7] *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources*, London, 1888 (new issue 1910), vol. I

Taoist hermit Ch'ang-Ch'un, written by his disciple, of which there is also a Russian translation [1]. Like the Muhammadans, the Chinese portray in vivid colours the cruel devastations wrought by the Mongols, but whereas religious fanaticism prevented the Muslims, with few exceptions, from observing those features by which the nomads were favourably distinguished from the settled population of Central Asia, we find greater impartiality in the Chinese opinions of the Mongols. Notwithstanding all their respect for their own secular culture, the Chinese were not seldom attracted by the simplicity of nomadic manners, and their remarks on the Mongols in such cases recall those of the classical writers on the Scythians and Germans: "Amongst them there remained traces of the manners of hoary
39 antiquity. . . . Holy sages could not | bequeath written instruction to them, and they have lived whole centuries without a care, sufficient unto themselves [2]." Meng-Hung not only sees in the habits of the Mongol savages the "unspoiled customs of antiquity," but even laments the destruction of this primeval simplicity by the outward polish of Chinese culture: "Alas that their preceptors are now Kin officials who have deserted their own country! At present they are beginning to issue from chaos (simplicity), they are destroying the natural (lit. the true) heavenly teaching, and are having recourse to low cunning. Oh how hateful it is! [3]"

Of the Muslim historians of the Mongol invasion there were three writers who were contemporaries of the event: Ibn al-Athīr in his famous chronicle [4], Minhāj ad-Dīn Abū 'Omar 'Othmān b. Sirāj ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Jūzjānī in the "Nāṣirī Tables [5]," and Shihāb ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad an-Nasawī in his "Biography of the sultan Jalāl ad-Dīn Mangubirtī" (or

[1] *Trudy Rossiiskoi dukhovnoi missii v Pekinye* (hereafter quoted as *Works of the Peking Mission*), vol. iv.

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 289.

[3] *Trudy*, iv, 232. For other Chinese works relating to the history of the Mongols cf. Bretschneider, i, 180 sq., Pelliot in *J.A.*, ii, xv, 130 sq. According to Pelliot, the most ancient work besides the *Meng ta pei lu* is the *Hsi ta che lio*, with a commentary dating from 1237 (this work is not mentioned by Bretschneider). The *Huang Yuan sheng ts'in cheng lu*, translated by Palladius, dates from the fourteenth century (Bret., i, 194; Pelliot, p. 130); according to Pelliot (p. 164) it is generally in close agreement with Rashīd ad-Dīn, but the text is "dans un état déplorable" (p 176).

[4] Ibn al-Athīr's account of the Mongol invasion was translated into Russian by Baron V. G. Tiesenhausen (*Sbornik materialov, otnosyaschikhsya k istorii Zolotoi Ordy*, St. P., 1884, vol. i).

[5] The portion of the book relating to the history of the Ghūrids, Qarā-Khiṭāys, and Mongols was published in Calcutta in 1864 (*The Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī of Aboo Omar Minhaj al-din . . . . al-Jawzjani*, ed. by W. Nassau Lees and Mawlawis Khadim Hosain and Abd al-Hai). The book was translated into English by Major Raverty (*The Ṭabaḳāt-i Nāṣirī*, London, 1881) with detailed notes; the index appeared separately in 1897.

perhaps Mankubirnī)[1]. Not one of the three authors gives us a complete history of the campaigns of Chingiz-Khān and his generals; they were all so situated that they could become acquainted with no more than a part of the events of these troublous times. Ibn al-Athīr lived in Mesopotamia, and could not collect detailed accounts of events in Turkestan; only for a few incidents, notably for the capture of Bukhārā and Samarqand, does he quote from eye-witnesses. Nasawī was living at the time of the invasion in his family castle in Khurāsān, and entered the service of the Khwārazm-shāh Jalāl ad-Dīn only after the return of the latter from India (in 1223). Somewhat before this he had come into contact with some of the high officials of Khorezmia, and he communicates, for the most part in their own words, many curious data on the internal and external affairs of the Khorezmian kingdom. It is from him that we gain the most detailed information on the condition of his native land (Khurāsān) at this | period; but military events 40
are related in his book more summarily than in the other sources. Jūzjānī, who was born in 589/1193, was in the service of the Ghūrid princes, and therefore the events which occurred in Afghanistan are related by him with special wealth of detail. He took part personally in the defence of one fortress. In 1227 the author emigrated to India, where he afterwards held the post of chief qāḍī, and where in 658/1260 he wrote his book. On certain campaigns, for example, that of Jūchī from Utrār down the Syr-Darya, not one of the three historians says a word. A very short account of the history of the Mongols from Chingiz-Khān to Hūlāgū is given by Nāṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī (d. 1274) in the beginning of his "Zīj-i Īlkhānī[2]."

A full account of the Mongol campaigns is given by 'Alā ad-Dīn Aṭā-Malik b. Muhammad Juwaynī (d. 681/1283) in his "History of the Conqueror of the World" (Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-Gushāy). This book was written in the same year as Jūzjānī's book[3], but the author was a much younger man, and cannot be

[1] Nasawī's book was published and translated into French by O. Houdas (*Vie de Djelal eddin Mankobirti*, t. i, texte arabe, t. ii, traduction française et notes, Paris, 1891–5; *P.E.L.O.V.*, 3e série, tt. ix, x). On the author see Brock., i, 319. The work is quoted by Ibn Shihna (text in the margin of the Egyptian edition of Ibn al-Athīr, vol. ix, p 86; on the author and his work see Brock., ii, 141 sq.) under the title تاريخ النتر by محمد المنشى; by Ismā'īl ibn al-Athīr (see Brock., i, 341) the author is called Ibn al-Munshī (MS Brit. Mus. Or. 7914, f. 46 b).

[2] A copy of this work in the Brit. Mus. (Add. 7698) is described by Rieu in his *Persian Cat*, p. 454. Amongst the later acquisitions of the Museum is another copy of the same work (Or. 7464), which is older and more correct, and contains a much more detailed historical introduction. On the author cf. Browne, ii, 484 sq.; *Grundriss*, ii, 344 and 348.

[3] This does not prevent Raverty (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 987) from including the author of the *Ta'rīkh-i Jahān Gushāy* among the writers who lived "from one to three centuries" after Jūzjānī

reckoned as a contemporary of the Mongol invasion; he may still have made use, however, of the narratives of older contemporaries. Juwaynī's work contains the history of the Mongols down to Hūlāgū's campaign against the Ismailites; in some manuscripts [1] a chapter on the conquest of Baghdād is added as a "supplement to the book" (dhayl-i kitāb). In addition to this, Juwaynī included in his work the history of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs (see above, p. 31). The portion of the book dealing with the Mongol conquest of Transoxania and Khurāsān has been printed in Schefer's *Chrestomathie* [2].

Juwaynī's work has not as yet been valued at its deserts. D'Ohsson accused the author of extravagant flattery of the Mongols, who had ruined his native land, and of an exuberantly ornate style; the same scholar, omitting to lay stress on the merits of the work, expresses his regret that the author "did not bring more veracity into his illumination of events and more sequence into his narrative [3]." The injustice of the reproach of excessive flattery was exposed by the very first critic of the "History of the Mongols," Abel-Rémusat [4]; as he very justly remarked, there could not at that time have been any question of a "fatherland" in our sense, and, except for the inevitable
41 miseries | of an age of war, the population of Persia was scarcely more wretched under Mongol rule than in the period of the Khwārazm-shāhs. In the matter of its panegyrical tone and abundance of rhetorical figures Juwaynī's language does not stand out from that of the vast majority of Persian historians. Nor have we noticed any special deficiencies in the author's system of exposition. He is not completely master of his material; in his narrative there are sometimes flagrant contradictions to be found, but in this respect the works of the later compilers, not excepting Rashīd ad-Dīn, stand in no way higher. On the whole, it is not to be denied that the author conscientiously endeavoured to give us a full and truthful narrative of events. Juwaynī's vast superiority over Rashīd ad-Dīn and Waṣṣāf lies in the fact that he lived at a time when the Mongol empire was still a unity, and that he visited Turkestan, Uighuria, and Mongolia in person. In his narrative he endeavoured, so far as his sources allowed, to relate the history of the whole empire, while Rashīd ad-Dīn and Waṣṣāf turned their attention chiefly to the history of the Mongol kingdom in Persia, and in part to its ally China. As for the Jaghatāy kingdom, these

[1] *E.g.* MS. Pub. Lib. (Petrograd), iv, 2, 34. According to Muḥ. Qazwīnī (Introduction to his edition, p. lxiii) this continuation was the work of Nāṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī, but Prof. Browne (*Lit. Hist*, iii, 66) says only that it is "probably an addition by a later hand."

[2] *Chrest persane*, ii, 110–60.

[3] *Histoire des Mongols*, i, pp. xx–xxvii.

[4] *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, i, 427.

historians not only themselves possessed the most meagre knowledge of the events which took place there, but they did not even make use of Juwaynī's account of Jaghatāy's first successors [1].

Juwaynī had already made use of oral narratives of the Mongols [2], and possibly also of some written ones; some of his expressions openly indicate a Mongol source [3]. Rashīd ad-Dīn used Mongol written sources to a much greater extent. |

Before the time of Chingiz-Khān the Mongols, as is well 42
known, had no written documents. On adopting the Uighūr alphabet, they used it first of all for the codification of the so-called "Regulations of Chingiz-Khān" (*i.e.* the national opinions and customs sanctioned by him), the observance of which was obligatory not only on all the inhabitants of the empire, but also on the Khāns themselves. Thus arose the "Great Yāsā" [4] of Chingiz-Khān. Written copies of the Yāsā are spoken of by many historians, amongst others already by Juwaynī, according to whose statement the laws were written on leaves preserved in the treasury of the principal members of the dynasty; on the accession of a new Khān, on the dispatch of a large army, and on the convocation of an assembly of the

[1] This narrative was published with a French translation by Defrémery (*J.A.*, 4e sér, t. xx, pp. 381–8, 399–406). That there exists as yet no complete edition of Juwaynī's work is, as Prof. Browne justly remarks (*Lit Hist.*, ii, 473), "not less than a scandal." At present two volumes have been published by Mīrzā Muhammad Qazwīnī for the Gibb Mem. Ser. (xvi), with a very full introduction translated by Prof. Browne in vol. i, and only the history of the Ismailites still remains to be published. Cf. also my article "Djuwainī" in the *Encyc. of Islam*; Browne. iii, 65 sq.

[2] Cf. *e.g.* his statement (i, 28): از جملهٔ مغولاں معتبر شنیده ام.

[3] Speaking of the events which preceded Guyuk's accession to the throne, Juwaynī (i, 197) represents Kūtān as answering his mother, on her demand that he should surrender certain nobles who had taken refuge with him, as follows.

بغاب الطیور که از مخالب باز بخاردنی بناهد از صولت او اماں می یابد ایشاں نز چون دما استبمان کرده اند وبدامن دولت ما تمسّك نموده باز فرسنادن ایشان در آذدن همّت ومروّت محظورست واز شیوهٔ مکرمت ومروّت دور

The same comparison is used in the Mongol narrative (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 43) by the deliverers of Chingiz-Khān: "When a bird hunted by a kite hides in thick grass, the thick grass saves its life; if this is so with grass, we should be worth less than it if we did not help a man who had fled to us."

[4] *Yāsā* (regulation, law): the fuller form الیساق (in Mongolian *Dzasak*) is used by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (*Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, texte et trad. par C. Defrémery et le Dr. Sanguinetti, Paris, 1855, iii, 40). Another term in Waṣṣāf (*MS. Pub. Lib.*, v, 3, 24, f. 390, تونچن; Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde*, S. 183, Tundschin); in the abridged edition of the Ta'rīkh-i Arba' Ulūs of Ulughbeg a quite incomprehensible term شب آشوب is used (Cod. Mus. Brit. Add. 26,190, f. 56). Cf. also my paper "Persidskaya nadpis' na styenye mecheti Manuche," 1911 (*Aniyskaya Seriya*, N. 5), p. 31, where another term "tankghāl yarligh" is quoted from Waṣṣāf.

princes to deliberate on affairs of state these leaves were produced, and matters were decided according to their contents[1]. Whether any of the historians ever saw a copy of the Yāsā is unknown. The most detailed account of the regulations of the Yāsā is found in the Egyptian writer Maqrīzī[2] (Taqī ad-Dīn Ahmad, d. 845/1441–2).

Along with this, the Mongols borrowed from the Chinese the custom of writing down the sayings of the Khāns and publishing them after their death. It stands to reason that such notes were made only when the Khān himself desired it, endeavouring in such cases to clothe his words in poetic form, or at least in rhythmic prose[3]. These maxims were called by the Turkish word "bilik" (knowledge). The biliks of Chingiz-Khān were studied and taught; in China on one occasion the question of the succession to the throne was settled in favour of that aspirant
43 who displayed the most thorough | knowledge of these biliks[4]. Some of Chingiz-Khān's biliks are quoted by Rashīd ad-Dīn in a supplement to his book[5].

Their brilliant victories contributed to the development of Mongol national sentiment[6], and under its influence the Mongols and their Khāns began to aspire to know the history of their nation, and to save from oblivion the great exploits of their fathers. The difference between history and legend was as little known to the Mongols as to other primitive peoples. In all probability even the teachers of the Mongols, the Uighūrs, had no real historical treatises; at any rate, Juwaynī and Rashīd ad-Dīn quote from their books only fantastic legends on the origin of their nation[7]. Under the influence of milieu, of class-tendencies, and so on, different versions of the traditions of Chingiz-Khān, of his ancestors, of his companions in arms, and of the formation of his empire were bound to arise. It is difficult to determine when these tales first began to be written down. According to one of Rashīd ad-Dīn's narratives Jaghatāy's Chinese wazīr already had in his possession, even before his preferment, one such list containing the history of Chingiz-Khān's

[1] Ed. Muh. Qazwīnī, i, 17 sq. Cf. Quatremère, *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse par Raschid-eldin*, Paris, 1836, p. clxi.

[2] Text and French trans. in S. de Sacy's *Chrestomathie arabe*, 2e éd., ii, 60 sq., 160 sq.; Russian trans. in Prof. Berezin's *Ocherk vnutrennyavo ustroistva ulusa Dzhuchieva*, St. P., 1863 (= *Trudy*, part viii), pp. 25–31.

[3] Rashīd ad-Dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 195.

[4] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, ii, 506–7.

[5] *Trudy*, xv, p. 120 sq. Prof. Berezin (*Trudy*, xv, 173) and Prof. Vasil'ev (*Zapiski*, iv, 381) erroneously confuse the biliks with the *yāsā*.

[6] Volentes nomen suum, hoc est Moal, exaltare super omne nomen (*Recueil de voyages et de mémoires*, publ. par la Soc. de géographie, t. iv, Paris, 1839, p. 259).

[7] Radloff, *Kudatku-Bilik in Transscription*, pp. xxv sq, xli sq, *K voprosu ob uigurakh*, pp. 40 sq., 56 sq.

campaigns[1]. There has come down to us, in the original and in a Chinese translation, a narrative composed in Mongolia in 1240[2]. The late Prof. Berezin called this narrative, not quite happily, "the Mongol-Chinese Chronicle"; it differs from all chronicles by the fact that the events are not related by years, the chronology being extremely vague and confused. In our view this curious monument must be taken as a product of the heroic epos. The outstanding heroes are much more highly praised by the author than are Chingiz-Khān and his family. Chingiz-Khān, according to the author, while yet a child murdered his brother, which caused his mother to bewail | the 44
cruel manners of her eldest sons, and to compare them to beasts of prey[3]; subsequently he treacherously killed one of his faithful servants[4]. In the same way the accusation is made against Uguday that he "from personal resentment secretly killed a faithful and devoted" companion in arms[5]. On the other hand, the author unconditionally approves of the pretensions of the heroes, one of whom openly required that Chingiz-Khān should obey his counsels in all matters[6]. A recommendation is put into Chingiz-Khān's own mouth to show respectful deference to the Khan's guards, *i.e.* the military aristocracy[7]. The ideal of the hero of the steppe, with his irrepressible valour, his unwavering fidelity to the head of his nation, and unlimited hospitality[8], is traced in the poem in high relief. As regards external events, the author dwells chiefly on the wars which took place in Eastern Asia, and only in a few words touches on the Mongol campaigns in the west.

The same material, in a different light, of course, is found in the official redaction of the Mongol tradition, which has come down to us in a Persian and a Chinese reworking. We know that the Mongol emperors in China gave some attention to the working-up of Mongol history; under the Emperor Kai-san (1308–11), for example, an official history of the Mongols of this

[1] Rashīd ad-Dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 195.

[2] On the Mongolian original see pamphlet of A. M. Pozdnyeev (St. P., *Zap Russk. Arkheol. Ob.*, 1883); on the Mongolian title (*Mongolun nigucha tobchiyan* = Secret History of the Mongols) see now Prof. Pelliot in *T'oung Pao*, XIV (1913), p. 131 sq. The Russian translation of Palladius, made from the Chinese (the Mongolian original had not then been found), is included in *Works of the Peking Mission*, vol. iv. The Mongolian original was to have been published by Pozdnyeev in Russia, and will now be published by Prof. Pelliot (see his promise in *J.A.*, 11, XV, 132).

[3] *Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 39–40.

[4] *Ibid.*, IV, 69.

[5] *Ibid.*, iv, 159.

[6] *Ibid.*, IV, 61.

[7] *Ibid.*, iv, 129.

[8] It is in this sense evidently that the description of the dwelling of Sorkhanshira, the noble rescuer of Tamuchin, is to be understood: "His dwelling could be recognized from afar by the noise of whipping of mares' milk, which went on from dusk to dawn" (*Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 43). The prosaic explanation put forward by Palladius (*ibid.*, p. 180), "The preparation of Kumis or wine was perhaps an obligation on the house of Sorkhanshira," is hardly correct.

sort was composed[1]. After the fall of the Mongol domination, a detailed history of the deposed dynasty (Yüan-shi = History of the Yüan dynasty) was put together, in accordance with the Chinese custom. Unfortunately only an abridged edition of this history has so far been translated into a European language[2]. In the works of European sinologues, sayings and quotations from the full text of the Yüan-shi are sometimes cited, which show us that a complete translation of the book would give us much new information. |

45 In Persia the composition of the history of the Mongols was entrusted by Ghāzān-Khān (1295–1304) to the wazīr Rashīd ad-Dīn. A physician by profession and the author of many theological treatises, Faḍlallāh Rashīd ad-Dīn b. 'Imād ad-Dawla Abu'l-Khayr[3] had already entered government service in the reign of Abāghā-Khān (1265–82), and in 697/1298 was appointed wazīr. Ghāzān instructed him to compose a history of the Mongol empire which would be accessible to the people[4]. The official chronicle of the Mongols was preserved in the treasury of the Ilkhān; from Rashīd ad-Dīn's description this chronicle, written in the Mongolian language and Mongolian script, was made up of separate fragments which had never been put into order. The book was considered sacred, and no one had access to it, so that historians could not make use of it, but drew their information "from the mouths of simple people[5]." Our author has probably the same chronicle in view when, in his account of the Tayjiut tribe[6], he quotes the "Golden Book"[7] (Altan-depter), which was "always preserved in the treasury of the Khān in the hands of the oldest amīrs." The unknown author of a genealogical history of the Mongols, written in the fifteenth century, remarks of one of Uguday's officials (bitikchi): "He belonged to the . . .[8] tribe; they guarded the *Golden Book*

[1] Abel-Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, ii, 3.

[2] Iakinth, *Istoriya pervykh chetyrekh khanov iz doma Chingizova*, St. P, 1829, Douglas, *The Life of Jenghis Khan*, London, 1877. On the composition and contents of the Yüan-shi cf. Bretschneider, *Med. Res*, i, 180–91; on other Chinese works P. Pelliot in *J.A.*, ii, xv (1920), 131 sq.

[3] Detailed accounts of the life and works of Rashīd ad-Dīn were inserted by Quatremère in the preface to the part of the "Collection of Chronicles" published and translated by him (*Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, t. i, Paris, 1836). Cf. now E. Blochet, *Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols par Fadl Allah Rachid ad-Din*, Leyden-London, 1910, and my review in *Mir Islama*, i (1912), pp. 56–107.

[4] According to D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, p. xxxv) the author received this order in 702/1302–3; this date is not in Quatremère.

[5] Quatremère, pp. 74–5.

[6] *Sbornik lyetopisei. Istoriya mongolov, sochinenie Rashid-Eddina.* Introduction in Prof. Berezin's translation, St. P., 1859, p. 183; Persian text (St. P., 1861), p. 244.

[7] In the MSS. we find the readings دور التاں دوبر and دور التان دوتو; Quatremère (p. 74) suggests التاں دور دوتر.

[8] Name unknown.

of Chingiz-Khān; no one outside his family and that of the king had seen this book[1]." The Tajik Rashīd ad-Dīn can scarcely have made direct use of the sacred chronicle of the Mongols; he learned the traditions about the Mongols verbally from the mouth of the greatest expert on Mongol history, Pūlād-chinksānk, the representative of the Great Khān at the Persian court, and from the mouth of Ghāzān himself, whose knowledge of history was surpassed by that of Pūlād (or Fūlād) alone[2]. Rashīd ad-Dīn's narrative is often in verbal agreement with the Yüan-shi, the common source, of course, being the Mongol official chronicle. In those cases when the Mongol tradition did not afford sufficient information about some campaign, the 46
author drew on the books of the nations who had been invaded by the Mongols; of these he mentions the Chinese, Indians, Uighūrs, and Qipchāqs. The history of the conquest of the Muslim lands is related exclusively from the work of Juwaynī.

The work was still unfinished when Ghāzān-Khān died. His brother and successor Ūljāytū entrusted Rashīd ad-Dīn with a still more extensive task, namely, the composition of a history of all the nations who had come into relation with the Mongols. The author availed himself of the assistance of scholars of different nations resident at the Persian court; thus the history of India was composed with the help of the Kashmīrī hermit Kamalashri, and the history of China with the assistance of two learned Chinese, Li-ta-chi and Maksun[3] (?), on the basis of a book composed by three Buddhist priests. We do not know what Europeans supplied Rashīd ad-Dīn with material for his history of the Franks. The information set forth in this part of his work is also distinguished by great accuracy; in the account of the relations between the Pope and the Emperor the importance of the former is somewhat exaggerated, from which it may be concluded that Rashīd ad-Dīn's European collaborators belonged, as might have been expected, to the priesthood. The whole work was completed in 710/1310–11[4], and was originally divided into three volumes; the first included the history of the Mongols, the second universal history and the history of the reign of Ūljāytū (according to Rashīd ad-Dīn's plan this part of the book was to be continued by other historians), and the third was a geographical supplement[5]. Later on the author substi-

[1] *Texts*, p. 159 (Kitāb Mu'izz al-Ansāb).

[2] D'Ohsson, iv, 359–60

[3] Thus in Quatremère, p. lxxviii; in *Collections scientifiques*, iii, 106, كسمون; in Blochet, *Introduction*, &c., 98, يكسون.

[4] The history of Ūljāytū was, according to Waṣṣār, carried down to 712 (Quatremère, p. lxxi).

[5] Quatremère, pp. 50–61.

tuted another division for this; it appears that he made a separate third volume of the short summary of universal history, which was originally included in the second volume as the first chapter (faṣl) of the first section (qism) of the second part (bāb), the geographical supplement forming the fourth volume [1]. The whole work received the title of "The Collection of Chronicles" (Jāmi' at-Tawārīkh); the first volume, written on the instructions of Ghāzān, retained, by Ūljāytū's wish, the name of Ta'rīkh-i Ghāzānī. |

47 Thus Rashīd ad-Dīn's work took the form of a vast historical encyclopaedia, such as no single people, either in Asia or in Europe, possessed in the Middle Ages. The very possibility of the creation of such a work with the assistance of learned men of all nations shows what might have been the results, under more favourable circumstances, of the Mongol invasion, which had connected the most far distant civilized peoples with one another. Rashīd ad-Dīn himself believed that posterity would make use of his works. He translated all his Persian works into Arabic [2], and all his Arabic works into Persian, and took steps to ensure that copies of all his works in both languages should be made annually [3]. Nevertheless, the "Collection of Chronicles" was not preserved intact even in the historian's native land. From Rashīd ad-Dīn's own testimony [4] it is evident that even during his lifetime there existed a strong party against him among the Muslim bookmen. In 1318, in the reign of Abū Sa'īd, he was accused of treachery and executed; after this, naturally, all care for the dissemination of copies of his works came to an end. A fourteenth-century historian, Muḥammad b. 'Alī ash-Shabāngāraī, the author of the *Majma' al-Ansāb* [5] (Collection of Genealogies), while recognizing Rashīd ad-Dīn's learning, accuses him of intrigues [6], makes no use whatever of his work, and does not even mention the latter. Another contemporary of our author, Abu'l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī al-Kāshānī, the author of a "History of Ūljāytū [7]," accuses Rashīd ad-Dīn of

[1] Quatremère, pp. lxxii–lxxiv, clix–clx.

[2] In one of the MSS. of the Bodleian Library there is preserved the Arabic translation of part of the "Collection of Chronicles," devoted to the history of China (MS. Arab. b 1). On more important extracts from the Arabic translation of the "Collection of Chronicles" see Morley, *Descriptive Cat. of Historical MSS. . . . in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1854, pp. 5, 8–11.

[3] Quatremère, pp. cxxxiv–cxxxix, clxvii.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. v, cxxvi.

[5] An autograph MS. of this work is preserved in the Asiatic Mus. (d 566); cf. also Rieu, *Catalogue*, i, 83–4.

[6] MS. As. Mus., d 566, ff. 222, 225 b.

[7] A copy of this treatise which belonged to the late Ch. Schefer is now preserved in Paris (cf. Blochet, *Catalogue . . . Schefer*, MSS. persans, i, no. 1419, p. 95 sq.), and there is another in Constantinople, Aya Sofia 3019, cf. my article in *Zapiski*, xviii, 0119; Stökheim, *Das Geschenk aus der Seldschukengeschichte*, Leiden, 1909, p. xi. According

plagiarism, and represents himself (Kāshānī) as the actual author of the "Collection of Chronicles"; Rashīd ad-Dīn, "by the hands of cursed Jews," presented this work for the sultan's inspection in his own name, and received in return for it fifty tomans in money and great possessions giving an annual income of twenty tomans; | of this remuneration, in spite of the promises 48
he had previously made, he did not share a single dirham with the real author[1]. It is difficult to say what grounds there were for this claim; it is very possible that Kāshānī took some part in the collection of materials for Rashīd ad-Dīn. There were other historians in the fourteenth century, such as Waṣṣāf, who even after the execution of Rashīd ad-Dīn continued to refer with unabated respect to his personality and his work; but not even the historian's sons, though one of them occupied the post of wazīr from 1328 to 1336, took any measures for the discovery and dissemination of copies of this work. The looting of the quarter which had belonged to Rashīd ad-Dīn's family in Tabrīz[2] (in 1336) probably also contributed to the disappearance of copies of his works. When at the beginning of the fifteenth century the collection of those parts of the "Collection of Chronicles" which had been preserved was taken in hand by order of the sultan Shāhrūkh, it was already impossible to find a complete copy of this work. At the beginning of the nineteenth century even the copies which were made under Shāhrūkh and his sons were considered lost, and Quatremère, when he undertook an edition of Rashīd ad-Dīn's work in 1836, knew only of that part of the book which related to the history of the Mongols[3].

At the present time a fairly considerable number of manuscripts of the "Collection of Chronicles" are known, and only the history of Ūljāytū[4] and the geographical supplement have not as yet been found. Judging from the catalogues of European libraries, there exists only one manuscript of the fourteenth

to Sussheim, the Schefer MS. is copied from the Constantinople MS. To the same author belongs a work on universal history (down to the fall of Baghdād), the first part of which is preserved in one MS. of the Berlin Library (no 368 in Pertsch's catalogue). The same work is mentioned by Mīrkhwānd (where الكاشانى is to be read for الكاشى) under the title of *The Cream of Chronicles* (زبدة التواريخ).

[1] *Centenaire de l'E.L.O.V. Recueil de memoires, &c.*, Paris, 1895, p. 12. A better text (from the Constantinople MS.) in *Zapiski*, XVIII, 0122 sq.

[2] Quatremère, p. lii.

[3] Cf. Morley, *Descriptive Cat*, p. 3, on the discovery of other parts of the جامع التواريخ for the first time in 1838.

[4] A copy of the جامع التواريخ, containing the history of Ūljāytū, was found in 1923 by Aḥmad Zaki Walidi in the Library of Meshhed (*Bull. de l'Acad.*, 1924, p. 247 sq.).

century, namely, that of the British Museum Add. 16,688[1]. In the manuscript itself we find a much later date (3rd Dhu'l-Ḥijja 930 = 2nd October, 1524), but according to Dr. Rieu this date refers only to a few leaves (2, 3, 291–3) written by a much later hand, the transcriber of which endeavoured to counterfeit the hand of his predecessor. This copy has, as a supplement to the book, a chapter on the accession of Ūljāytū, written not by Rashīd ad-Dīn himself, but by his copyist, who speaks of the wazīr as his contemporary. Nevertheless, the manuscript is by no means distinguished by that accuracy which might have been presumed from its antiquity. It is sufficient to note that
49 according to this | manuscript (fol. 8) Jaghatāy had six sons in all, whereas further on (fol. 17), as in the other manuscripts, there is mention of the seventh son of this Khān

The remaining manuscripts all belong either to the fifteenth century or to still later dates; apparently we are indebted for the preservation, if not of the whole of the "Collection of Chronicles," at least of a considerable part of it, exclusively to the enlightened care of Shāhrūkh and his fellow-workers. The establishment of the text presents great difficulties; even if only the fine and old copies are compared with each other we find a whole series of very material contradictions, especially in the genealogy of the Chingizids. One of the oldest and best copies (written in 810/1407–8) was formerly in the Public Library in Petrograd, but is now unfortunately lost[2].

Even before the appearance of Rashīd ad-Dīn's work, in Sha'bān 699 (spring of 1300), 'Abdallāh b. Faḍlallāh, who subsequently received the surname of Wassāf al-Ḥaḍrat (His Majesty's panegyrist), had begun to write his history of the Mongols. As is well known, Wassāf's work is written in an extremely pompous style, and is regarded as the best example of Persian eloquence[3]. The author gives himself out as the immediate continuator of Juwaynī, of whose work he held a very high opinion, and there-

[1] Rieu, *Catalogue*, pp. 78–9. The MS. in the Royal As. Soc. (Morley, p. 11; Arabic translation of a part of the work) bears the date A. H. 714.

[2] Cf. *Zapiski*, xv, 232, on a very fair copy of the تاريخ غازانى in Tashkent with the proper names (in genealogies) transcribed in Uighūr letters.

The introduction (on Turkish and Mongol tribes) and the history of Chingiz-Khān has been edited and translated by Berezin (*Trudy*, v, vii, xiii, xv); a part of the تاريخ غازانى from Uguday to Timūr (the grandson of Qūbilāy) by Blochet in the Gibb Mem. Series, vol. xviii, 2; the history of Hūlāgū by Quatremère (cf. sup., p. 44, n. 3). On Rashīd ad-Dīn and his works cf. Browne, iii, 68–87, with an interesting list (pp. 80 sq.) of Rashīd ad-Dīn's letters contained in a MS. previously unknown.

[3] The book is generally known as the Ta'rīkh-i Waṣṣāf; the title given by the author was كتاب تجزية الامصار وتزجية الاعصار (Book of the division of provinces and passing of the times).

fore begins his own narrative with the death of Mangū. His account of the events of the reign of Qūbilāy differs in many very material points from that of Rashīd ad-Dīn, and in some cases it is difficult to determine on which side the truth lies. The first four parts of the work were presented to the Sultan Ūljāytū and the Wazīr Rashīd ad-Dīn on Thursday, 24th Muḥarram 712[1] (1st June, 1312). After bringing his narrative down to the year 710, the author subjoins to it an account of the origin of the Mongol empire, of the dynasty of the Khwārazm-shāhs, and of Hūlāgū's expedition (following Juwaynī).

The fifth part was written later[2]; it contains the conclusion | of the history of the Mongols, and a chapter on the Juchids and 50
Jaghataids, in which the author agrees with Rashīd ad-Dīn's narrative, even in those cases when he himself in the first book related the same events differently. After this the author continues the history of the Hulagids down to the suppression of the revolt of the Amīr Qūrmishī (719/1319). The first book was edited and translated into German by Hammer-Purgstall[3], and the whole work was printed at Bombay in 1269/1853[4].

At the end of 717 (in the preface is given the date 15th Shawwāl = 31st December, 1317) Banākatī (Abū Sulaymān Dāwud b. Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad, the court poet of Ghāzān-Khān) wrote a treatise under the title of "Garden of the intelligent with reference to the annals of the aristocracy and genealogies" (Rawḍat uli'l-albāb fī tawārīkh al-akābir wa'l-ansāb). This work is in reality no more than a copy of Rashīd ad-Dīn's "Collection of Chronicles," to which the author adds only a very insignificant supplement dealing with his own times[5].

In the fourteenth century there appeared also the historical and geographical compositions of Ḥamdallāh b. Abū Bakr Mustawfī Qazwīnī[6]. The historical work, which bears the title of

[1] The first part of the book was submitted to Ghāzān-Khān on Sunday, 13th Rajab, 702 (3rd March, 1303); see Quatremère, p. xiii.

[2] According to D'Ohsson (i, p. xxxiii) and Rieu (*Cat.*, p. 161) in 728; in MS. Pub. Lib. v, 3, 24, the years 717 (f. 424) and 718 (f. 425) are indicated as the year when this part was composed, but these dates are incorrect, as in the same passage it is stated that at that time the Jaghataid Ilchigiday was already reigning. The lithographed (Indian) edition has 727 (p. 607) and 718 (p. 608: ثمان وعشر وسبعمائة).

[3] *Geschichte Wassafs*, Wien, 1856. On the author and his work cf. Browne, iii, 67 sq.

[4] There does not seem to be a copy of this edition in the Brit. Mus.; the printed catalogue (p. 45) mentions only another Persian edition (vol. i only), Tabrīz, 1272/1865–6.

[5] Cf. Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 79–80. There is also a MS. of this work in Petrograd Univ. Library (No. 285). The statements made by Browne (iii, 100 sq.) regarding this work are not quite correct. All that Banākatī says about Europe (Roman Emperors and Popes) and China (account of printing) is borrowed from Rashīd ad-Dīn (see Rashīd ad-Dīn's text about printing in China, published by Baron Rosen in *Collections scientifiques*, iii, 107 sq.).

[6] On the author and his work cf. the very full account in Browne, iii, 87–100.

"Selected History" (Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda), was written in 735/1334–5, and brought down to 730/1330[1]. We are given in it a short account of general history, which is not, however, devoid of importance. Where Rashīd ad-Dīn, in relating the history of the Sāmānids and the early Ghaznevids, transcribes word for word the Persian translation of 'Utbī's book, Qazwīnī gives us some data which are not found in 'Utbī, but in favour of which some other sources speak. Thus the history of the conflict of the Sāmānid government with the Sīmjūrids is related by him not as in 'Utbī, but as in Gardīzī and 'Awfī[2]. Qazwīnī's account of the Jaghataids[3] is very short, and apparently not very trustworthy. At the end of the book there are added accounts of many shaykhs, arranged in chronological order; finally at the end of his life the author subjoined to his book a narrative of the later events of the fourteenth century, and brought it down
51 to | 744/1343-4. His son Zayn ad-Dīn continued his father's narrative down to the conquest of Persia by Timūr. The chapter on the Sāmānids was published by Schefer as a supplement to his edition of Narshakhī's work[4], and the chapter on the Saljūqids in the *Journal Asiatique*[5]. An edition of the whole work was printed by Melgunov in 1873, but has not seen the light[6]. It has now been published in facsimile from an ancient (fifteenth century), but not very correct, manuscript by Prof. E. G. Browne in the Gibb Memorial Series (vol. xiv), with an abridged translation and indices.

Qazwīnī's geographical work, entitled "Heart's Delight" (Nuzhat al-Qulūb), was written in 740/1339. The author does not confine himself, like his contemporaries (Abu'l-Fidā and Dimashqī), to a repetition of the statements of the tenth-century geographers, but notes the changes which had taken place since then. In addition to this he gives us detailed information on the administrative division of Persia in the period of Mongol domination, and on the taxes levied from each province. His work is also of importance for linguists as one of the few medieval monuments of the Mongolian language; in the cosmographical part of the book the names of various animals are given in parallel in Persian, Turkish, and Mongolian. The Nuzhat al-Qulūb was printed in its entirety in Bombay in 1311/1894, and has since been published and translated by G. le Strange in the Gibb Memorial Series (vol, xxiii, 1915–1918)[7]. Some chapters

[1] Cf. Rieu, *Catalogue*, pp. 80–82.
[2] *Texts*, pp. 11–12, 91–2.
[3] Ed. Browne, pp. 576 sq.
[4] *Description de Boukhara, &c.*, pp. 99–111.
[5] 4e série, tt. xi, xii (1848).
[6] In Petrograd University Library there is a MS. of the Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda (No. 153) written in Dhu'l-Qa'da 813 (March 1411).
[7] On the versified chronicle of the same author see Ethé, in *Grundriss*, ii, 236 Blochet, *Introduction*, p. 106 sq.; Browne, iii, 95.

were published by Schefer as a supplement to his edition of the Siyāsat-Nāmah [1].

We shall not linger over the other historical and geographical compositions written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Persia and Western Asia, which have little relation to Turkestan, at least to the period which forms the subject of the present investigation [2]. The facts which we have brought forward prove that historical literature attained in Persia at this period a considerable degree of development, and that we possess a sufficient number of sources for the study of the history of the Mongol domination in Persia. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of the history of Central Asia. Political disturbances among the descendants of Jaghatāy did not favour | the development of 52
science and literature; besides, Persian culture did not attain complete supremacy there. The Uighūr alphabet [3] was widely used as well as the Arabic; we find Uighūr writers even at the court of the Timūrids, down to and including the last representatives of that dynasty [4]. The term "bakhshī" (from the Sanskrit *bhikshu*) was applied equally to Uighūr scribes and to Buddhist hermits; in explaining this word the author of the Jaghatāy dictionary says that it was the name given to "those scribes of the kings of Turkestan who knew no Persian whatsoever [5]." Under the Jaghatāy Khāns these scribes were apparently in greater favour at the court than the representatives of Muslim culture, and the chronicling of historical events was completely in their hands. Quite definite indications of the existence of Uighūr writings have, as we shall see farther on, been preserved, whereas we do not know of a single Muslim literary composition written by the desire of any Jaghatāy Khān. There has come down to us only one historical treatise written in Central Asia at this period, the "Supplement to the dictionary 'Ṣurāh'" of Abu'l-Faḍl b. Muhammad, known as Jamāl Qarshī. The author in 681/1282 translated into Persian the Arabic dictionary of al-Jauharī [6], and at the very beginning of the fourteenth century wrote (in Arabic) the "Supplement" to it, in which we find some

[1] *Siasset Namèh*, supplément, pp. 141–235.

[2] Reference should be made also to the work of Abū Sa'ādat 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī al-Yamanī al-Yāfi'ī called *Mirrors of the gardens of Paradise with reference to the knowledge of human vicissitudes*, written in the fourteenth century. In this work the events are arranged in chronological order, the greatest attention being given to biographies of shaykhs and scholars From this book we have taken the account of the famous shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā (*Texts*, pp. 154–5). On the author and his works see Brock., ii, 176 sq.

[3] Abel-Rémusat, *Recherches sur les langues tartares*, Paris, 1820, i, 40; *Notices et Extraits*, v, 586–7.

[4] Cf. *Zapiski*, x, 219.

[5] Cf. Budagov's dictionary, *s. v.* بخشی (*sic* for بخشی).

[6] On the Arabic work and the Persian translation see Brock., i, 128 and 296.

information on several Central Asian dynasties, and especially about the shaykhs and scholars who enjoyed a reputation in Central Asia. His accounts are often of a legendary character, but he sometimes gives us valuable historical and chronological data; in addition to this, his account of the shaykhs who were his own contemporaries gives us some idea of the intellectual life of this period. The work was written in Kāshghar at the desire of the head of the local priesthood, quite independently of the Mongol court. The first known copy of the "Supplement" was discovered in Central Asia towards the end of last century by M. S. Andreev, and was sent through V. P. Nalivkin to the Asiatic Museum in Petrograd[1]. |

53 The author of the abridgement of the history of Ulugh-beg cites the "abridged collection" (Muḥtaṣar) of the "great amīr" Khujandī, but this work was probably not written before the period of Timūr, as it throws Timūr's ancestor, Kharāchār-noyon, into some prominence[2]. The "History of the family of Chingiz" of Muḥammad Tashkandī, mentioned by Ḥājjī Khalīfa[3], was written not earlier than the second half of the fifteenth century, as is shown by the citations from this work which we find in the book of the historian Jannābī, who wrote at the end of the sixteenth century[4].

The Uighūr writings could not take the place of the Persian historical works. The Osmanlis alone of all Turkish peoples have acquired the ability to discriminate between the historical and the legendary; the Uighūrs, apparently, had no historical works in our sense of the word[5]. Naturally the information regarding the history of the Mongols, which was taken by the historians from Mongol and Uighūr sources, has a purely legendary character; such, for example, is the account of the death of Tuluy, who sacrificed himself to the spirits as a ransom for his brother Uguday. This story is found in the Chinese history[6], in Rashīd ad-Dīn[7], and the East-Mongolian bard[8], who is also, as we have seen, sympathetic towards Tuluy and his sons. Similar tendentious stories were also disseminated in the kingdoms of the Juchids and the Jaghataids. The author of the abridgement of the history of Ulugh-beg, speaking of the accusations brought against Jūchī by Jaghatāy and Uguday, adds

[1] *Zapiski*, viii, 353 and xi, 283–7; *Texts*, pp. 128–52. On another (better) MS. bought by me in 1902 see *Zapiski*, xv, 271 sq. On the reading of the word الفرشى, *Zapiski*, xi, 286, and *Texts*, p. 140: وعرفى بالقرشى لذلك.

[2] *Texts*, p. 162.

[3] *Haji-Khalfa*, iii, 109.

[4] MS. As. Mus. 528, p. 441. V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, &c., i, St. P., 1884, pp. 535–8.

[5] See above, p. 42.

[6] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 254.

[7] Ed. Blochet, p. 220 sq. D'Ohsson, ii, 58–9.

[8] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 154.

that these accusations were set down in detail in the annals of the learned men of the Jaghatāy kingdom, but that their absence of foundation is demonstrated by the testimony of all impartial historians. As the abridgement of the history of Ulugh-beg was written in the period of Uzbeg overlordship, the author used also Juchid legends[1].

The doubtful trustworthiness of the Uighūr writers is at once evident from the facility with which falsifications of the history of the Jaghatāy ulus were made to oblige Timūr. Timūr, having commissioned | the Persian historian Niẓām ad-Dīn Shāmī to 54
write the account of his campaigns, at the same time made use of the services of Uighūr writers, who composed a verse chronicle of his campaigns in Turkish[2]. It is probably to the same Uighūrs that the fantastic legend of the pact said to have been concluded between the brothers Qābūl, the ancestor of Chingiz-Khān, and Qāchūlī, the ancestor of Timūr, is indebted for its origin. According to this agreement the descendants of the former were to occupy the throne and the descendants of the latter the post of wazīr. At the same time, so the story goes, there was drawn up a document[3] furnished with a "red seal;" the agreement was renewed between Chingiz-Khān and Kharāchār or Qarāchār (the descendant of Qāchūlī), and subsequently between Duva-Khān and Ilengir (the grandson of Kharāchār), but the document subsequently disappeared during the disturbed reign of 'Alī-Sulṭān. On the strength of this agreement Kharāchār and several of his descendants were sovereign rulers of the Jaghatāy kingdom. No historian of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as d'Ohsson[4] has already pointed out, speaks of any such authority possessed by Kharāchār and his descendants; nevertheless, the legend of these absolute wazīrs, which was evidently designed to buttress the rights of Timūr himself, still continues to lead some European scholars into error. We first find it in some historians of the fifteenth century, who were dependent on Uighūr sources.

Of these historical works, the one which enjoys the greatest reputation is the "Book of Victory" (Zafar-Nāmah) of Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī[5], who wrote in 828/1425. The title, which

[1] *Texts*, pp. 162–4.

[2] On this chronicle and its title تاريخ خانى cf. *Zapiski*, xv, 188.

[3] The most detailed account of this document is found in the abridgement of the history of Ulugh-beg. Cf. Miles, *The Shajrat ul Atrak*, London, 1838, p. 373.

[4] *Histoire des Mongols*, ii, 108–9. D'Ohsson's remark that Kharāchār is not mentioned at all in Rashīd ad-Dīn is incorrect; both in the heroic cycle (*Works Pek. Mss.*, iv, 134) and in Rashīd ad-Dīn (ed. Blochet, p. 178; *Trudy*, xv, 144) Kharāchār is mentioned as one of Jaghatāy's amīrs, but of his importance in the Jaghatāy kingdom there is not a word in these sources.

[5] Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 173–7; Browne, iii, 362–5.

was devised by Timūr himself, had already been given to his own book by Sharaf ad-Dīn's predecessor, Niẓām ad-Dīn Shāmī, who wrote a history of Timūr during the lifetime of the great
55 conqueror in 806/1403–4[1]. Sharaf | ad-Dīn took over his predecessor's plan almost without modification, but he made use of the Uighūr verse chronicle of Timūr's campaigns as well. The introduction (muqaddama) to the book is devoted to a sketch of the history of the Mongol kingdoms. The history of the Jaghatāy kingdom is here related very briefly; the author evidently used Juwaynī and Waṣṣāf, and in part Rashīd ad-Dīn, but for the history of the fourteenth century gives hardly anything more than the names of the Khāns[2].

In Fārs, about 815/1412, an unknown author, living at the court of Timūr's grandson Iskandar, wrote a work (the manuscripts bear no title[3]) dealing with general history, and based chiefly on the works of Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī and Rashīd ad-Dīn. The author made use, however, of the legendary tales on the history of the Jaghatāy Khāns to a greater extent than the other historians. The character of these tales show that they were taken from Mongolian or Uighūr sources, not Muslim; thus of the Khān Tarmashīrīn, who had gained the ill-will of the Mongols by his partiality for Islām and Muslim culture, all that is said is that he "did not observe the Yasāq, and therefore from every corner raised the head of some rebel."

Fārs was also the native country of Khusraw b. 'Ābid Abar-

[1] Rieu, *Cat.*, 170–2: Browne, III, 361 sq. The MS. in the library of Tashkent (No. 14 b; Kal', *Katalog*, pp. 13–14) is a copy of an earlier work of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Yazdī; this work, now edited (by Zimin and Barthold) in *Teksty po istorii Srednei Azii*, I, 1915, was one of the sources of Niẓām ad-Dīn and Sharaf ad-Dīn. The contents are very fully discussed in the introduction, with extracts from Niẓām ad-Dīn's work (on which see *ibid.*, I, pp. xxvi sq.) from the Brit. Mus. MS. The whole of Niẓām ad-Dīn's work was incorporated by Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū in the first edition of his compilation, and is preserved in Constantinople in the library of Damad Ibrahim Pasha, No. 919 (cf. *Zapiski*, XVIII, 0138 sq.).

[2] As is well known, Sharaf ad-Dīn's work was translated into French by Pétis de la Croix (*Histoire de Timur Bec*); the original was published in Calcutta in 1887–8 (*The Zafarnamah by Maulana Sharfuddin Ali of Yazd*, ed. by Maulawi Muhammad Ilahdad) The introduction appears neither in the French translation nor in the Calcutta edition, and I have made use of the Asiat. Mus. MS., No. 568. There are other MSS. in the British Museum, in the Tashkent library, and elsewhere.

[3] Rieu, *Cat.*, p. 1062 sq. There is another copy of this work in the Asiat. Mus. (No. 566 b, c). I have called this work (in several papers) the "Anonym of Iskandar", as the work preserved in the Brit. Mus. Or. 159 (Rieu, p. 180), which is likewise lacking both title and author's name, is called the "Anonym of Shāhrukh" (cf. *Teksty po istorii Srednei Azii*, introd., pp. xxxiii sq.; *Zapiski*, xxiii, 20 sq.). The work described by Ethé (*Cat. of the Bodleian*, pp. 21–2 (Elliot 2) under the (false) title of جامع التواريخ) is not identical with this work (as was stated in the Russian original of this book and also in my paper in *Zapiski*, xvii, 06), but with the تاريخ خبرات, cf. infra. Cf. also my paper, "The historian Musawi as author of the تاريخ خبرات", in *Bull. Acad. des Sciences*, 1915, pp. 1365–70.

qūhī[1], known by the name of Ibn Mu'īn, the author of a still rarer work, "The garden of Chronicles"[2] (Firdaws at-Tawārīkh), written | in 808/1405-6. The author gives only very brief 56
accounts of the history of a few dynasties, stating the length of each sovereign's reign, the year of his death or deposition, as well as the names of the wazīrs, generals, and scholars who were the contemporaries of each. There is a copy (not quite complete) of the chronicle in the Public Library of Petrograd (MS. Dorn 267), which was apparently written by the author himself.

The Turkish tales were used also by the unknown author of a genealogical history of the Mongols, written in 829/1426, under the title of "The Book celebrating the genealogies in the family tree of the Mongol sultans[3]." The author quotes Turkish historians, Mongol historians, and historians of the Khān's house (uruq). For the history and genealogy of Timūr's ancestors the author takes from these sources the same legendary material as did Sharaf ad-Dīn, but he sometimes gives us interesting information which is not found in the other sources. The genealogy of the Timūrids was continued by some other author down to the end of the dynasty[4].

In the reign of Shāhrukh, and not entirely independently of the court, there was written "Faṣīḥ's digest" (Mujmil-i Faṣīḥī), the work of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Faṣīḥ al-Khwāfī[5]. This gives a short chronological synopsis of events from the beginning of the Muhammadan era to the lifetime of the author, who wrote in 845/1441. In spite of its brevity Faṣīḥ's compilation is not without importance, and gives us some new information, especially concerning the shaykhs and writers in Central Asia and Persia

Of Shāhrukh's court historian, Ḥāfiz-i Abrū (Shihāb ad-Dīn 'Abdallāh b. Luṭfallāh al-Khwāfī[6], d. 833/1430), and of his compilations, both historical and geographical, I have spoken elsewhere in detail[7]. Ḥāfiz-i Abrū's historical compilation

[1] On the town of Abarqūh see Yāqūt, i, 85-7.

[2] On this work see Dorn, *Cat. des manuscrits et Xylographes orientaux de la Bibl. Imp. Publ.*, St P., 1852, pp. 265-7. Horn, "Asadi's neupersisches Worterbuch Lughat-i Furs" (*Abh. der Kon. Ges. der Wiss. zu Gott.*, N. F., B. I., No. 8), S. 30, *al-Muzaffariya* (Sbornik statei, &c.), pp. 335 sq

[3] Cf. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, p. xlv; Rieu, *Catalogue*, p. 183; *Texts*, p. 159.

[4] "Bakhshīs who know Turkish and Uighūrs who speak Mongol" (f. 8: بخشیان ترکی دان وایغوران مغول زبان) are quoted also by an unknown author in the Oxford MS. Th. Hyde 31 (Ethé, *Catalogue*, p. 83). The date of this work is not earlier than the fourteenth century, as the author quotes Yāfi'ī (f. 116).

[5] *Bulletin de la classe hist.-phil. de l'Acad. Imp. des Sciences*, vol. ii, pp. 1 sq.; *Collections scientifiques*, iii, 111-13; Berzhe, *Kratkii Katalog Tiflisskoi pub. bibl.*, Tiflis, 1861, p. 1033.

[6] Not Nūr ad-Dīn Luṭfallāh b. 'Abdallāh al-Harawī, as is stated in European catalogues, following an erroneous statement by 'Abd ar-Razzāq Samarqandī.

[7] *al-Muzaffariya*, pp. 1-28, and afterwards *Zapiski*, xviii, 0138-0144; *Bulletin*

57 | ("The Cream of Chronicles") was the chief source used by 'Abd ar-Razzāq Samarqandī, the author of a work entitled "The rising-place of the two lucky constellations and meeting-place of the two seas[1]." This work, written between 872 and 875, deals with the history of the years between 704 and 875. 'Abd ar-Razzāq's account of the history of Timūr differs in many respects from Sharaf ad-Dīn's account, and either he or Ḥāfiz-i Abrū apparently made use of the "anonym of Iskandar." In the East 'Abd ar-Razzāq's work entirely supplanted that of his predecessor; for example, the very popular story in the East of Shāhrukh's embassy to China was taken by all later historians from 'Abd ar-Razzāq, although it is told in greater detail by Ḥāfiz-i Abrū[2]. We find the same story (but very briefly told) in another of Shāhrukh's contemporaries, namely, Muḥammad b. Faḍlallāh Musawī, the author of the "Chronicle of Good Things" (Ta'rīkh-i Khayrāt), which was begun in Rajab 831 (1428), but completed after 850/1446–7, as Shāhrukh's death is mentioned in it[3]. This author also made use of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū's work, as is evident from the description of the manuscript in Rieu's *Catalogue* (Supplement, p. 270).

Shāhrukh's son and successor, Ulugh-beg (d. 1449), wrote a "History of the Four Ulūs" (Ta'rīkh-i arba' ulūs), embracing, as the title shows, the history of the whole Mongol Empire. Ulugh-beg's work has not come down to us, but we find quotations from it in several authors, especially in the "Ḥabīb as-Siyar" of Khwāndamīr. From these quotations it is evident that the author brought his history of the Mongol kingdoms down to his own times, but that he often limited himself to a bare mention of the names of Khāns without adding details of any sort on their reigns[4]. There is, therefore, scarcely any reason specially to deplore the loss of this work. The abridgement of Ulugh-beg's work, which we have already mentioned (p. 52), is preserved in the British Museum[5]; its unknown author calls

de l'Acad. des Sciences, 1914, p. 881 (where MS. No. 171 in the India Office Cat. (Ethé, p. 76) is mentioned); *Encyc. of Islam*, s. v. Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū. Unfortunately nothing of all this has been used by Prof. E. G. Browne in his *Lit. Hist.*, iii, 424 sq., with the result that the statements there made regarding the portions of the works of Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū that have been preserved are quite erroneous. Since 1900, I have seen two copies of the geographical compilation of Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū which are not listed in catalogues, and which contain, like Cod. Mus. Brit. Or. 1577, the part of the work finishing with the history of Khurāsān; one belongs to W. Vyatkin in Samarqand, the other is in the School of Oriental Studies, London.

[1] *Notices et Extraits*, xiv, pt. 1; Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 181–3.

[2] *al-Muẓaffariya*, p. 27.

[3] Rieu, *Catalogue*, Supplement, pp. 270–1.

[4] حبيب السير, Teheran ed., iii, 25–6.

[5] Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 163–4; Ethé, *Cat.*, pp. 77 sq., where it is erroneously stated, as in Rieu's *Catalogue*, that the title شجرة الاتراك has been given to the work "without any justification in the text itself." There is now a third copy in the British Museum,

his work by another name as well, that of "The Genealogical Tree of the Turks" (Shajarat al-Atrāk)[1]. The old English translation of this | book, made by Colonel Miles, cannot by any 58 means be considered satisfactory.

At the very end of the fifteenth century, in 897/1492, Mu'īn ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Isfizārī wrote a history of Herāt under the title of "The book of the gardens of Paradise with reference to the merits of the town of Herāt[2]." From this book, which has not yet been published, we have taken the characteristic story of the artisans of Herāt who were carried prisoners to Mongolia[3].

In the last years of the rule of the Timūrids was written that historical compilation which was for long almost the only source for European investigators of the history of Persia and Central Asia, the work, namely, of Mīrkhwānd[4] (Muḥammad b. Amīr-khwānd-shāh, d. 903/1498), called "The Garden of Purity with reference to the lives of the Prophets, Kings, and Caliphs" (Rawḍat aṣ-Ṣafā fī sīrat al-anbiyā w'al-mulūk w'al-khulafā). As is well known, Mīrkhwānd's work was divided into seven books, of which the last included the history of his contemporary the Sultan Ḥusayn, and was finished by the historian's grandson Khwāndamīr. Khwāndamīr was responsible also for the final re-working of the geographical supplement, which was not incorporated in the Eastern printed editions, and manuscripts of which are more rarely met with than manuscripts of the remainder of the work.

In the first book the author enumerates the historical works known to him, both Arabic and Persian, adhering neither to chronological nor to any other kind of order; it is difficult to say whether he had in his hands all the books that he mentions. In this section he mentions a very large number of works, from

Or. 8106, ff. 340–513, from which Miles's translation was made; Add. 26,190 seems to have been copied from Or. 8106. The title شجرة الاتراك is in Or. 8106 on f. 348 b. There is still another copy in the library of the India Office. On Ulugh-beg's work see my *Ulugh Bek i evo vremya* (1918), p. 113, where it is stated that the work was not written by Ulugh-beg, but was presented to Shāhrukh in Ulugh-beg's name by a "learned man."

[1] Fol. 13 a: ودرین مسوّده که موسوم بشجرة الاتراك است.

[2] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, I, pp. xliv–xlv. Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 206–7. Browne, iii, 430 sq., where the "detailed account" by Barbier de Meynard in *J.A.*, 5. xvi, 461–520 is quoted. Isfizārī mentions amongst his authorities a "record concerning certain of the Kurt kings" by Sayfī Harawī. There is a copy of the latter work in Calcutta, where it was copied by Sir E. Denison Ross.

[3] *Texts*, p. 165.

[4] Rieu, *Cat.*, pp. 87–96. Elliott, *History of India*, iv, 131–3, where the European editions and translations of the several parts of Mīrkhwānd's work are enumerated. Cf. also Browne, iii, 431 sq. A list of European and Oriental editions and translations is now given in the *Catalogue of Persian printed books in the British Museum*, by E. Edwards, London, 1922, col. 416 sq.

Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, the biographer of the Prophet, to the historians of the Timūrid period. In his later narrative the author very rarely cites his sources, but we find quotations from
59 books which have not come down to us. | The books which are of the greatest importance for us are the fourth (on the history of the Persian dynasties) and the fifth (on the history of the Mongols). In relating the history of the Khwārazm-shāhs, Qarā-Khiṭāys and Mongols[1], the author of course used the works of Juwaynī, Rashīd ad-Dīn, Waṣṣāf, and Sharaf ad-Dīn. This part of his work does not in general inspire confidence in his compilation, as Mīrkhwānd makes no effort to examine the contradictions which we find in Juwaynī's account of the Khwārazm-shāhs and Qarā-Khiṭāys, but selects one version and deliberately omits everything which contradicts it. His blind reliance on this part of Mīrkhwānd's work constitutes perhaps the chief defect of Oppert's researches on Prester John[2]. In his account of the descendants of Chingiz-Khān Mīrkhwānd for the most part repeats Rashīd ad-Dīn, but occasionally he gives new material as well; thus the story of Uguday's grandson Qāydū, the founder of the independent Mongol kingdom in Central Asia, is related by him in greater detail than in the other sources, though, for the rest, the corresponding portion of Rashīd ad-Dīn's work has suffered such especial mutilations and omissions in the manuscripts that the establishment of the original text is almost impossible.

We shall not linger over the later Persian compilations, and shall say a few words only about a history of the Shaykhs of Bukhārā, from which extracts have been quoted in the texts annexed to our survey[3]. This work, which bears the title of "Kitāb-i Mullāzāda" (Book of the Mullah's son), was written by a certain Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, who was given the surname of "Benefactor of the poor" (Mu'īn al-fuqarā), and judging by the number of manuscripts enjoys great popularity in Central Asia. The author enumerates the tombs of the Muslim saints buried in Bukhārā, and gives some biographical information about them. The date of the author's life is not known; from the chronological data quoted in his book it is evident that he did not live before the fifteenth century, and the accuracy of these data proves that
60 he | made use of his sources with the utmost conscientiousness.

[1] The history of the Khwārazm-shāhs and the history of Chingiz-Khān have also been published in Europe (*Histoire des sultans de Khorezm*, publ. par Defrémery, Paris, 1842; *Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, publ. par Jaubert, Paris, 1841).

[2] *Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und Geschichte*, 2-te Auflage, Berlin, 1870.

[3] *Texts*, pp. 166–72. On this work cf. also *Encyc. of Islam*, 1, s. v. Burhān.

III. EUROPEAN WORKS OF REFERENCE

The first attempt at a general sketch of the history of the Turkish and Mongol tribes was made, as is well known, by Deguignes[1]. His work is of greater importance for the history of the eastern than of the western part of Central Asia, as he made use of Chinese sources to a considerable extent, but had to content himself with a few works of compilation on the side of Muslim literature.

The original Muslim sources for the history of the Mongols were first examined in detail by Baron d'Ohsson, the first edition of whose *Histoire des Mongols* appeared in 1824, the second, considerably extended, in 1834–5[2]. The author applied himself to his task with noteworthy conscientiousness, and almost exhausted the sources accessible to him, especially for the history of the Mongols in China and in Persia. His somewhat one-sided view of the "repulsive pictures" of Mongol history may at the outset be admitted as a defect in the work. D'Ohsson allows some significance to Mongol history only in so far as a knowledge of it is indispensable for the realization of the "great events of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries;" consequently, while relating in sufficient detail the history of the civilized kingdoms which came under Mongol rule, he devotes no more than a few words to the history of Mongol | supremacy in Central Asia and 61
in Russia. Besides this he made use of nearly all unpublished works in single manuscripts only, and those not always the best ones; at the present day, when we have a number of these texts in critical editions, we are able to correct some of the mistakes he made. In spite of all this d'Ohsson's work still retains its importance; on account of the author's erudition and the cautiousness of his deductions it stands incomparably higher than the later works of Hammer-Purgstall[3], Wolff[4], Erdmann[5], and even the voluminous history of the Mongols by Sir Henry Howorth[6]. Not knowing Eastern languages, Howorth was entirely dependent on his predecessors; on his own showing he entered upon his task "as an ethnologist and historian, not as

[1] J. Deguignes, *Histoire générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols et des autres Tartares occidentaux*, 4 tomes en 5 vols.. Paris, 1756–8.

[2] *Histoire des Mongols d'après Tchinguiz-Khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan*, par M. le baron C. d'Ohsson, 4 tt., La Haye et Amsterdam, 1834–5. The third edition (Amsterdam, 1852) is only a reprint of the second.

[3] *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde*, Pesth, 1840; *Geschichte der Ilchane d. i. der Mongolen in Persien*, Darmstadt, 1842–3.

[4] *Geschichte der Mongolen oder Tataren, besonders ihres Vordringens nach Europa, so wie ihrer Eroberungen und Einfälle in diesem Welttheile*, kritisch bearbeitet von O. Wolff, Breslau, 1872.

[5] *Temudschin der Unerschutterliche*, Leipzig, 1862.

[6] *History of the Mongols*, London, 1876–88.

a linguist." We cannot, however, point to a single passage where the author has shown a closer acquaintance with the methods and laws of history and ethnology than did d'Ohsson. His theories on the origins of different nations are founded exclusively on personal names and titles, although, as is well known, it is in both these cases that the influence of civilized peoples, perhaps even of foreign origin, is most readily shown. Having accepted as Turks nearly all the peoples who had settled in Mongolia prior to Chingiz-Khān, the author apparently does not ask himself how it was that the insignificant Mongol nation, after subduing some strong Turkish tribes, was able not only to preserve its language, but also to Mongolize the vanquished. As an ethnologist the author should have known something of nomadic life and its political organization, in which there can be no question of a regular order of succession to the throne or of elections according to legal forms, yet he seriously examines the question [1] which of the Chingizids in one case or another had the best right to the throne, and whether the election of this or that Khān was legally valid [2]. |

62 Some attention should be given to the copious notes appended by Major Raverty to his translation of Jūzjānī's work (see above, p. 38). In these notes excerpts are quoted from a large number of other sources, partly unpublished and very little known, and attempts are here and there made to summarize the data about some nation or other, or some dynasty. The author himself in the preface (p. xv) calls his work "a very thesaurus of the most varied and often recondite historical material;" "many time-honoured historical errors have been pointed out and rectified." Reviewers, "for fear nobody else should see it," will probably point out the absence of an index; but for this task the author's time is "too valuable," and he hopes that the Index Society will undertake it. The author's desire was carried out, and we now have an index to his book, so that the latter, if the author's own pronouncement on it is to be believed, is now freed from all defects. The author's opinion of the value of his work and the very harsh, and sometimes sarcastic, tone which he adopts towards his predecessors deprive his book of all right to the indulgence of critics, of which, nevertheless, he stands in great need. His own blunders, partly noted by us in the course of our narrative (see also above, p. 39, n. 3), leave far behind the

[1] *History of the Mongols*, i, 171, 180, 218.

[2] As little scientific importance is possessed by the same author's articles on the different Central Asian nations, published in *J.R.A.S.*, 1875–98, under the general title of "The Northern Frontagers of China." The last of these articles (*J. R.A.S.*, July, 1898) is devoted to the Qarā-Khānids; the level of its scientific importance is sufficiently indicated by the author's statement (on p. 468) that "the earliest authors who speak of Boghrā-Khān's invasion of Transoxania wrote more than two centuries after his death."

"errors" which he has indicated. He conveys historical information without any, even the most elementary, historical criticism; he draws no distinction whatever between history and legend, between original sources and later compilations. Bitterly attacking his predecessors for faulty transcriptions of proper names, Raverty himself mutilates even the best known names, and writes Khurz for Khazar, 'Umro for 'Amr. The author's time appears to have been too valuable not only for the compilation of an index, but even for a cursory review of his own book; only thus can the fact be explained that on p. 33 he maintains that Abu'l-Faḍl Bal'amī, the translator of Ṭabarī, received the post of wazīr under Isma'īl, and continued to hold it until the reign | of Nūh b. Manṣūr (i.e. for a period of more 63
than seventy years), and on p. 38 that Abu'l-Faḍl Bal'amī (here the author correctly distinguishes this person from the translator of Ṭabarī) was put to death (*sic*) in A.H. 330. Among the surface defects of the book there are some to which it is very much more difficult to reconcile oneself than the absence of an index. The author nowhere cites any definite manuscript, nor for the most part does he say what manuscripts he used nor when or by whom this or that work was written, so that there is no possibility of verifying his statements. On account of the vast material of facts of which the author disposed (amongst other things he is the first, so far as we know, who quotes Gardīzī) he undoubtedly might have dispelled established errors and substitued for them new and more durable theories; but for the attainment of this result some conscientiousness and some acquaintance with elementary scientific processes are required. In neither respect does Raverty's work satisfy even those requirements which we are accustomed to expect from the work of novices. The sole importance therefore which it retains lies in its rich, though very confusedly arranged, collection of facts[1].

A fresh attempt to give a general survey of the history of the Turkish and Mongol peoples is presented by M. Cahun's work[2], with which we have dealt in detail elsewhere[3], where we endeavoured to show that this work, brilliant from the literary point of view, possesses no serious scientific importance.

A short sketch of the history of Turkestan was published in 1899 by E. D. Ross (now Sir E. D. Ross) in part I of *The*

[1] After d'Ohsson's and Raverty's works, the largest number of quotations from unpublished Muslim sources is to be found in Quatremère's notes to the portion of Rashīd ad-Dīn's work which he published (see above, p. 44).

[2] *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie, Turcs et Mongols des Origines à 1405*, Paris, 1896.

[3] *Zhurn. Min. Nar. Prosv.*, June, 1896. Cf. also M. Th. Houtsma's criticism in *Gott. Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1896, No. 9); the judgement of the Dutch critic entirely coincides in substance with my own.

Heart of Asia[1]. Its chief merit is the comparatively detailed account of the first centuries of Islām based on Ṭabarī in both the Arabic and Persian versions (pp. 34–108); of the later sources little use has been made, and the only manuscript source quoted is the "Ẓafar-Nāmah" of Nizām ad-Dīn Shāmī. Of course the author himself would hardly say that from his book we learn "everything important" about the history of Central Asia[2].

No scientific value whatever can be claimed by the two volumes of Jeremiah Curtin, published in 1908 (after the author's death), *The Mongols: A History* and *The Mongols in Russia*, the former with a foreword by Th. Roosevelt. In spite of the claim made in this foreword for the author that "In this particular field no other American or European scholar has even approached him," he is much behind Sir Henry Howorth in knowledge and accuracy. He never mentions his sources, not to speak of any critical remarks on their relative importance. We are only told, in a note preceding *The Mongols in Russia*, that "In gathering material for *The Mongols* and *The Mongols in Russia* Mr. Curtin used the early chronicles of China, Persia, and Russia. To obtain these chronicles he went several times to Russia and once to the Orient." The books themselves bear no witness to any acquaintance with original sources. The second volume is far rather a very uncritical history of Russia than a history of the Golden Horde.

Up to the present no monographs dealing with the history of the Muslim part of Central Asia in the pre-Mongol period have been published which satisfy contemporary scientific requirements, nor any investigations of the several sources (with the exception of the prefaces of some scholars to the texts edited by them, which have been mentioned in their proper place).
64 This cannot but reflect as well on general works on | the history of Islām, even on the latest of them, that of the late Prof. A. Müller[3]. The author scrupulously made use of the Arabic sources (for the most part already published), but he was less well acquainted with the Persian sources; the characteristics of the chief actors in the history of Central Asia (e. g. Maḥmūd of Ghazna) are partly incomplete and one-sided in his work. In dealing with the history of the Mongols the weakness of deductions made without a study of the Persian original sources was so far recognized by the author himself that he disclaims full responsibility for this part of his book[4].

[1] See my review in *Zapiski*, xii, 0130 sq.

[2] W. Rickmer Rickmers, *The Duab of Turkestan*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 543.

[3] *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande*, 2 Bde, Berlin, 1887 (in Oncken's collection). The Russian translation of this book, published under the editorship of N. A. Myednikov (St. P., 1895), is, unfortunately, absolutely unreliable; cf. my remarks in *Musulmanskii Mir*, 1922, p. 82 sq.

[4] *Der Islam*, ii, 211.

In the Russian language the history of the Mongols [1], except for the history of the Golden Horde [2], and that of the Central Asian dynasties in the pre-Mongol period, has not yet been subjected to a detailed scientific investigation. Of special monographs one alone, the work, namely, of Prof. V. A. Zhukovsky on Merv [3], satisfies contemporary scientific requirements. It is much to be desired that on the model of this work investigations should be carried out on the history and antiquities of the other large cities of Central Asia, especially of Bukhārā, Samarqand [4], and Balkh.

[1] M. I. Ivanin's book, *O voennom iskusstvye i zavoevaniyakh mongolo-tatar i sredneaziatskikh narodov pri Chingiz-khanye i Tamerlanye*, St. P., 1875, may have some value only for military history.

[2] Special mention should be made of Prof. Berezin's *Ocherk vnutrennyavo ustroistva ulusa Dzhuchieva*, St. P., 1863 (*Trudy*, part VIII), and of Baron V. G. Tiesenhausen's *Sbornik materialov otnosyaschikhsya k istorii Zolotoi Ordy*, vol. I, St. P., 1884; the continuation of the latter work has not yet appeared.

[3] *Drevnosti Zakaspiiskavo kraya. I. Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, St. P., 1894 (*Materialy po Arkheologii Rossii*, publ. by the Imp. Archaeological Commission, No. 16). See on this work *Zapiski*, IX, pp. 300–303, XI, pp. 327–33. Cf. now also my article on the history of Merv, *ibid.*, XIX, 115–38.

[4] A very fair treatise on the historical geography of the district of Samarqand has been published by V. Vyatkin in Samarqand; cf my review in *Zapiski*, XV, 0150–0156. For G. le Strange's well-known book on *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, and the part of it devoted to Transoxania cf. the remarks in my review, *Zapiski*, XVII, 0102–0107, and *Encyc. of Islam*, s. v. Bukhārā.

Many interesting facts and opinions, but in a very confused arrangement, may be found in the works of J. Marquart, principally his *Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften* (Leipzig, 1898) with the paper "Historische Glossen zu den alttürkischen Inschriften" (*W.Z.K.M.*, XII, 157–200); *Erānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i* (Berlin, 1901); *Osteuropaische und ostasiatische Streifzuge* (Lpz., 1903); *Ostturkische Dialekt-studien* (this title was given by mistake; Berlin, 1914). On the last named cf. the review by P. Pelliot in *J.A.*, II, XV, 125–85, and my review in *Russkii Istoricheskii Zhurnal*, VII (1922), 138–56. One of Marquart's sources, written by a Parsi in the early period of Islām, is the "List of Cities" (Stadtbeliste), i. e. *Liste géographique des villes de l'Iran*, par E. Blochet, *Receuil des travaux relatifs à la philologie et l'archéologie égypt. et assyr.*, t. XVII, 1895, pp. 165–76. Cf. *Grundriss der Iran. Phil*, II, 118 (§ 98).

For the geographers of Islām (there is no article on this subject in the *Encyc of Islam*) cf. Baron Carra de Vaux, *Les Penseurs de l'Islam*, tome II (*Les géographes, &c.*), Paris, 1921. On the historical geography of Transoxania see also several of my articles in the *Ency of Islam* (principally Amū-Daryā, Bukhārā, and Farghāna), and my books *Svyedyeniya ob Aral'skom morye i nizov'yakh Amu-Dar'yi s drevnyeishikh vremen do XVII-vo vyeka*, Tashkent, 1902 (German translation, 1910 *Nachrichten uber den Aral-See und den unteren Lauf des Amu-Darja*), and *K istorii Orosheniya Turkestana*, Petrograd, 1914.

CHAPTER I

65 GEOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF TRANSOXANIA

MĀWARĀ'AN-NAHR (the civilized region in the basin of the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya) was not, according to the terminology of the medieval Muslim geographers, included in Turkistān (the land of the Turks, i. e. the regions extending between the Muslim possessions and China, and inhabited by Turkish and Mongol nomads); but politically this country, unprotected by any natural barrier against the inroads of the nomads, was for the most part subject to Turkish peoples. The political boundary between Īrān and Tūrān has changed more than once; sometimes, as in the Achaemenid period and at the time of the Arab supremacy, the whole of Transoxania was united politically with Anterior Asia; but from the tenth century onwards the province has always remained under the rule of Central Asian peoples, and in treaties of peace between the Īrānian and Tūrānian rulers the Amu-Darya was generally accepted as the boundary of their respective "spheres of influence." Ethnographically also the country, originally populated by Aryans, has become Turcicized, and at the present day not only the nomadic inhabitants of the country, but also the majority of the settled population speak Turkish. On account of its fertility and its populousness Transoxania generally held the first place amongst the provinces subject to the Turks; it is, moreover, the only province concerning which we possess detailed historical and historico-geographical information. All these considerations induce us to devote the following geographical sketch exclusively to Transoxania, the more so that the data for the historical geography of the other provinces of Western Turkestan, i. e. Semiryechye and the eastern part of the Syr-Darya province, have already
66 been reviewed | by us in several articles [1].

In view of the importance of the Amu-Darya as the customary official boundary between Īrān and Tūrān we shall begin our

[1] O Khristianstvye v Turkestanye v do-Mongol'skii period (*Zapiski Vost. Otd.*, viii, 1–32), and German translation (Tübingen, 1901), *Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung*; *Otchet o poyezdkye v Srednyuyu Aziyu*, St. P., 1897 (*Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk po Ist.-phil. otd.*, i, No. 4); *Ocherk istorii Semiryech'ya* (*Pamyatnaya knizhka Semiryechenskavo Oblastnovo Statisticheskavo Komiteta na 1898*, ii, pp. 74–170).

survey with the shores of this river. As the boundary was frequently violated from one or other side, it will be necessary to mention also those provinces to the south of the Amu-Darya with which some portions of Transoxania were at times more closely connected than with Samarqand and Bukhārā[1].

The ancient Aryan name of the Amu-Darya, Vakhshu[2] or Wakshu, was preserved in the name of the river Wakhsh[3] (Surkhab), from which it may be concluded that in ancient times this river was considered to be the head-water of the Amu-Darya. The Muslim geographers regarded as such the Jaryāb, now the Panj, which was called Wakhāb[4] in its upper course, and flowed through the provinces of Wakhān, Shughnān, and Karrān (probably Roshan and Darwaz)[5]. In the tenth century these provinces were still inhabited by heathens[6], although it is evident that politically they were subject to the Muslims. According to Ibn-Khurdādhbih[7], Wakhān paid a tribute of 20,000 dirhams (in another manuscript 10,000), | Shughnān 40,000 67
(in another manuscript 4,000), Kaiiān 4,000. In Ya'qūbī[8] there is a mention of "Ḥumār-bek, king of Shughnān and Badakhshān." Marco Polo[9] calls the inhabitants of Wakhān in his time Muslims. Gold[10] and silver[11] mines are spoken of in Wakhān; the trade route to Tibet, i. e. to the upper system of

[1] A splendid but of course too brief survey of Transoxania was given by Leich in Berezin's *Russian Encyc Dictionary* (Part III, vol I, pp. 577-83). Besides this the historical geography of the basins of the Zarafshān and Upper Amu-Darya have been reviewed by Tomaschek (*Centralasiatische Studien*, I, Soghdiana, Wien, 1877, *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist Classe der Kais. Acad der Wissenschaften*, Bd. lxxxvii). In I. Minaev's book *Svyedyeniya o stranakh po verkhov'yam Amu-dar'i* (St. P., 1879) we find hardly any historico-geographical information for the period from the Muslim conquest to the Mongol invasion Very valuable assistance for the study of the historical geography of Khorezmia is afforded by M. J. de Goeje's monograph "Das alte bett des Oxus" (Leyden, 1875). Cf. also the last four chapters of G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1905, and my review in *Zapiski*, XVII, 0102 sq. The detailed descriptions of Transoxania all belong to the Sāmānid period; of the geographical conditions up to and beyond this period we have only fragmentary information.

[2] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, S. 37; W. Geiger, *Die Pamir-Gebiete*, Wien, 1887 (*Geographische Abhandlungen*, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. A. Penck in Wien, B. ii, Heft i), S. 136.

[3] According to Bīrūnī (*Chronologie*, p. 237: trans., p. 225) in the eleventh century Wakhsh was still called the spirit-protector of the waters, and especially of the Amu-Darya. Even now according to Regel (*Pet. Mitt.*, xxx, 333, quoted by Geiger, l. c.), the term Wakhsh is applied not only to the Surkhāb, but also to the Panj and some other tributaries of the Amu-Darya. Cf. also Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, ii, 26, n. 2.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 91.

[5] Cf. the spelling Kurān in Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 222, where it is placed in the southern part of Badakhshān.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 296-7.

[7] *Ibid.*, vi, 26 According to Maqdisī (*ibid.*, iii, 340) Wakhān paid 40,000 dirhams,

[8] *Ibid.*, vii, 292; cf. Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, 225.

[9] Minaev, *Svyedyeniya, &c.*, p. 75; Yule's *Marco Polo*, 3rd ed., i, 171.

[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 93.

[11] *Ibid.*, i, 297.

the Indus populated by Tibetans, whence musk was imported, ran through Wakhān and Shughnān, and Marco Polo passed through this same region to Kāshghar. But, on the whole, owing to their inaccessibility and their complete unsuitability for nomadic life these provinces were but little touched by foreign incursions, and have preserved a purely Aryan population to the present time.

The next province on the trade route from Tibet was Badakhshān, probably unsurpassed among all the provinces on the Upper Amu-Darya. It was celebrated for its magnificent pastures, its broad and highly-cultivated valleys, its ruby and lapis lazuli mines, and finally for its excellent climate[1]. The province was accessible to foreign conquest only from the S.W. side, i. e. from the side of the Amu-Darya valley, and here only do we find Turkish elements alongside the Aryan population. On the whole, Badakhshān was but rarely exposed to invasion, and usually enjoyed political autonomy[2]. The capital of the province has apparently always been in the locality of the present Fayzābād; Jarm, which lies more to the south, and has preserved its name to the present day, was in the ninth century the extreme limit of Muslim dominion along the road to Tibet[3].

Between Balkh and Badakhshān lay the district of Ṭukhāristān, which received its name, as is well known, from the Tokhari, who are mentioned among the races who overthrew the Graeco-Bactrian Empire[4]. In the period of Arab domination and in
68 the time of the Sāmānids | the province extended from the bank of the Amu-Darya to the passes of the Hindu Kush. In this region the banks of the Amu-Darya are for the most part sandy and utterly unsuited to artificial irrigation; the largest settlements are always situated at a considerable distance from the river, near the points where streams and rivulets debouch from the mountains in the direction of the Amu-Darya, which, however, with a few exceptions they fail to reach. The chief road

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 278; ii, 327; iii, 303. Mınaev, *Svyedyeniya, &c.*, pp. 73–4.

[2] Muḥammad-Ḥaydar (*The Ta'rīkh-i-Rashīdī*, ed. by N. Elias and E. D. Ross, London, 1895, p. 107) avers, with some exaggeration, that the country had remained free from invasion since the days of Alexander of Macedon. Cf my article "Badakhshān" in *Encyc. of Islām*, where it is stated that the tradition of the descent of the ruling family from Alexander is not mentioned before the thirteenth century, and is found for the first time in Marco Polo, cf. Yule, *Marco Polo*, 3rd ed., i, 157.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 288. Sam'ānī (*s. v.* البدخشي) and Yāqūt (i, 528) mention a rabāṭ built in Badakhshān by Zubayda, the wife of Hārūn ar-Rashīd.

[4] Vivien de St. Martin, *Les Huns Blancs ou Ephthalites*, Paris, 1849, pp. 25–6. Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, p. 33; cf. Grum-Grjimailo, *Istoricheskoe proshloe Bei-shanya*, St. P., 1898, pp. 5–6, where the author tries to prove that the Tokhari used in ancient times to inhabit Afghanistan, and in the first and second century B.C. were "not the conquerors but the conquered race." Ta-hia is also identified with Tukhāra by Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p 204.

from Balkh to Badakhshān[1] passed through the following places: Khulm (two days' journey from Balkh), Warwālīz or Walwālīz (two days from Khulm), and Ṭāyqān or Ṭālqān (two days from Warwālīz and seven from the capital of Badakhshān). The town of Qunduz, which was the capital of an important kingdom in the first half of the nineteenth century, has only latterly come to the fore, although it is mentioned as early as the thirteenth century. The largest town in Ṭukhāristān was considered to be Ṭālqān, which has kept its name (Tālkhān) to the present day. It was a third of the size of Balkh[2]. The greatest importance from a commercial and military point of view attached to Khulm, which was situated on the river of the same name not far from its exit from a narrow valley. The present Khulm or Tash-Kurgan, which rose only in the nineteenth century, lies somewhat south of the ruins of the old town. The most frequented road to the Hindu Kush always ran through the Khulm valley[3]. Two days' journey from Khulm lay Siminjān, probably corresponding to the modern Haybak; the river valley narrows considerably here, and to this day a fortress stands there dominating the neighbourhood. Two days' journey from Siminjān lay Baghlān, a village, still existing under the same name, not far from the junction of the Baghlān river with the Qunduz river. This part of the road therefore connected the valleys of Khulm and Qunduz. At the beginning of the eighth century the districts of Khulm, Siminjān, and Baghlān were the scene of some military operations between the Arabs and the natives, of which Ṭabarī gives a fairly detailed account[4].

Andarāb or Andarāba (so on coins), situated at the base of the main ridge of the Hindu Kush, was reached in five days from Siminjān, probably via Baghlān. | In the tenth century it ranked 69
as the third town in Ṭukhāristān (after Ṭālqān and Warwālīz); numismatic data prove, as is well known, that a special dynasty reigned at Andarāb and Balkh at that period as vassal princes dependent upon the Sāmānids. From Andarāb roads led through the Hindu Kush (the most convenient pass is the Khāwak, 13,000 ft. high) to the valley of the river Banjhīr, now Panjshīr. A thousand years ago the valley was already celebrated for its silver mines, which are still in existence, and they were considered the richest in the eastern portion of the Muslim world[5]. On the river the towns of Gāryāba, Banjhīr[6], and Farwān or Parwān are mentioned, the last of which preserves its name to this day.

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 286. [2] *Ibid.*, i, 279.

[3] *Ibid.*, i, 279, 286; iii, 346. A. Burnes, *Travels in Bokhara*, new edition, London, 1839, ii, 147–200. Kostenko, *Turkestankii krai*, St. P., 1880, ii, 175–90.

[4] *Tabarī*, ii, 1219.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 288. Cf. the graphic account in Yāqūt's *Mu'jam*, i, 743.

[6] *Ibid.*, i, 280 جاريابه; iii, 346 كاريابه; vii, 288 بنجهار; in other passages بنجهير.

From Parwān one road descends to the Kābul valley through Charikar and Istalif; the other ascends along the river Ghūrband to the village of the same name, and to Bāmyān. Ghūrband was invaded by the Arabs at the end of the eighth century [1]. Bāmyān is separated from Kābul by very much higher mountains and passes than it is from Khulm and Balkh: nevertheless the passes on the road to Khulm have more often formed the political frontier, and even in the nineteenth century the frontier between the Uzbeg and Afghan dominions, until the submission of the former to the Afghan Amīr, was the Āq-rabāṭ pass, to the north of Bāmyān. In the tenth century Bāmyān was reckoned as the chief town of the province of which both Kābul and Ghazna formed part and which was under the rule of a native prince [2]. At the present time the usual way from Balkh to Bāmyān is through Khulm; the Arabic geographers had evidently another road in view, namely, that ascending the river of Balkh, and thence west to the junction with the road from Khulm. On this road the only town mentioned is Madar, six days' journey from Balkh, and four from Bāmyān. A village of that name still exists to-day on the road from Khulm, seventy miles from Bāmyān; somewhat to the north of the present village, on the left of the road (if it is approached from the north) the ruins of the ancient town of Madar are visible. |

70 The term "Ṭukhāristān" was also used in a much broader sense to embrace all the provinces on both shores of the Amu-Darya which were economically dependent on Balkh [3]. Between the Panj and the Wakhsh Iṣṭakhrī [4] names four rivers, which united their waters above the ford at Ārḥan; the nearest to the Jaryāb was the river Akhshū (? Āqsū), which flowed past Hulbuk, then the Barbān [5], Parghār [6], and Andījārāgh [7]. It appears that by the name Akhshū and Barbān (or Barsān, see below) is meant the Kulab-Darya [8], by the name Parghār the Kchi-Surkhab, and

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, vii, 288–90. [2] *Ibid.*, i, 280.

[3] *Ibid.*, vii, 93, 289–92. *Tabarī*, ii, 1180. Ṭukhāristān in the proper sense was called First or Lower; the mountain provinces on the upper course of the Amu-Darya were included in Upper Ṭukhāristān.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 296.

[5] The reading Balbān (بلبان, cf. *B. G. A.*, ii, 348) is found as well as Barbān (بربان). It is possible that the correct readings are تلبار and ترمار, and that this name has been preserved in the name of one of the headwaters of the Kulab-darya (on modern maps Talvar and Talbar). For Akhshū Marquart (*Ērānshahr*, p. 233) reads Bākhshū, but the text has ويسمى باخْشوا, Yāqūt (ii, 171, 16) باخْش.

[6] In Iṣṭakhrī فارغر; in the Tumansky MS. پارغر and بارغر; in Ibn-Rusta (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 93) بارغر.

[7] In Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 290, 1) اندیشاراع.

[8] The Kulab-Darya still bears also the name of Āq-ṣū (Geiger, *Die Pamir-Gebiete*, S. 155).

by the Andījārāgh the Ta'ir-su. In the Tumansky MS. (fol. 9 a) it is said that the river which flowed past Munk and Hulbuk fell into the Amu-Darya near Parghār. In this locality there is even now a village of Parghār or Parkhār. The province between the Panj and the Wakhsh bore the name of Khuttal or Khuttalān. The most important part of this province was always the narrow but fertile valley of the Kchi-Surkhab and its tributary the Kulab-Darya. On the banks of the former stood Munk, the largest town in the province, on the site of the present Baljuan, and Hulbuk, the capital of the amīr of Khuttal, near the present Hulbagh, somewhat south of Kulab [1]. The province of Wakhsh, occupying the plain of Kurgan-tübe, was united politically to Khuttal. Its chief town Halāward was surpassed in size by Munk only, and was larger than Hulbuk. The town of Lēwkand [2] also lay on the Wakhsh one day's journey above Halāward. It was reckoned two days' journey from Munk to Hulbuk, and as much from Hulbuk to the Ārḥan ford on the Amu-Darya, which likewise was two days' journey from Halāward. Besides this, there is mention of a "Badakhshān | ford" on the river Jaryāb, 71
six days' journey from Munk. From the Badakhshān ford to the district [3] of Bīk [4] was reckoned two days' journey, thence one day to Andījārāgh (crossing on the way the river of the same name), and one day further to Pārghar (also after crossing the river Pārghar); after this the road crossed the river Barbān (or Talbār, see above), and reached Hulbuk. Two days' journey above Lēwkand stood the stone bridge over the Wakhsh, which is still in existence. From this bridge to Munk was reckoned two days' journey; four farsakhs from the bridge along the Munk road was the town of Tamliyāt. From these data it may be deduced that Hulbuk was on the left bank of the Kulab-Darya, not far from its junction with the Kchi-Surkhab; that Halāward was on the same spot as Kurgan-tübe [5], Lēwkand near the village of Sang-tuda, and Andījārāgh not far from the mouth of the Ta'ir-su (according to Maqdisī [6] this town was not far from the Amu-Darya). It is more difficult to determine the exact site of the Ārḥan [7] and Badakhshān fords, as we do not know the

[1] These identifications have already been made by Tomaschek (*Soghdiana*, 36, 46), who identifies Hulbuk likewise with Χολβιόλνα or Χόλβυσσα of Ptolemy. We are told that a great many Graeco-Bactrian coins were found near Kulab; cf. D. Logofet, *Na Granitsakh Srednei Azii* (St. P., 1909), iii, 190.

[2] Written لاوكند and ليوكند (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 297, 339).

[3] I use this word (*volost'* in the original) to translate رستاق, which means a whole group of villages; sometimes an entire rustāq belonged to a single owner (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 323; v, 323).

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 290. This rustāq likewise was the property of a single owner.

[5] The same view is expressed in Marquart's *Ērānshahr*, p. 233.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 291.

[7] In the history of Tīmūr (*Pétis de la Croix*, i, 19, 172; Zafarnamah, Calcutta,

distances of these places from the towns situated south of the Amu-Darya. On the Jaryāb, one farsakh above Ārḥan, there was still another town, Kārbang[1].

The river Wakhsh flowed from the dominions of the Turkish Qarluqs through the Pāmir[2], Rāsht, and Kumādh provinces[3]. From this information we must conclude that at this period the
72 name Pāmir | was applied also to the Alai Range. Rāsht, which was reckoned a part of the Muslim dominions as early as the tenth century, corresponded to Karatégin[4]. The province of Kumādh was identified by Tomaschek[5] with the *Κομηδῶν ὀρεινή* mentioned in Ptolemy, and with the kingdom of Kiu-mi-tho mentioned by Hiuen-Tsiang[6]. According to the Tumansky manuscript the upper course of the Kafirnihan was situated in the same province. One of the head waters of the Surkhān, the Qaratagh-Darya, bore the name of Kum. The province was inhabited by the Kumījīs[7], who are reckoned as Turkish by

1887–8, i, 38, 184), ارهنك, on the southern bank of the Amu-Darya. Marquart (*Ērānshahr*, p. 233) identifies Arhang with Ḥazrat-Imām, but this cannot be correct as the two places are mentioned separately in the 'Abdallāh Nāmah (cf. Rieu, *Suppl.* (Persian), No. 73, p. 49), MS of the Asiatic Mus., 574, age, f. 413 b and 437 a. Ḥazrat-Imām, which is not mentioned in medieval sources, is connected with a legend about the head of Ḥusayn. The Tīmūrid prince Muḥammad Jūkī (a grandson of Ulugh-beg, cf. my *Ulugh-bek i evo vremya*, p. 141 sq.) is said to have given this sanctuary a cauldron large enough to cook three hundred sheep. At Ḥazrat-Imām was the head of a large canal derived from the Amu-Darya in the reign of 'Abdallāh-Khān (sixteenth cent.); cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 76. Another legend connects Ḥazrat-Imām with the Imām 'Alqama, a contemporary of Muḥammad (cf. below, environs of Samarqand); see the history of Nādir-shāh by Muḥ. Kāẓim, iii, 203 a (the only copy in Petrograd, *Bulletin de l'Acad.*, &c., 1919, p. 927 sq.).

[1] Written كاربنج and كاربنك (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 276, 297, 339; iii, 290). Together with Khuttal the province of Bāsār, Bāsara, or Bāsarān is mentioned (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 37 (text); vii, 92–289). This province is apparently mentioned in Tabarī, ii, 1180 (باسار انحصن) and 1597 (بسان). The conjectures of the editors (in the first case كاسان, in the second نسا) are undoubtedly unsuccessful. Possibly the same province is mentioned in Gardīzī (*Texts*, p. 7) under the name باشنداره. The reference in *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 92 ult. is doubtful, in view of the emendation of the text by Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 234, n. 1 (ذات اليسار, opposed to ذات اليمين), but in *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 37 and vii, 289 we certainly have the name of a province. نعخر in Beladsori, ed. de Goeje, p. 420, must have been, judging from the context, in Farghāna.

[2] Usually نامر, but in Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 290) بامر.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 92. Here الكميذ, Ya'qūbī (*Ibid.*, vii, 290) كماد.

[4] In the history of Tīmūr (*Pétis de la Croix*, i, 174) the province is called قايرتكين, in the Calcutta edition (i, 189 تيرتكين).

[5] *Soghdiana*, 47–8.

[6] Cf. now Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., F, 164, and my remarks in *Zapiski*, xv, 0177; also my article "Karategin" in the *Encyc. of Islām*.

[7] The name of this people in various spellings is met with in Gardīzī and Bayhaqī (*Texts*, p. 9).

Maqdisī. The Kafirnihan river was called Rāmīdh [1], and one of the headwaters of the river even yet preserves this name (Ramit or Roumit). Between the Kafirnihan and Wakhsh were the provinces of Wāshgird and Quwādhiyān (Kabadian). The capital of the first province was the town of the same name, which in the ninth century formed a part of the dominions of Khuttal, and was even the capital of the ruler [2]. It was roughly equal [3] to Tirmidh in size and was situated at a distance of one day's journey from the stone bridge on the Wakhsh [4], i. e. on the site of the present Fayzābād. The province possessed great importance in the ninth century; here, at a distance of four farsakhs from the chief town, ran the frontier of the Turkish dominions, in consequence of which it had as many as 700 fortifications. According to Sam'ānī this country, at the beginning of the Muslim period, had a special alphabet which was preserved in books [5]; in all probability this alphabet was of Sanskrit origin, and dated from the time when Buddhism was supreme in the land. In the tenth century the province was chiefly famed for the production of saffron [6]. Between Wāshgird and Rāsht (i. e. the capital of the latter province) was reckoned four [7] or five days' journey, from which it is evident that the capital or "fortress" of Rāsht was approximately in | the locality of Garm, 73
the present chief town of Karategin. On this road [8] the following towns are mentioned: Īlāq (one day's journey from Wāshgird, probably Kala-i-dasht [9]), Darband (one day's journey farther on, probably Obi-garm), and Garkan (two days from the fortress of Rāsht). At the end of the eighth century the Arabs built a wall here to protect the province from Turkish raids [10].

In the province of Quwādhiyān, besides the chief town, bearing the same name, we find mention of Nūdiz ("new fortress") and some other towns on the Kafirnihan. The pronunciation of their names is difficult to determine [11], nor is their position ascertained. Madder was exported in large quantities from the province [12]. Near the mouth of the Kafirnihan was the ford of Awzaj or

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 93, زامل, more correctly رامذ, as in Lerch (*Russische Revue*, 1875, vii, 8). Cf. Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 43; Sam'ānī facs., *s. v.* القباذياني, where the spelling زاميل is given.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 292. [3] *Ibid.*, i, 298.

[4] *Ibid.*, i, 341. [5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الواشجردى.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 288, 298.

[7] *Ibid.*, vi, 24. [8] *Ibid.*, i, 340.

[9] To the present day Ilak is the name of the river on which the city of Fayzabad is situated.

[10] It is not known whence Tomaschek (*Soghdiana*, 49) borrows the details of this wall, which he attributes to Ibn Khurdādhbih and Ibn Sa'īd. In the texts of these two authors as known to me, there is no statement that the wall was protected by two fortresses, or that the town of Kāshghar lay to the east of it.

[11] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, iii, 290. [12] *Ibid.*, i, 298; ii, 350.

Ūzaj, the present Ayvaj[1]; near the mouth of the Wakhsh, the well-known crossing place of Mēla[2], three days' journey from Balkh[3], and two farsakhs from Tirmidh[4]. In the thirteenth century this place was called Panjāb[5]. Quwādhiyān formed a part of Khuttal[6] in the ninth century, but the geographers of the tenth century[7] give the distances only from Ṣaghāniyān (three days, probably through the Hazrat-bovi pass) and from Tirmidh (two days, from which it is evident that it was more closely connected with these towns than with those of Khuttal.

The northern part of the Kafirnihan valley joins the valley of the next tributary of the Amu-Darya, the Surkhān (in the
74 Tumansky MS. | and the history of Tīmūr[8], Chāghān-rūd). Ibn Rusta[9] names as tributaries of the Kafirnihan the rivers Kum-rūd, Nihām-rūd, and Khāwar-rūd, flowing from the Buttam mountains (on this name see below) Sinām, Nihām[10] (Darai-Niham in the Hisar range), and Khāwar; in fact these rivers (now the Qaratagh-Darya, Tupalang, and Sang-gardak-Darya) form the sources of the Surkhān[11]. In the Middle Ages the valley of the Surkhān formed the province of Ṣaghāniyān or Chaghāniyān[12]; the ruler of the province bore in the pre-Muslim period the title of Ṣāghān-Khudāt[13]. According to Maqdisī[14] there were as many as 16,000 villages in Ṣaghāniyān, but in extent, wealth, and size of the towns the province was inferior to Khuttal. The chief town, which bore the same name, was four days' journey or twenty-four farsakhs from Tirmidh[15], and three days from Quwādhiyān, probably on the site of the present town of Denaw, which is still to-day, by its commercial and strategic importance, the centre of the region[16]. The present name of the town (properly Dīh-i naw = new village) is mentioned in the

[1] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, iii, 290, 292. In the history of Tīmūr (*Pétis de la Croix*, i, 184) اوباج (in the Calcutta edition, i, 196, اوباج).

[2] The usual spelling is ميلة, in Mas'ūdī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, viii, 64) مالا.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 283. [4] *Ibid.*, viii, 64.

[5] *Bibl. Paris, Anc. Fonds Pers.*, 384, f. 191 (Jahān-nāmah): بحدود ختلان ووخش پنج آب دیگر بدو [یعنی بجیحون] پیوندد وآن موضع‌را پنج آب خوانند.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 93. [7] *Ibid.*, i, 341.

[8] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 183; *Zafarnamah*, i, 196. [9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 93.

[10] In Ibn Khurdādhbih (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 37) the province is called Nihām, in Maqdisī (*Ibid.*, iii, 344) بهام, three days' journey from Ṣaghāniyān. Together with Nihām, Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions the provinces of Bīnqān, Mandajān and Kast (the pronunciation of these names is doubtful), probably also situated in the basin of the tributaries of the Surkhān.

[11] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 43.

[12] Arabic ص as often for Persian چ.

[13] *Tabarī*, ii, 1596. [14] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 283, 290.

[15] *Ibid.*, i, 339–40; vi, 24, 162. [16] Kostenko, *Turkestanskii krai*, ii, 146.

history of Tīmūr[1]. The town of Ṣaghāniyān[2] possessed a citadel, and in extent exceeded Tirmidh, though inferior to it in population and wealth. There were fine covered bazaars in the town; bread was cheap, and meat was sold in large quantities. In the middle of the bazaars was a fine mosque supported by columns of burnt brick without arches; the mosque of Ṣaghāniyān was still famous in the twelfth century[3]. Water was led into every house, and the neighbourhood of the town was covered with dense vegetation owing to abundant irrigation; fowling took place in the winter, the grass being so high that it covered the horses. The inhabitants were distinguished | for their 75
orthodoxy and hospitality, but there were few learned men among them, and no faqīhs at all.

Some towns are mentioned in the southern part of the valley, between Tirmidh and Ṣaghāniyān. The first was Ṣarmanjān, Ṣarmanjīn or Charmangān[4], one day's journey or six farsakhs from Tirmidh; the remains of this town are possibly the ruins three miles south of the village of Jar-kurgan, where there is to be seen a tower of burnt bricks about twenty-eight metres high and four-and-a-half in diameter[5]. Ṣarmanjān, together with another town Hāshimgird[6] (which was situated one stage from Tirmidh on the road to the Iron Gate), formed part of a separate province[7], whose capital was Tirmidh, and which in the pre-Muslim period was under the rule of a special dihqān or king[8]; under the Sāmānids, occasionally at least, it was administered by the Amīr of Ṣaghāniyān[9]. In Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[10] a village of Būgh is mentioned, six farsakhs from Tirmidh[11]. The populous

[1] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 109. Cf. also my article "Chaghāniyān" in *Encyc. of Islām*, where the words چغانیان که امروز بدیه نو مشهور است are quoted from Maḥmūd b. Walī (seventeenth cent.). The latest opinion of J. Marquart (*Ostturk. Dialektst.*, p. 71, n. 2 (das erste mit *Sicherheit* belegte *mongolische* Wort in Westen)) that Chaghāniyān comes from the Mongolian *chagan* "white" is of course, erroneous.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 298; iii, 283. [3] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الصغانی.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 339–40; Yāqūt, iii, 383. Sam'ānī (f. 351 b) gives جرمنکان as the Persian form (بالعجمیة) of صرمنجن.

[5] *Sbornik geograf., topograf. i statist. materialov po Azii*, published by the Mil. Instruc. Committee of the Russian Headquarters Staff, Part lvii, p 396. On other ruins in the southern part of the Surkhān valley see Geiger, *Die Pamir-Gebiete*, S. 160.

[6] The town may have received its name from Hāshim b. Bānīchūr (Bāichūr?), ruler of Wakhsh and Halāward (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 291). On this prince and his dynasty see Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 301 sq.

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 298. The town of Ṣarmanjī mentioned in Ibn-Ḥawqal (*Ibid.*, ii, 349, 401) is undoubtedly identical with Ṣarmangān.

[8] Beladsori, p. 418; Tabarī, ii, 1147, where the king bears the title of Tirmidhshāh.

[9] *Texts*, p. 10 (Gardīzī).

[10] Yāqūt, i, 761.

[11] Other villages mentioned in the neighbourhood of Tirmidh are Būsanj (Yāqūt, i, 758, not in Sam'ānī) and Rukhshabūdh (so Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الرخشبوذی) or Rukhshayūdh (so Yāqūt, ii, 771).

and rich trading village of Dārzangī[1], all of whose inhabitants were weavers, was situated one day's journey or six farsakhs from Ṣarmanjān; the cathedral mosque was among the bazaars, and another river, as well as the Surkhān[2], flowed past the town. This evidently refers to the ravine of Bandi-Khan or Kok-jar (six kilometres to the west of Kum Kurgan), which is now full of water in the spring only; an old but durable bridge
76 of baked brick[3] still exists here. | Between Dārzangī and Ṣaghāniyān (seven farsakhs from the first and five from the second) there was still another village, Barangī[4]. A few other villages are mentioned in Ṣaghāniyān[5], such as Bāsand, a large village two days' journey from Ṣaghāniyān (according to Maqdisī one day), with many gardens; Zīnwar, one day's journey from Ṣaghāniyān (according to Maqdisī three post-stations); Būrāb (one stage or four farsakhs from Ṣaghāniyān); Sang-gardak[6], one day's journey from the capital, probably near the mouth of the Sang-gardak river; Rīkdasht (six farsakhs from the capital), Kumgānān[7] (two farsakhs from the capital), and some other names whose pronunciation cannot be determined.

With reference to the road between Ṣaghāniyān and Wāshgird, i. e. between Denaw and Fayzabad, we find contradictory descriptions in the Arabic geographers[8]. In the plain which joins up the valleys of the Surkhān and Kafirnihan valleys we find in the Middle Ages the provinces of Ākharūn or Kharūn, and Shūmān (in Hiuen-Tsiang Ho-lu-mo and Su-man or Shuman, the second of which lay east of the first)[9]. At the beginning of the eighth century both provinces were under one ruler[10], and later on they were evidently incorporated in Ṣaghāniyān[11]. The district of Guftān, mentioned in the account of Qutayba's campaigns, was probably in the southern part of the Surkhān valley, or somewhat west of it, in the present district of Shirabad[12].

Not far from the mouth of the Surkhān was the strong

[1] In the geographers of the tenth century دارزنجی, in Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 289) دارزنکا, in Bayhaqī (p. 576) دارزنکی.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 283–4. The distance between Dārzangī and the capital is incorrectly given in Maqdisī (*ibid.*, 344).

[3] Kostenko, *Turkestanskii krai*, ii, 144. *Sbornik materialov*, lvii, 391, 395.

[4] برنجی, *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 33, 211.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 340–41; iii, 283–4, 344.

[6] In Maqdisī سنکردا.

[7] *Texts*, p. 9 (Gardīzī).

[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 340; vi, 24, 162. According to Gardīzī (*Texts*, p. 9) the distance between Saghāniyān and Shūmān was twelve farsakhs. De Goeje's opinion (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 24) that travellers on this road crossed the Wakhsh is undoubtedly incorrect. The river mentioned here can be no other than the Kafirnihan, although the width is considerably exaggerated.

[9] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 39–40, 42; Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., f. 195 sq.

[10] Beladsori, p. 419; Tabarī, ii, 1180.

[11] *Texts*, p. 9.

[12] Beladsori, p. 420; Tabarī, ii, 1150, 1180.

fortress of Tirmidh, of which we find fairly detailed accounts in the Arabic geographers. These accounts have been given by me elsewhere in a note to an article by Poslavsky [1], to whom we owe a detailed description of the existing | remains of the town. 77
The ruins described by Poslavsky are undoubtedly the remains of medieval Tirmidh [2], although this is apparently in contradiction with Ibn Ḥawqal's evidence [3] that the river (Surkhān) fell into the Amu-Darya below the town. The island on which the Arab leader 'Othmān b. Mas'ūd lodged 15,000 men, at the siege of Tirmidh in 85/704, and which took the name of "Othmān's island" [4] from him, is undoubtedly Aral-Payghambar; Bayhaqī [5] and Sharaf ad-Dīn Yazdī [6] also mention the island opposite Tirmidh. From the indications of the Arabic geographers it is evident that the ancient town destroyed by Chingiz-Khān was actually on the river bank, and here there have been preserved the most ancient ruins, while the groups of ruins farther away from the river bank are the remains of the new town which was built after Chingiz-Khān, and still existed under the Uzbegs. In the history of Tīmūr there is a mention of "old Tirmidh" [7] alongside the Tirmidh existing at that time [8].

In the ruins of the ancient city we find amongst other buildings the mausoleum of the holy ḥakīm Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. 'Alī Tirmidhī [9], who died in 255/869. According to Poslavsky the mausoleum is built of white marble, according to Prof. Mushketov [10] of limestone resembling marble. Poslavsky considers this monument as hardly surpassed "in quality of workmanship and material" by any of the ruins of antiquity seen

[1] *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, Dec. 1896, pp. 87–8. Cf. now the paper of A. Semenov in *Protok. Turk. kruzh. arkh.*, xix, pp. 3–20.

[2] The reading Tarmidh established by Tomaschek (*Soghdiana*, 37) is fully confirmed by the local pronunciation indicated by Sam'ānī, who spent twelve days here (*s. v.* الترمذى). Evidently the natives still pronounce the name of the ancient town in the same way, as the Russian officers who surveyed the district in 1889 write Termiz or Tarmyz (*Shornik materialov*, lvii, 393, 399).

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 349.

[4] Beladsori, p. 419; Tabarī, ii, 1162.

[5] Baihaki, ed. Morley, p. 704.

[6] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 62; *Zafarnamah*, i, 81.

[7] *Pétis de la Croix*, p. 41; *Zafarnamah*, i, 57.

[8] The canal by which Tirmidh was irrigated was taken from the Surkhān 54 miles upstream, probably near the Bendi-Khan (cf. supra), the canal for the irrigation of the modern Russian fortress (built in 1894) at a distance only of eleven miles (*Turkestanskiya Vyedomosti*, 1905, No. 115). The fortress destroyed by Chingiz-Khān was rebuilt several times, notably by Khalīl Allāh (beginning of the fifteenth cent.) and by Muḥ. Raḥīm Khān (eighteenth cent.); cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 73 sq.

[9] An account of him may be found in the Tadhkiratu 'l-Awliyā of Farīd ad-Dīn 'Aṭṭār (ed. Nicholson, ii, 91 sq.; نفحات الانس of Jāmī, eastern edition, p. 77); see also *Prot. Turk kruzh. arkh.*, 22 August, 1897, pp. 17–20. This saint has no connexion whatever with the author of the celebrated canonical collection of traditions; the name of the latter was Abū 'Īsā Muḥammad b. 'Īsā.

[10] *Turkestan*, St. P., 1886, p. 578.

by him in the whole region. There is no doubt that the tomb was not erected by the contemporaries of the saint, and is not,
78 indeed, earlier than | the fourteenth century, as is proved by the Arabic inscription written in the naskhī of that period[1]. The grave is mentioned in the history of Tīmūr[2].

The existence of a large island, facilitating the construction of a floating bridge, and its proximity to Balkh (two stages), the centre of the whole country, made Tirmidh perhaps the most important crossing of the Amu-Darya after Āmul (Charjuy); wars frequently broke out over its possession between the rulers of Transoxania and of Afghanistan. According to Prof. Mushketov, "coins, the majority of which are Greek," are frequently found among the ruins of the old fortress; if this is the case, the town must have been of importance long before the beginning of Arab domination.

Half-way between Tirmidh and Balkh is mentioned the village of Siyāhgird, which still exists: the remains of ancient Siyāhgird lie ten miles from the present village[3]. The city of Balkh may be considered the oldest large town in the basin of the Amu-Darya; Muslim writers justly call it the "Mother of towns" (Umm al-bilād). Here was the capital of the semi-mythological Bactrian empire, subsequently the Bactrian satrapy of the Achaemenids, in which, at any rate under Darius, Margiana[4] (the province of Merv) was also incorporated. After Alexander of Macedon, Balkh was the centre of the Graeco-Bactrian empire. Our information on the latter is not sufficiently explicit to enable us to define its boundaries accurately; but in any case the statements of the classical geographers show that for some time probably all the cultivated lands north of the Amu-Darya were incorporated in it.[5] The importance of Balkh is explained by its central position (at an equal distance from the western, eastern, northern and southern borders of the Eastern-Iranian civilized world), as already pointed out by Ya'qūbī[6]. Consequently Balkh was the capital of the country at the time when all Aryan Central Asia was still united under the sway of one ruler or viceroy, whereas Merv came to the front in consequence of the submission of the provinces north of the Amu-Darya

[1] The late artist, N. N. Shcherbina-Kramarenko, kindly showed me the excellent photographs taken by him of this monument. Cf. now the article (with photographs and a translation of the inscription by me) of Rozhevits in the *Izvyestiya Imper. Russk. Geogr. Obshch.*, xliv, pp. 647 and 652.

[2] *Pétis de la Croix*, iii, 202; *Zafarnamah*, ii, 209.

[3] Kostenko, *Turkestanskii krai*, ii, 168.

[4] Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, p. 3.

[5] Strabonis *Geographica*, ed. Didot (Paris, 1853), lib. xi, cap. xi, § 2. Cf. now my article "Greko-baktriiskoe gosudarstvo i evo rasprostranenie na severo-vostok," *Bull. Acad. des Sciences*, 1916, pp. 823–8.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 287–8.

to the Central Asian tribes, | when it became the chief aim of the 79
rulers of Khurāsān either (as under the Sāsānids) to defend the line of the Amu-Darya or to endeavour to establish their authority in Transoxania (as under the Arabs and the Saljūqs). Under the Sāsānids, according to Muslim accounts, Balkh was the residence of one of the four Marzubāns of Khurāsān[1]; at the beginning of the eighth century, the native ruler bore the higher title of Ispahbadh[2]. But the authority of the Sāsānids, in the seventh century at least, hardly made itself felt here, as is evident from Hiuen-Tsiang's accounts of the Buddhist monasteries in Balkh and its dependent provinces on both banks of the Amu-Darya[3].

In the neighbourhood of Balkh was the Buddhist temple of Nawbahār ("new monastery"), which enjoyed a great reputation among the Muslims, and is described in detail by Ibn al-Faqīh[4]. According to the latter, the temple belonged to idolaters who held the same faith as the Chinese emperors and the Kābul-shāh (ruler of Kābul); many pilgrims came here to pay reverence to the largest of the idols. The administration of the Nawbahār was in the hands of the Barmakid family, who governed an estate embracing an area of eight farsakhs in length and four in width. Balkh and the Nawbahār were destroyed by the Arabs in the reign of the Caliph 'Othmān, or, according to other accounts, in that of Mu'āwiya[5]. The Arabs built a new town in the locality of Barūqān, two farsakhs from Balkh. Not until 107/725 did the governor Asad b. Abdullāh restore the town on the former site, commissioning the representatives of the same house of the Barmakids to carry out this work[6]. In the ninth century (from June 848, according to the author of the history of Balkh[7]) Balkh was the seat of Dāwud b. 'Abbās, grandson of Hāshim b. Māhīchūr (who is of course identical with the Hāshim b. Bānīchūr, mentioned above, p. 73, note)[8]. Dāwud b. 'Abbās was the builder of the village and castle of Nūsār, in the neighbourhood of Balkh, and of some edifices in the town itself. All these buildings | were destroyed in the year 256/870 by Ya'qūb, 80
the founder of the Ṣaffārid dynasty; after the departure of

[1] Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny*, p. 9, from *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VI, 18 (text).

[2] Tabarī, II, 1206, 1218.

[3] *Memoires sur les Contrées occidentales*, trad. par M. Stanislas Julien, Paris, 1857, I, 23–34. Cf. also the article on Balkh (by R. Hartmann) in the *Encyc. of Islām*.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, V, 322–4. Cf. also Yāqūt, IV, 817–20.

[5] Beladsori, pp. 408–9.

[6] Tabarī, II, 1490. The historian of Balkh refers the restoration of the town to the year 118/736 (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, I, 71). According to Tabarī (II. 1591) Asad transferred his capital to Balkh in the year 118. Cf. also my article "Barmakids" in the *Encyc. of Islām*, and my remarks in *Festschrift Goldziher*, p. 261.

[7] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, I, 72.

[8] Cf. also Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 301 sq.

Ya'qūb, Dāwud returned to his ruined castle, but died within seventeen days[1]. In the Ṭāhirid and Sāmānid period, Balkh[2] was one of the largest cities in Khurāsān, equal to Merv and Herāt; according to Maqdisī it rivalled Bukhārā in size.

In the environs of Balkh, as in those of Bukhārā and Samarqand, there was in early times a wall[3], twelve farsakhs in length, with twelve gates, which surrounded both the town and neighbouring villages; in the ninth century it had already ceased to exist. Like all large towns, Balkh was divided into the town proper (called by the Arabs *madīna*, and by the Persians *shahristān*)[4], and the suburbs, *rabaḍ* (the Persian term, *bīrūn*[5], is not met with in the historians and geographers). According to Ya'qūbī the rabaḍ of Balkh had four gates, according to the geographers of the tenth century seven. The former statement must probably be taken to refer not to the rabaḍ, but to the shahristān; we find shahristāns with four gates in other large towns also, which is probably explained by the influence of the architecture of Persian towns of the Sāsānid epoch[6]. According to Ya'qūbī there was one farsakh between the wall of the rabaḍ and that of the shahristān; the length and breadth of the latter was likewise one farsakh (three miles), but according to Iṣṭakhrī only half a farsakh; the walls and all the edifices were built of clay. In the centre of the shahristān stood the cathedral mosque, the erection of which is referred by the historian of Balkh to the year 124/742[7]; round it lay the bazaars. Maqdisī extols the prosperity of the town, which enabled Balkh together with its environs to contribute an enormous sum to the state treasury.

Under Chingiz-Khān Balkh was destroyed after a rising of its inhabitants, and was still lying in ruins in the first half of the fourteenth century, at the time of the travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa[8]; it was restored soon after, but did not regain its former importance. The remaining ruins of the ancient town extend over
81 some sixteen miles, and have never been | subjected to any detailed investigation; apparently all the ruins seen on the surface of the earth relate, as was to be expected, to the Muslim

[1] *Texts*, p. 4 (Gardīzī), and Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الدوساری.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 254, 278; iii, 301–2; vii, 287–8.

[3] See texts cited by me, *Zapiski*, xix, 119.

[4] Often met with in Narshakhī; cf. also the texts cited by me in *Zapiski*, xvii, 0107.

[5] Alberuni, *Chronologie*, ed. Sachau, p. xviii.

[6] Justi, *Geschichte der Orientalischen Volker im Altertum*, Berlin, 1884, p. 455.

[7] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, i, 71. This date is, however, doubtful, as Asad b. 'Abdullāh, who died, according to all authorities, in 120 or 121, is named as the builder.

[8] *Voyages d'Ibn-Batoutah*, iii, 58–62.

period[1]. The actual chief town of the province, Mazār-i-Sharīf, fourteen miles to the east of Balkh, rose around the supposititious grave of the Caliph 'Alī, discovered in the twelfth century near the village of Khayr. According to the story handed down by the traveller al-Gharnāṭī[2], the governor of the province, his soldiers and 'ulamā, saw with their own eyes the uncorrupted body of the Caliph; the authenticity of the grave, was, as usual, demonstrated by miracles, for which apparently there was at the time some necessity, since it is to the same period that are referred the discoveries of the uncorrupted relics of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob[3] (the grave of the prophet Ezekiel was also shown in the neighbourhood of Balkh in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's time). Over the tomb of 'Alī a magnificent building was erected, which immediately became a place of pilgrimage. The present mazār is of course of much later origin than the old one destroyed by Chingiz-Khān[4].

The road connecting Balkh with the other base of the Arabs in Khurāsān, i.e. Merv, ran, like the road from Balkh to Badakhshān, in a roundabout fashion along the foot of the mountains[5]; on reaching the river Murghāb it turned north-west and followed the river bank to Merv. Between Balkh and Maiwarrūd (the present Meruchak or more probably perhaps Bala-Murghab[6]) are mentioned the towns of Shapurqān (or Ushpurqān), Fāryāb and Ṭālqān; of these Shapurqān alone has retained its name to the present day[7]. All these towns were at a distance of three days' journey from each other. Shapurqān and Fāryāb were included in the province of Gūzgān or Guzgānān[8], which was ruled in the ninth and tenth centuries by the Farīghūnid dynasty, who were destroyed by Maḥmūd of Ghazna[9]. The capital of the province, according to Iṣṭakhrī, was the town of Anbār, lying one stage south of Shapurqān, according to Maqdisī the town of Yahūdīya; in order to go from Anbār to Yahūdīya it was necessary to travel for two days along the road to Fāiyāb and one day more on to Yahūdīya. From Shapurqān to Yahūdīya was reckoned three days' journey, and thence | one more day to 82
the town of Kunddiram[10]. The distance, according to Maqdisī,

[1] Burnes, *Travels*, ii, 204 Cf. also the description (with plan) of Yate, *Northern Afghanistan*, pp. 256, 280, and from this book in my *Istoriko-geog. obzor Irana*, p. 19.
[2] *Texts*, pp. 21–2. [3] *Ibn al-Athīr*, x, 394.
[4] The grave was discovered a second time in the fifteenth century; cf. my *Obzor Irana*, p. 21, from Isfizārī.
[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 286; iii, 346.
[6] Cf. on this question my paper "Merwerrūd" in *Zapiski*, xiv, 028–032.
[7] On the situation of the other towns see my paper "Merwerrūd" in *Zapiski*, xiv, 028 sq.
[8] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, i, 270–1; iii, 298, 347.
[9] On the Farīghūnid dynasty see *Zapiski*, x, 128–30.
[10] Marquart (*Ērānshahr*, 85 sq.) spells Kunddarm and places this city on the site of Gurziwān (or Guzarwān).

from Yahūdīya to Fāryāb was two days and the same to Shapurqān, from Yahūdīya to Anbār one day, so this town also was probably situated south of the main road[1]. There is mention also of a separate road from Merv to Yahūdīya, crossing the Balkh road near the castle of Aḥnaf b. Qays, at a distance of one day's journey from Marwarrūd on the bank of the Murghāb[2].

The Arabic geographers do not indicate the distance between these towns and the next town on the Amu-Darya, Kālif, the only information being that it was two days' journey from Tirmidh to Kālif[3]; the twelfth-century author Sam'ānī alone[4] defines also the distance between Balkh and Kālif (18 farsakhs). In the tenth century Kālif was situated on both banks of the river, and was thereby distinguished from all the other towns along the banks of the Amu-Darya. The main portion of the town with the mosque, which was located in the Dhu'l-Qarnayn rabāṭ, was on the left bank; opposite this rabāṭ, on the right bank, was the Dhu'l-Kifl rabāṭ[5]. The road from Bukhārā to Kālif ran, as it still does, through the Kashka-Darya valley, which was otherwise more closely connected with the Zarafshān basin than with the banks of the Amu-Darya.

On the Amu-Darya below Kālif were the towns of Zamm and Akhsīsak, the first on the left, the second on the right bank of the river, five days' journey from Tirmidh and four from Āmul (Charjuy), i.e. evidently on the site of the present fortress of Kerki. Zamm and Akhsīsak formed a single administrative unit: the pulpit of the Imām, *i.e.* the Cathedral mosque, was in Zamm, amongst covered bazaars according to Maqdisī. According to Iṣṭakhrī Zamm was a small, according to Maqdisī a considerable town, in whose neighbourhood were pastured many camels and sheep[6]. In enumerating the crossings of the Amu-Darya Maqdisī mentions neither Zamm nor Akhsīsak; the Kerki crossing is called by him Karkūh, and opposite Karkūh, on the right bank of the river, was the Bānkar[7] (or Bāykar) crossing. Maqdisī inserts the road to Karkūh from the province of Gūzgān, *viz.* from Fāryāb through Andkhūd (present Andkhui);

[1] Yahūdīya seems to be identical with Maymana or, as it was called in medieval times, Maymand; cf. my *Obzor Irana*, p. 23, and Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 78.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 270; iii. 314. On the castle of Aḥnaf cf. also Beladsori, p. 406.

[3] *Ibid.*, iii, 343.

[4] Facs. Margoliouth, *s.v.* الكالفى; also in Yāqūt (iv, 229).

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 291. There were (according to Maqdisī) three crossings between Kālif and Tirmidh. Dhu 'l-Kifl is the prophet mentioned in the Koran, 21, 85 and 38, 48; cf. the article of I. Goldziher in the *Encyc. of Islām*. The worship was later transferred to the island of Aral-Payghambar (whence the name) near Tirmidh; cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 75. Kālif is mentioned as a town on the *southern* bank of the river even in the eighteenth century; the modern town on the northern bank must have been founded only in very recent times (*ibid.*).

[6] *Ibid.*, i, 283, 298; iii, 291.

[7] *Ibid.*, iii, 292.

from Andkhud to Karkūh | was reckoned three days' journey [1]. 83
According to Iṣṭakhrī the name of Andkhud or Ankhud was borne by a whole district (rustāq), the capital of which was the small town of Ushturj [2]. In later times Andkhud apparently acquired greater importance; according to the accounts of travellers there are near Andkhui, now an unimportant village, the ruins of an extensive old town [3].

From Zamm onwards along the left bank the waters of the Amu-Darya began to be used for artificial irrigation [4]; the uniformly cultivated tract on the left bank began from Āmul [5] (Charjuy). Āmul lay one farsakh from the river, and in size roughly equalled Zamm [6]; but in consequence of its position on the high road from Khurāsān to Transoxania, this small town acquired such importance that the entire river was called by its name [7]. On the right bank, also at a distance of one farsakh from the river, was Farabr or Farab. In the town there was a large cathedral mosque, built entirely of burnt brick, no wood at all being used in its construction. The Amīr of Farab formerly ruled with such independence that "it was not necessary for him to go to Bukhārā on any business whatever"; there existed also a legend of a certain local judge "who delivered judgements with the injustice of Shaddād [8]." By Qudāma [9] Farabr is called "the village of 'Alī"; according to Yāqūt [10] it bore also the name of "the rabāṭ of Ṭāhir b. 'Ali." Maqdisī mentions some crossing places between Karkūh and the main Khurāsān road; of these Nawīda, a small town on the right bank with a cathedral mosque, the crossing place of the inhabitants of Samarqand, and the Arab village of Burmādūy [11] may be mentioned. Not far from Farab was the still-existing village of Batik, which is already mentioned in Narshakhī [12]. |

The main road from Khurāsān to Transoxania always 84

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 347. [2] *Ibid.*, i, 270–1.

[3] A. Vambery, *Travels in Central Asia*, London, 1864, 240 sqq. (Russian trans., St. P., 1865, p. 120). *Sbornik materialov po Azii*, Pt. xlvii, p. 109. Cf *Obzor Irana*, p. 24, and Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 426, cited in the *Encyc. of Islām* (a very short article)

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 297.

[5] *Ibid.*, i, 338. [6] *Ibid.*, i, 281.

[7] Cf. also the opinion of Streck (*Encyc. of Islām, s. v.* Āmul) that Āmū may be "an ancient local name of the Oxus," from which the name of the city may have been derived. It is quite possible that the name of the town of Āmul on the Oxus, like that of the town in Māzandarān, is connected with the name of the pre-Aryan people of Amards, who may in ancient times have lived as far east as the Oxus; cf. the opinion of Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 136. If this be so the name Āmū is older than the Aryan name Wakhsh (Oxus). The name Chārjūy appears for the first time in the fifteenth century; cf. my article in the *Encyc. of Islām.*

[8] Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 17; Russian translation by N. Lykoshin, p. 29. Upon Farab and the remains of this city cf. now L. Zimin in *Protok. Zakaspiiskavo kruzhka lyubitelei Arkheologii*, iii (1917), p. 1 sq.

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 156. [10] Yāqūt, iii, 867.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 291–2. [12] Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p 5.

ran, as it still does, through Āmul and Farab, as the Amu-Darya is here approached by the Zarafshān, which not only in the tenth century but even in the time of Alexander [1] was lost in the sands before reaching the bed of the Amu-Darya. The valley of the Zarafshān, to the description of which we shall now turn, has always been the most fertile and populous part of Transoxania.

The name Zarafshān is not found in historical works prior to the eighteenth century. On the basis of the Chinese transcript Na-mi Tomaschek arrives at the conclusion that the ancient Aryan name of the river was Namik [2]. According to the Arabs the river flowed from the Buttam or Butmān [3] mountains; by this name they understood all the mountainous region between the upper courses of the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya, distinguishing a First, Central, and Outer Buttam (evidently the Hisar, Zarafshān, and Turkestan ranges). The Zarafshān flowed from Central Buttam [4], in the locality of Burghar, near the frontier of Ṣaghāniyān; here was the Jan water, resembling a lake surrounded by villages [5]. From the sources of the river to Samarqand was reckoned from twenty to thirty farsakhs [6], the Fan-Darya evidently being regarded as the head stream. At the village of Burghar the river was swelled by a stream which flowed from the Maskhā district of Ushrūsana [7] (in Bābur [8] the river Masikhā or Maschā, the present Matcha, the head stream of the Zarafshān). Somewhat lower down was the town of Būnjikath, i.e. Panjikath. The distance between this town and Samarqand was nine farsakhs according to the geographers [9],
85 according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt [10] | six in all; the first statement is the more correct one [11]. Somewhat lower down, in the

[1] Cf. Arrian's *Anabasis*, iv, 6, 6, and my remarks in *Zapiski*, xxi, 0147. Only Ḥāfiẓ Abrū says that in his day the Zaiafshān in flood-time reached the Oxus (*al-Muzaffarīya*, p. 18). On the contrary, we are told by Bābur (ed. Beveridge, f. 45 b transl. p. 77) that in his time the waters "during three or four months of the year" did not reach Bukhārā.

[2] *Soghdiana*, 19–20. It is quite possible that in Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 293) instead of ناسف, and in Nerchakhy (p. 5) instead of ماصف, should be read نامق. In later authors right up to recent times the river usually bears the name of Kūhak (little mountain), after the name of the small eminence near Samarqand (now Chopan-Ata).

[3] This latter name is used in the Tumansky MS.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 328. [5] *Ibid.*, i, 319.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 370–83. [7] *Ibid.*, ii, 383.

[8] Ed. Beveridge, f. 97, trans, p. 149, and index *s. v.* Macha. Cf. also *ibid.* 99, trans., p. 152, the mention of the village Ab-burdan with a tomb at the spring head. In the same village there has been found a very ancient wooden column; cf. *Bull. de l'Acad., &c.*, Petrograd, 1921, p. 215.

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 342. [10] Yāqūt, i, 744.

[11] Near Panjikath there is mentioned later the village of Mughkada-i Panjīkath (house of the fire-worshippers of Panjīkath): Vyatkin, *Materialy*, p. 25.

locality of Waraghsar (literally "head of the dam"), four farsakhs from Samarqand [1], a dam was constructed and the river divided up into several streams. The longest of these, the Barsh, flowed past Samarqand, and is probably identical with the present Dargham ariq; from it were derived the town ariqs.[2] South of it were the ariqs of Bārmish (about one day's journey) and Bashmīn (the shortest). The inhabitants of Waraghsar were responsible for the maintenance of the dam, and were therefore exempted from kharāj. Waraghsar corresponds to the modern Rabat-i khoja; the three canals were afterwards called Dargham, 'Abbās, and Qarāunās (now Dargham, Yangi-Ariq, and Qazan-Ariq) [3]. Opposite Waraghsar, from the Ghūbār locality, were taken three ariqs, Būzmājan, Sināwāb, and Ishtīkhān, which watered the northern part of the district of Samarqand. The largest channels, that is to say the Barsh and Bārmish, were navigable [4], probably for rafts only, as, according to Maqdisī, then as now actual navigation was possible only on the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya [5].

In its general outlines this system of irrigation was undoubtedly in existence before Islām, as is evident from the attempt made by the governor Asad b. 'Abdallāh (in 735 or 736) to deprive the inhabitants of Samarqand of water by constructing a dam at Waraghsar [6]. Iṣṭakhrī's account shows, however, that the ariqs flowing to the south of Samarqand were not distinguished by special length, and that the Monas ariq, which, according to Arandarenko [7], "carried an immense volume of water beyond Qarshi" did not exist at that period; it is very doubtful indeed whether such a channel ever existed.

In extent and population Samarqand was always the first city of Transoxania, even in the age, when, as under the Sāmānids, Bukhārā was the capital of the kingdom. This importance is explained chiefly by its geographical position at the junction of the main trade routes from India (via Balkh), from Persia (via Merv), and from the Turkish dominions. The extraordinary fertility of the neighbourhood of the town also made it possible for an enormous number of people to be collected in one place. |

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 342; also in Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الورغسرى.

[2] The term *ariq* (اريق and ارغ) is used peculiarly of the irrigation canals in Turkestān.

[3] See for particulars my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, pp. 104 sq.; on Rabāṭ-i Khoja, *ibid.*, 116; Bābur, ed. Beveridge, f. 59, trans., p. 97.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 319–21. [5] *Ibid.*, iii, 323.

[6] Tabarī, ii, 1586.

[7] G. A. Arandarenko, *Dosugi v Turkestanye*, St. P., 1889, p. 270. In addition to this book, some interesting accounts of the dams on the Upper Zarafshān are given by N. Petrovsky in the *Izvyestiya Imp. Russk. Geog. Obshch.* (vol. xxxiv, part iv, pp. 490–3). The information contained in this article is also very dubious, however; cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 103.

86 In ancient times, however, Samarqand was not distinguished by such size as under the Sāmānids; according to Curtius the outer wall of the town was seventy stadia in circumference (about ten miles), according to Hiuen-Tsiang only twenty li[1] (between four and five miles). Some local traditions on the origin of the town are communicated by Nasafī[2]; according to these the town at the time of Qutayba's invasion (i.e. at the beginning of the eighth century) had already existed for 2,250 years, but only thirteen kings were known, who had reigned one after the other, probably that dynasty under which the Arab conquest took place. According to one legend the founder of the town, or at least of part of it, was Alexander of Macedon[3].

The oldest description of Muslim Samarqand is that of Ibn al-Faqīh.[4] By his account Samarqand together with its environs was, like Balkh and Bukhārā, surrounded by a wall twelve farsakhs long, with twelve gates; the gates were built of wood and had two leaves; beyond each gate was a second, two-leaved like the first; between the first and second was the habitation of the door-keeper. The Arabic text is not altogether clear (we accept de Goeje's interpretation) but it apparently points to the existence of two lines of walls. The suburbs (probably the city with the suburbs) occupied an area of 6,000 jarībs[5], the town itself 5,000 jarībs, and the inner town[6] (shahristān) 2,500 jarībs. Within the last-named was the cathedral mosque and the citadel, with the governor's palace; the citadel had two iron gates. Samarqand therefore differed from Bukhārā, in that the citadel,
87 as in some | other towns (for instance the capital of Usrūshana), was included in the shahristān.

The historians give us very scrappy information on the topography of Samarqand and its gradual transformation. Ṭabarī[7] ascribes to Abū Muslim the construction of the outer wall of

[1] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 65. The li of that time was only ⅓ verst, not as now ½ verst.

[2] *Texts*, p. 48–9.

[3] Also *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 318; v, 325.

[4] *Ibid.*, v, 325–6. Cf. also Yāqūt, iii, 134, where only one outer town (of 10,000 jarībs) and one inner town (of 2,500 jarībs) are mentioned.

[5] In the dictionary Tāj al-'Arūs (eastern ed., i, 179) it is stated that the jarīb contained ten qafīz, by another reckoning four qafīz in all; like the measures of length and weight, this measure varied in size in the different countries. The qafīz is said (iv, 70) to contain 144 dhirā', i.e. it probably equalled the square of this measure (cf. the analogous definition of the tanap in Khanykov, *Opisanie Bukharskavo khanstva*, p. 113). In the *Encyc. of Islām*, article Djarīb, it is stated only that "its size varied according to place and time." The jarīb is generally taken to be 3,600 square dhirā' (cf. *Mafātīḥ al-'Olūm*, p. 66). By Herzfeld's measurements the dhirā' is put at 51·8 cm. (*Der Islam*, iv, 199), i.e. slightly over half a metre, and somewhat less than the Russian arshin. The jarīb must therefore be somewhat more than 900 square metres.

[6] It is probably to this town, and not to that of the 5,000 jarībs, as in the text, that the statement that the town had four gates should be referred.

[7] Tabarī, iii, 80.

the town; according to the same historian[1], the rebel Rāfi' b. Layth, being besieged by the general Harthama, when the outer wall had been occupied, retired into the inner town (809) and maintained himself there for another whole year. According to Ya'qūbī[2] Samarqand was surrounded by a large wall which had fallen into decay and was restored by order of Hārūn ar-Rashīd. Nasafī gives[3] the name of the builder of the outer wall of the town as Abū Nu'mān, probably thinking of one of the semi-legendary Yemenite kings, whom the authors of historical legends brought to Samarqand, apparently for no other reason than that the name of one of them was Shammar. In the year 135/752-3 Abū Muslim, according to Nasafī, constructed the gates, battlements, and watch towers; the length of the whole wall was seven and a half farsakhs, and Abū Muslim divided it into 360 sections. There was a tower at every 200 gaz (dhirā', cf. *supra*); as Nasafī reckons 12,000 gaz to the farsakh, the total number of towers by this reckoning was 450. The height of the wall was four gaz.

The geographers of the tenth century[4] describe chiefly the shahristān, which, as in other towns, had four gates; on the east, the Chinese, on a height from which the descent was made to the Zarafshān by many steps; on the west the Nawbahār or Iron gate; on the north the Bukhārā or Usrūshana gate; on the south the Kish or Large gate. The wall of the shahristān was apparently constructed in pre-Muslim times; for its construction it had been necessary to use a great deal of clay, so that a large ditch was formed; in order to bring water into the town by this ditch, a stone dam was built at "The Coppersmiths" (aṣ-Ṣaffārūn). The water entered the shahristān by the Kish gate, at the "Arch head" (Ra's aṭ-Ṭāq) where the chief bazaars were situated, and where the population of the town was principally concentrated. Even in the twelfth century the locality | near the Kish gate was one of the best quarters of Samarqand[5]. 88
The ariq had been dug in the pre-Muslim period, and passed over the ditch of the wall; the whole of its sides was covered with lead. The revenue from the sections of ground lying on the banks of the ariq was devoted to its maintenance; labour on the repair of the dam formed an obligation in kind on the fire-worshippers of Samarqand, who were on this account exempted from the poll tax.

From these data it would be difficult to form an accurate idea

[1] Tabarī. iii, 775.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 293.
[3] *Texts*, pp. 48–9; trans. by Vyatkin, *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, pp. 242 and 250.
[4] *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, i, 316–17; ii, 365–6; iii, 278–9; v, 322.
[5] Yāqūt, i, 446 (from Sam'ānī, *s.v.* البابكسى).

of the site of the medieval shahristān of Samarqand, but it is now fully established that the shahristān corresponded to the ruined site actually called Afrāsiyāb, to the north of the modern town [1]. Outside the shahristān lay the eminence called Kūhak ("little mountain," now Chopan-ata), which, according to Iṣṭakhrī [2], was half a mile in length, and was in close proximity to the city walls; here stone was quarried for the city buildings and clay for the manufacture of vessels and other articles. From the Chinese gate the road descended to the river, evidently for the purpose of crossing the then existing bridge, which in Ibn Ḥawqal [3] bears the name of Jird. The remains of a later bridge are still to be seen (although it is at some distance from Afrāsiyāb), the construction of which popular tradition ascribes, like all other buildings in the land, to Tīmūr, or 'Abdallāh of Bukhārā, though it was actually constructed by Shaybānī at the beginning of the sixteenth century [4]. The river under the bridge was several qāmas deep (the qāma was a measure corresponding to a man's stature); at the time when the mountain snows thawed, the water sometimes rose above the bridge, and the inhabitants of Samarqand were not able to prevent inundations. A bridge near Samarqand is also mentioned by the historian 'Utbī [5]. Another and smaller bridge is mentioned by Sam'ānī in the Ghātfir or Ghātfar quarter, situated "in the town itself," which in the twelfth century nearly corresponded to the modern town [6].

The Nawbahār gate was in the western wall of Afrāsiyāb; the modern cemetery of Sangrasān is in the neighbourhood of this
89 gate [7]. | The citadel was, as is seen from the ruins, in the northern part of Afrāsiyāb; the "citadel" of which Ḥāfiẓ Abrū speaks as having been destroyed by Chingiz-Khān [8] means not only the tenth-century citadel but the whole site of Afrāsiyāb (cf. Juwaynī's account of the Mongol conquest below). The Bukhārā gate was in the northern, the Kish gate in the southern wall of Afrāsiyāb. The most populous quarter of the city, called Ra's aṭ-Ṭāq (by the tenth-century geographers) or Darwāza-i Kish (by Sam'ānī), was already situated in the modern town, in the northern part of it. That the locality near the Kish gate

[1] See my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 106 sq.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 318.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii, 371.

[4] Cf. the account of my journey to Turkestan in 1916, *Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences*, 1916, p. 239 sq.

[5] Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 217; 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 323 (قنطرة كوهك).

[6] *s. v.* الغاتفرى (for the vocalization cf. الرستغفرى, *s. v.*). This quarter was situated near the modern citadel, cf. Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., p. 19.

[7] Near the same gate, in the town itself, have been found the remains (not yet excavated) of an old building; cf. *Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences*, 1916, p. 1241.

[8] *Al-Muzaffarīya*, pp. 14, 16.

was already incorporated in the town in pre-Islamic times is confirmed by Iṣṭakhrī's account[1] of an iron slab with incomprehensible letters which he saw on this gate. The inhabitants asserted that the inscription was in the Himyaritic language and that its contents were handed down from generation to generation; it stated the distance between Ṣan'ā, the capital of Yemen, and Samarqand, and the distance between several other points as well[2]. This explanation of the inscription is evidently of a piece with the fantastic legends already mentioned of the expeditions made by kings of Yemen to Samarqand, but the fact remains that there was in the tenth century a slab on the Kish gate bearing an inscription undecipherable by the inhabitants themselves. At the time of Iṣṭakhrī's stay in Samarqand, the gates were destroyed by rebels; later on they were rebuilt of 90
iron by the governor of the town, Abu'l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad b. Luqmān b. Naṣr b. Aḥmad b. Asad (a cousin of the Amīr Naṣr), but the inscription of course was not restored.

The outer wall of the city is described by Iṣṭakhrī in the following terms[3]. "The Sughd river flows between the rabaḍ and the town (shahristān); the wall stretches behind the river, from the locality known under the name of Afshīna past the Kūhak gate, subsequently encircling Warsnīn, Fanak gate, Rīwdad gate, Farrukhshīdh gate, and Ghadāwad gate; thence it extends to the river, which serves as a sort of fosse for the rabaḍ on the northern side. The length of the diameter of the wall surrounding the rabaḍ of Samarqand is two farsakhs." There is of course a contradiction here; if the river flowed between the shahristān and the rabaḍ, it could not be "like a fosse for the rabaḍ on the northern side." Elsewhere in Iṣṭakhri[4], and also in Maqdisī[5], it is stated that the gates were eight in number: Ghadāwad, Isbisk, Sūkhashīn, Afshīna, Warsnīn, Kūhak, Rīwdad, and Farrukhshīdh. The Fanak gate is not mentioned here, so that it is identical with either Isbisk or Sūkhashīn gate. Fanak is mentioned in Sam'ānī and in Yāqūt[6] as a village in the neighbourhood of Samarqand, at a distance of half a farsakh from the town. Ghadāwad was a quarter in the environs of Samarqand at a distance of one farsakh[7], Isbiskath (in Yāqūt Isbaskath) a village two farsakhs

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 318.

[2] The inscription is quoted, in a completer form than that given by Iṣṭakhrī, in Ibn al-Faqīh (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, v, 326) and Yāqūt (iii, 136) from the famous philologist Aṣma'ī (on whom see Brockelmann, i, 104). It has been suggested (by E. Blochet) that the inscription was in the Orkhon characters, which bear some resemblance to Ḥimyarī, but the Arabs gave the name of Ḥimyarī or Musnad to nearly all unknown scripts; cf *Zapiski*, xii, p. xxiv sq.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 317.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 318.

[5] *Ibid.*, iii, 278.

[6] Yāqūt, iii, 920.

[7] *Ibid.*, iii, 776. Sam'ānī spells غُذَاوَذ Ghudhāwadh.

from Samarqand [1], Warsnīn or Warsnān one of the quarters in Samarqand [2]. The village of Rīwdad, as we shall see farther on, lay to the south of the town, at a distance of one farsakh. In the tenth century all the gates of the rabaḍ were destroyed by order of the Sāmānid government, in consequence of an insurrection of the inhabitants [3]. At the edge of the village of Farrukhshīdh, outside the wall, was the grave of the Khwāja 'Abdī Bīrūn (the outer Kh.'A.) which is still shown to-day; another grave, before reaching the wall, is called Khwāja 'Abdī Darūn (the inner Kh.'A.) [4]. |

91 The ruins of the western wall are mentioned by Khanykov [5], four versts to the west of the present town. In Jannābī [6] ruins of the walls of the old town are mentioned situated still farther west, at a distance of half a day's journey from Samarqand; Tīmūr built here the town of Dimashq (now a village in the district (volost) of Anhār). This information refers to the rabaḍ wall, remains of which are visible even to-day and were explored by the Russian Committee for the Exploration of Central and Eastern Asia in 1903. The wall is called Dīwār-i Qiyāmat, or Kundalang, is nearly twenty-seven miles long and encloses a surface of nearly forty-four square miles [7].

The numbers of the population of course did not correspond to our idea of a town of this size; a considerable part of the area was occupied by gardens, almost each house possessing one; in viewing the town from the summit of the citadel no buildings were to be seen because of the trees in the gardens [8]. We have of course no statistical data regarding the number of the inhabitants of Samarqand; according to Ch'ang-Ch'un [9] there were about 100,000 families in the town prior to Chingiz-Khān's invasion. If we bear in mind that several years before this the town was devastated by the Khwārazm-shāh, and that the Qarā-Khānid epoch was on the whole one of decay in culture and consequently in civic life also, then we may, without exaggeration, conjecture that the Samarqand of the Sāmānids had more than 500,000 inhabitants.

The wide development of horticulture of which Iṣṭakhrī speaks required a considerable extension of artificial irrigation. The geographers of the tenth century, unfortunately, do not give

[1] Yāqūt, i, 238.
[2] *Ibid.*, iv, 921.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 367.
[4] Cf. Vyatkin in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, 279.
[5] *Opisanie Bukharskavo khanstva*, St. P., 1843, pp. 100 and 106, where it is called Divuol (i. e. Dīwāl or Dīwār) Qiyāmat.
[6] MS. As. Mus., No. 528, p. 452. Jannābī's source is Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Aja'ib*, ed. Cairo, 1285, p. 17.
[7] Vyatkin, *Materialy, &c.*, p. 21; *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, p. 277 sq.
[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 317
[9] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 311; Bretschneider, *Med. Res.*, i, 78.

us any detailed information on the ariqs of Samarqand; some few data, and these very obscure, are found in Nasafī[1]. According to his statements, the river entered the town through the western (?) gate and was split up into four channels, and each channel again into two branches, so | that there were eight 92
ariqs in all. The four channels were Jākardīza, Muzākhīn (or Mazdākhīn), Iskandargham, and Asangīn and Sangrasān; the two last names, apparently, designate two branches of one and the same channel. The area of the sections of land irrigated by them is defined in habls, each ḥabl containing 60 dhirā'[2]. Samarqand together with its environs was reckoned at 14,600 ḥabls (according to another manuscript only 4,600) and 670 (or 680) sluices. Of these the Jākardīza ariq, which watered the shahristān and is identical with the ariq of pre-Islamic construction mentioned by Iṣṭakhrī and Maqdisī, irrigated 1,067 ḥabls; its length was 17,240 gaz, and there were 59 sluices on it. The Muzākhīn (or Mazdākhīn) ariq was divided into 45 branches, and irrigated 2,900 ḥabls or 2,750 (or according to another manuscript 2,785) jifts (a jift being an area of ground which could be ploughed in one day by a yoke of oxen, like the Latin *jugum*); the Iskandargham ariq 1,486 jifts; the Asangīn and Sangrasān ariqs 275 jifts. According to this reckoning the total number of habls of ground must have been considerably above 4,600, and at the same time far below 14,600. All these channels watered only the town itself and its environs to the west and south; the environs to the north and east seem to have been irrigated, as now, only by channels derived from springs, such as the Siyāb (Siyāh Āb, or in Turkish Qara Su, Black Water) or the Āb-i Raḥmat mentioned by Bābur[3]. By the "Wādī's-Sughd" Iṣṭakhrī seems to have meant not only the Zarafshān but the Siyāb as well, as only thus can the contradiction mentioned above be explained. In the thirteenth century Ch'ang Ch'un[4] speaks only of two channels leading into the town; but even then, as in the tenth century, water was led into almost every house.

The name Jākardīza was borne in the twelfth century by one of the quarters of Samarqand, in which lay the cemetery which served as a burial-place for the 'Ulamā and the notables[5]. In

[1] *Texts*, pp. 49–50. Cf. Vyatkin's translation and comments in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, 252 sq., 287 sq., and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 108.

[2] Le Strange, *Baghdad*, p. 326.

[3] Ed. Beveridge, f. 48, trans., p. 81.

[4] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 311; Bretschneider, *Med. Res.*, i, 77 sq.

[5] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الجاكرديزى, where the following words (quoted in my *Texts*, p. 55, from the MS. of the Asiat. Mus.) are omitted: بها مقبرة كبيرة مشهورة للعلماء والكبار. The cemetery still exists, and is situated in the eastern part of the present native town

addition to those already mentioned, we know the following names of quarters (maḥalla) in Samarqand:

1. Asfizār in the shahristān with a palace of the Sāmānids[1]. 2. Bāb-Dastān, connected with which was the large quarter of Ushtābdīza[2]. 3. Panjkhīn[3], a large quarter. 4. Zaghrīmāsh[4], a large quarter. 5. Sangdīza (in Persian) or Raḍrāḍa (in Arabic)[5] (lit. "Small Stones"). 6. Farzāmīthan[6] in the rabaḍ. |
93 7. Faghīdiza[7]. 8. Kanwan[8]. 9. Māturīd or Māturīt[9] in the rabaḍ, now a village to the north-west of the town, a country residence for wealthy citizens[10]. 10. Gurjmīn (or Karjumīn?) with a palace of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn[11]. 11. Qibāb[12]. The Warsnīn quarter also bore the name Yārkath[13]. Sam'ānī[14] quotes in addition the names of three streets, the streets 'Abdak and Ṣālīḥ (in the Ghātfar quarter) and the street of the wall of Ḥayyān.

Of individual city edifices there are mentioned: 1. The old palace of the Arab Amīrs, in the citadel; in the time of Iṣṭakhrī[15] the palace was still intact, but Ibn Ḥawqal[16] found it already in a ruinous condition. 2. The prison, also in the citadel; it is already mentioned by Iṣṭakhrī though Ibn Ḥawqal says that it was built only in his own day. 3. The cathedral mosque, in the shahristān, near the citadel; a wide road[17] passed between it and the citadel; the site of this mosque, to the west

(*Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, 1896, vol. iv, pt. iv, pp. 31–2). Sam'ānī, *s.v.* السونخي, places the cemetery near the "Mazār Gate," meaning probably the Mazār of Qutham b. 'Abbās.

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 366.

[2] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الاشنانديزكى; Yāqūt, i, 275, 444.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* البنجخنى; Yāqūt, i, 743.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الزغريماشى; Yāqūt, ii, 931.

[5] Yāqūt, ii, 789; iii, 162, 168

[6] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الفرزامبثنى; Yāqūt, iii, 872.

[7] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الغغبدزى; Yāqūt, iii, 904 (where the name is spelt فَغَنْدَرَه).

[8] Yāqūt, iv, 313.

[9] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الماتريتى; mentioned by Yāqūt (iv, 378) under the erroneous spelling ماتيرب.

[10] Arandarenko, *Dosugi v Turkestanye*, p. 653. Māturīd was the home of the great theologian Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī, d *c.* 333/944 (Brock., i, 195); his grave is still shown to-day in Jākardīza, cf. *Bull. de l'Acad.*, &c., 1921, p. 215 sq.

[11] *Texts*, p. 87 ('Awfī).

[12] Yāqūt, iv, 25 (plural of قبّة, cupolas or tents).

[13] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* اليارکثى.

[14] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الزغريماشى and الساغرجى (where the reading عاهر in the facs. is a mistake for غاتفر). Sam'ānī (*s.v.* المربّعى) mentions also a quadrangular square (المربّعة) in Samarqand.

[15] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 316.

[16] *Ibid.*, ii, 365.

[17] *Ibid.*, i, 317.

of the citadel in Afrāsiyāb, was explored in 1904 and 1905 by Vyatkin and myself[1]. 4. The Castle of Rāfi' b. Layth[2]. The streets of the town were, with few exceptions, paved with stone; the buildings, as now, were for the most part constructed of clay and wood. The bazaars were mostly in the rabaḍ, chiefly near the Kish gate[3]. In the town and in the rabaḍ there were as many as 2,000 places where it was possible to obtain iced water gratis, the means for this being supplied by benefactors. The water was kept in fountains, or was put in copper cisterns and earthenware vessels[4]. Remarkable also is Ibn Ḥawqal's statement[5] on certain figures of animals standing in the public squares of Samarqand | (in spite of the fundamental rules of Islām): 94
"Astonishing figures are cut out of cypresses, of horses, oxen, camels, and wild beasts; they stand one opposite the other, as though surveying each other and on the eve of engaging in a struggle or combat."

Among the sanctuaries of the town the first place has always been held by the tomb of Qutham b. 'Abbās. Of this cousin of the Prophet, who is supposed to have arrived in Samarqand in the year 56/676 together with Sa'īd b. 'Othmān[6], we find contradictory accounts among the Arabs themselves; according to one he was killed, according to another he died a natural death[7]; by one account he even died not at Samarqand but at Merv[8]. The putative or actual tomb of Qutham became during the reign of his 'Abbāsid relations, and probably not without their participation, the object of a Muslim cult. Qutham is now known to the people under the name of Shāh-Zinda ("living prince"); there is a legend that he was not killed, but in saving himself from the infidels entered a cliff which opened miraculously before him and closed again after him[9].

Already in the time of Bābur[10] the tomb bore the name of

[1] Cf. *Zapiski*, xvi, p. xxxiv sq.; *Izvyest. Russk. Komiteta dlya izucheniya Srednei i Vost. Azii*, No 4, p. 21 sq., and No. 8, p. 22 sq. With deeper excavations the remains of the heathen temple which was at the same place should be found; cf. *Texts*, p. 49, and *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, 250.

[2] Sam'ānī, *s. v* العصرى (facs. f. 456 a, sup.).

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 317–19.

[4] *Ibid.*, i, 290; ii, 339.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii, 365.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, iii, 425. Ṭabarī in his account of Sa'īd's campaign (ii, 179) makes no mention of Qutham, but speaks of him in his other work (appended to the edition of the chronicle; cf. iii, 2352 *infra*).

[7] Beladsori, p. 412.

[8] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, vii, 298. Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 39.

[9] This legend is related in the book called "Qandīya" (see above, p. 15) in the part not translated by V. Vyatkin. A translation of the same legend from another source is given by Vyatkin in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, v, 230 sq. Other legends are quoted by M. Lapin in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, 1896, vol. 4, pt. iv, pp. 40–1.

[10] Bābur-Nāmah, ed. Beveridge, f. 44 b; trans., p. 75 (where already Shāh-i zinda). *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, 1896, vol. 4, pt. iv, p. 31.

Mazārshāh ("Tomb of the prince"). It is quite possible that there was some sort of a tomb here in pre-Islamic times which was revered by the natives, and that the cult of this tomb was transferred to the Muslim saint. Already in the twelfth century, as now, persons of importance were buried near Qutham's tomb; there was also a madrasa called by Qutham's name[1]. A detailed description of the tomb is first given by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa[2], from which it is evident that there was an edifice here in the pre-Tīmūrid period, considerably surpassing the present mausoleum in magnificence. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa refers its construction to pre-Mongol times; according to his account, the Tatars, when they were still heathen, not only caused no damage to the sanctuary,
95 but even began | to pay it respect, when they witnessed the miracles performed there. The mausoleum is described in the following terms: "Outside Samarqand is the tomb of Qutham b. 'Abbās b. 'Abd-al-Muṭṭalib; the inhabitants of Samarqand come out to visit it every Sunday and Thursday night. The Tatars (also) come to visit it, pay vows to it and bring cows, sheep, dirhams, and dīnārs; all this is used for the benefit of visitors and the servants of the hospital[3] and the blessed tomb. Above it is a square edifice with a cupola; at each corner are two marble columns, green, black, white, and red in colour. The walls of the building (also) are of different coloured marble with gold decoration (or inscriptions); the roof is made of lead. The tomb is covered with black wood adorned with precious stones whose corners are fastened with silver; above it burn three silver lamps. The hangings of the cupola are made of wool and cotton. Outside the building flows a large canal, which traverses the hospital situated there; on both banks there are trees, grape vines, and jasmine; and in the hospital there are chambers for visitors."

To Samarqand province were reckoned twelve districts[4] (rustāqs), six south of the Zarafshān (Būnjikath or Panjikath, Waraghsar, Māymurgh, Sanjarfaghān, Dargham, and Abghar), and six to the north (Yārkath, Būrnamadh, Buzmājan, Kabūdhanjakath, Wadhār, and Marzbān). The districts are enumerated in order from east to west; some of them, such as Māymurgh

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الكشانى. M. Lapin quotes an account attributing the construction of the madrasa to Sultan Sinjar from the "History of Nīshāpūr" by Abū 'Abdallāh. The quotation is actually taken from the modern "Samarīya" of Abū Ṭāhir Khōja, edited by Vesselovsky in 1904 (p. 22), and translated by Vyatkin in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, vol. vi (p. 175 sq.); cf. my review in *Zapiski*, xii, p. 0122 sq.

[2] *Voyages d'Ibn-Batoutah*, iii, 52–4. On the spelling of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa see Fischer in *ZDMG.*, lxxii, p. 289.

[3] The word الزاوية means "cell," and house for the reception of strangers; here it is evidently intended in the latter sense, or perhaps in the sense of "madrasa."

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 320–23; ii, 369–73.

(in which also Waraghsar and Sanjarfaghān were formerly incorporated), Kabūdhanjakath[1] and Abghar[2], formed in pre-Islamic times separate principalities. The Waraghsar, Māymurgh, Sanjarfarghān, and Dargham districts were irrigated by ariqs taken from Waraghsar; Dargham was considered specially fertile and was famed for its vineyards[3]. The whole irrigated area from Waraghsar to the western edge of Dargham was ten farsakhs in length and four in width[4]. In Abghar (the present volost of Chashma-āb) there was no artificial irrigation; it contained chiefly pasture and arable land, watered only by rain, which gave good harvests nevertheless (a hundredfold and even more); there were more villages too | than in the other districts. 96
Ibn-Ḥawqal asserted that in a good harvest year the produce of the Abghar fields could maintain the whole population of Soghd[5]. The district extended over an area of two days' journey, and single villages sometimes covered a stretch of two farsakhs. Two days' journey below Samarqand the Payy or Fayy[6] ariq branched off from the south bank of the river, its course extending to a distance of two days' journey; the locality which it watered was considered the most fertile and populous portion of Soghd. Fayy also in early times formed a separate principality[7]. There were no large towns besides Samarqand in the districts south of the Zarafshān. Only at Panjīkath was there a cathedral mosque; in the neighbourhood of this town were many fruit trees, and for quantity of fruit, especially of almonds and nuts, Panjīkath district took the first place. In Māymurgh there was a particularly large number of castles; here, in Rīwdad, the chief village of this district, were the castles of the Ikhshīds themselves, *i. e.* the pre-Muslim rulers of Soghd[8]. According to Sam'ānī[9] Rīwdad was one farsakh distant from Samarqand; in the twelfth century there was a military camp here at a certain period of the year. Samarqand province

[1] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 79–87; now also Marquart, *Chronologie*, p. 56 sq.; Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., p. 134 sq.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, v, 68.

[3] Dargham is already mentioned as a river (wādī) in the verses quoted by Yāqūt, ii, 568.

[4] The name Sanjarfaghān is preserved in the modern Zanjīrbāgh, a village on the right bank of the Yangi-arıq; cf. MS. Asiat. Mus., e 574 ag (waqf-nāmah of the sixteenth cent.), f. 38 a and 67 b, and Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c, 38.

[5] According to Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 279) the whole population of Soghd and Bukhārā for two years.

[6] Must be spelled فيّ not قيّ, as is proved by the modern name Narpay = Nahr-i Pay; cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 117. The explanations suggested by Marquart (*Chronologie*, p. 60, and *Ērānshahr*, p. 29, n. 2; cf. also his *Osttürk. Dialektstudien*, p. 197) are consequently erroneous.

[7] J. Marquart, *Chronologie der Altturkischen Inschriften*, Leipzig, 1898, S. 60 (from Tabarī, ii, 1422, where a prince (malik) of Fayy is mentioned).

[8] So *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 279.

[9] *s. v.* الريوددى.

extended southwards to the Shāwdār mountains, which formed a special district, and included among other villages the Nestorian village of Wāzkard, mentioned by Iṣṭakhrī and described in detail by Ibn-Ḥawqal. It may possibly be identical with the village of Wāzd or Wīzd in Shāwdār, mentioned by Sam'ānī[1] at a distance of four farsakhs from Samarqand. The district extended for more than ten farsakhs and was considered one of the healthiest and most beautiful localities. The Nestorians had churches and cells here; Ibn Ḥawqal saw there many Christians from 'Irāq, who had come in order to enjoy solitude and the healthy air. Vyatkin identifies this Christian village with the modern Kingir, in the district of Urgut[2].

Of the northern districts two, *i.e.* Yārkath and Būrnamadh, were on the border of the neighbouring province of Ushrūsana; the waters of the Zarafshān did not reach here, and the cultivated fields were irrigated from springs and by rainfall. By Sam'ānī[3]
97 Yārkath is already | reckoned to Ushrūsana; Yāqūt[4] reckons also Būrnamadh in Ushrūsana. Būrnamadh was four farsakhs from Zāmīn, on the main road from Samarqand[5]. The district of Buzmājan was watered by an ariq of the same name; its chief town, Bārkath or Abārkath[6], was on the main road from Samarqand to the Syr-Darya, four farsakhs from the former[7]; according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt the town was also for some time incorporated in Ushrūsana[8]. The district of Wadhār was traversed by the Sināwāb ariq, which reached to Ishtīkhān; the Kabūdhanjakath and Marzbān districts were irrigated by a special ariq taken off the river opposite Samarqand. The towns of Kabūdhanjakath and Wadhār were both at a distance of two farsakhs from Samarqand[9]. Tomaschek[10] identifies Kabūdhanjakath with the present village of Gubdan or Gubdun[11]. The town of Wadhār, like some of the villages of this district, was

[1] *s. v.* الوازدى.

[2] *Protok. Turk. kruzh.*, v, 159 sq; *Materialy*, &c., p. 37. To the north-west of Urgut, near the village of Sufiyān, have been found Christian "graffiti" with the figure of the cross and Syriac letters; cf. *Bull. de l'Acad.*, &c., 1921, p. 215.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الباركثى; Yāqūt, iv, 1001.

[4] Yāqūt, i, 755.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 20, 156.

[6] *Ibid.*, iii, 279.

[7] *Ibid.*, i, 334, 342.

[8] Yāqūt, i, 464; Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الباركثى (in the facs. by mistake الابارکثى, and *infra* ابارکث). Bārkath was on the site where Tīmūr built the village of Shīrāz (see my *Orosh. Turkestan*, 111).

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 342. According to Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الوذارى) and Yāqūt (iv, 916) Wadhār was four farsakhs from Samarqand, and according to Sam'ānī contained a fortress (حصن), a cathedral mosque and a minaret.

[10] *Soghdiana*, 85.

[11] The village of Kābud, the present Besh-arık (Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., 70) is mentioned by Bābur (ed. Beveridge, f. 59 b; trans., p. 98) together with Shīrāz.

the centre of the Arab population of the district; these Arabs belonged to the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il, but called themselves Subā'ites, evidently after Abū Muzāḥim Subā' b. an-Naḍr as-Sukkarī, the builder of the local cathedral mosque, who died in Jumādā I, 269[1] (end of 882). In the time of Ibn Ḥawqal the decline in the Arab colony was already noticeable, but some remains of its former greatness still existed. Even Sam'ānī visited the grave of Subā' b. an-Naḍr. In Wadhār cotton fabrics were manufactured which enjoyed a great reputation and commanded high prices even in 'Irāq. Ibn Ḥawqal speaks of them in very laudatory terms[2]. The district of Marzbān took its name from Marzbān b. Turgash[3], the ruler of this district, who, together with other dihqāns from Soghd was summoned to the Caliph's court.

North-west of Samarqand lay the districts of Ishtīkhān | and 98
Kushānīya[4], forming a separate administrative unit, and therefore not enumerated among the districts of Samarqand. From Samarqand to Ishtīkhān was reckoned to be seven farsakhs; from Ishtīkhān to Kushānīya one stage or five farsakhs[5]. Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[6] also reckon the distance from Samarqand to Kushānīya as twelve farsakhs. The Ishtīkhān ariq, as we have seen, was derived from the Zarafshān at Ghūbār. The village of Ishtīkhān, as is well known, still exists; in the tenth century it was a considerable town consisting of a shahristān, citadel, and rabaḍ. In the eighth century, after the occupation of Samarqand by the Arabs, the Ikhshīds of Soghd transferred their capital to it[7]. The revenues from the bazaars of Ishtīkhān and from some villages belonged to the general 'Ujayf b. 'Anbasa, who is mentioned in the history of the Caliphs[8]. They were confiscated by the Caliph Mu'taṣim; the Caliph Mu'tamid (870–92) placed these revenues at the disposal of Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir, ruler of Khurāsān (862–73). The district of Ishtīkhān extended over an area five days' journey long and one day broad, and its north-eastern frontier was the Sāgharj mountains; according

[1] Sam'ānī, *loc. cit.* The figure 209 in Yāqūt (iv, 917) is a mistake, as according to Sam'ānī, Abū Muzāḥim only returned to his native country from 'Irāq in 233.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 403.

[3] He is mentioned amongst the accusers of the famous Afshīn at the time of the latter's trial (225/840). Cf. Tabarī, iii, 1310, 1312; Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 365–6.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 323; ii, 374–5; iii, 279–80.

[5] *Ibid.*, i, 342; ii, 403.

[6] Yāqūt, iv, 276; Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الكشانى.

[7] See my article "Die Altturkischen Inschriften und die Arabischen Quellen," S 21–2 (Radloff, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, Zweite folge).

[8] The general of the Caliphs Ma'mūn and Mu'taṣim who betrayed Rāfi' b. Layth in 192/808 and transferred his services to the Caliph (Tabarī, iii, 732; Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 142); he was killed by order of Mu'taṣim in 223/838 (Tabarī, iii, 1265–6; Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 349).

to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[1] a village in the neighbourhood of Ishtīkhān five farsakhs from Samarqand bore the same name. In the same region was situated the town of Afarīnkath or Farankath, to-day Frinkent or Prinkent, built in the seventh century by Afārūn, brother of Ghūrak, prince of Samarqand[2].

Kushānīya district equalled Ishtīkhān in breadth (Maqdisī even defines its breadth at two days' journey) but in length was considerably smaller than it (only two stages). The town of Kushānīya was reckoned as the most flowery in Soghd (of course after Samarqand); Iṣṭakhrī calls it "the heart of the Soghdian towns." In pre-Muslim times it constituted a separate principality[3]; the title of Kushān-shāh is mentioned even by Ṭabarī[4]. According to Ibn Khurdādhbih[5] the Kushān-shāh was at one time styled ruler of all Transoxania. This statement probably
99 refers to the period of Yueh-Chih or Kushan rule; the name | of Kushans was transferred also to the succeeding rulers of the land, the Hayṭāl or Ephthalites[6]. Iṣṭakhrī[7] indicates the distance from Ishtīkhān and Kushānīya to the towns situated on the main road from Samarqand to Bukhārā; from Ishtīkhān to Zarmān was one farsakh, and from Kushānīya to Rabinjan or Arbinjan two farsakhs.

The road between Samarqand and Bukhārā or "Royal road"[8] (Shāh-rāh), by which the two great cities of Transoxania were united, was always of great importance. From Samarqand to Bukhārā was reckoned at 37 or 39 farsakhs and six or seven days' journey[9]. The first village on this road was Zarmān, at a distance of seven farsakhs from Samarqand; it is already mentioned in the eighth century[10], and was probably not far from the present Chimbai[11]. Between Samarqand and Zarman, two farsakhs from the former, was the castle of 'Alqama[12]. The

[1] Yāqūt, iii, 11.

[2] Cf. *Fihrist*, p. 18; *Texts*, p. 48 (Qandīya; trans. in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, viii, 241) and *Zapiski*, viii, 9. Even in the seventeenth century Afarinkent was the residence of a hākim or beg, and only after this time was superseded by Dahbīd. The inhabitants of both villages are Persians (Tajiks); in Afarinkent there are also some Arabs: Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., 57 sq.

[3] *Soghdiana*, 89–99.

[4] Marquart, *Chronologie der Alttürkischen Inschriften*, S. 59.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 29. Tomaschek is, therefore, apparently right in considering Kushānīya the capital of the Kushans.

[6] According to the Chinese historians there was in Kushānīya a building with pictures of the Emperors of China, the Turks, Persia, and Rome, and of Hindu Brahmans (Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., p. 145). The place is called to-day Kashan-Ata (Vyatkin, *Materialy*, p. 49).

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 343. Ḥāfiẓ-Abrū (*al-Muẓaffarīya*, p. 21) also gives the distance from Kushānīya to Dabūsiya (five farsakhs).

[8] This term is used by Narshakhī (ed. Schefer, p. 11).

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 334; v, 325; vi, 19, 156.

[10] Tabarī, ii, 1529.

[11] At the present day Zarmān is a very small village (Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., p. 76).

[12] Koshk-i 'Alqama (the castle of 'Alqama) or "Imam Ata-i 'Alkama" is even yet

next town, Rabinjan or Arbinjan, five or six farsakhs from Zarmān, is also already mentioned in the eighth century[1]. It was probably somewhat west of the present Katta-Kurgan, not far from the Zirabulak heights. In the twelfth century the town was destroyed during the invasion of the Khwārazm-shāh[2] Il-Arslān (in 1158). Judging by the distances, the above-mentioned locality of Fayy (p. 93) irrigated by the ariq of the same name, is identical with Arbinjan and its neighbourhood[3]. The next chief stations on this road, namely Dabūsiya, Karmīnīya, and Ṭawāwīs, are of the same antiquity. The name of Dabūsiya (five farsakhs from Rabinjan) has been preserved in the name of the ruins of Qal'a-i Dabūs, somewhat to the east of the village of Ziyā ad-Dīn; ancient Dabūsiya probably included also the castle Qal'a-i Ziyā ad-Dīn, adjacent to the tumulus of ruins, which is the residence of the local ruler. To quote N. F. Sitnyakovski[4], who examined the ruins: "The vast cemetery may prove that a town really existed here." The construction of the fortress was (probably erroneously) | ascribed 100
in the fifteenth century to Jalāl ad-Dīn, the last Khwārazm-shāh[5].

Five farsakhs from Dabūsiya was Karmīnīya, the present Kermine; Narshakhī[6] reckons the distance to Karmīnīya from Bukhārā at 14, Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[7] at 18 farsakhs. According to a local tradition quoted by Narshakhī the town was originally called Bādiya-i khurdak (literally "Little pitcher"). An unsuccessful etymology was propounded by one of the local pundits of the twelfth century, and quoted in Sam'ānī, according to which the town received its new name from the Arabs, who found the environs of the town, in fertility of soil and quantity of water, "similar to Armenia" (ka-Armīnīya). Sam'ānī found the town in a ruined condition, which was probably the work

the name of a village ten miles from Samarqand on the main road to Bukhārā (Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., 57; *Ref. Bk.*, &c., VI, 254).

[1] Tabarī, II, 1249.

[2] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الربنجنى.

[3] The Narpay is even to-day the only source of irrigation in the district of Katta-Kurghan; Khanykov (*Opis. Bukh. khan.*, p. 35) thinks that it is not an artificial channel but a natural arm of the river. If this channel was artificial it may have been constructed after the time of Alexander, when "Marakanda" (Samarqand) was destroyed, and the political centre of the Zarafshān basin was, as we are told by the Chinese, from the second century B C., in the district of modern Katta Kurghan. Samarqand is not mentioned by the Chinese before the fifth century of our era. Near Zirabulak is now the hill Ramjan or Ramjan-Tepe, just on the former (pre-1914) frontier between Russia and Bukhārā; cf. Vyatkin, *Materialy*, &c., 55; Pospyelov in *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, X, 108

[4] *Protok. Turk. Kruzh*, Year III, p. 92. The ruins were again visited and described, in much more detail, by the late L. Zimin in 1915 (printed in 1917, *Protokoly*, &c., XXI, 43–64).

[5] *al-Muzaffarīya*, p. 21.

[6] Nerchakhy, p. 10.

[7] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الكرمنى; Yāqut, IV, 268.

of the Khwārazm-shāh Il-Arslān; in the fifteenth century there was again a large town on the site[1]. At a distance of one farsakh (according to Sam'ānī two farsakhs) to the east of Karmīnīya, and approximately 350 yards[2] to the north of the main road, was the village of Khudīmankan, which in the twelfth century belonged to the "followers of the Ḥadīth" or Shāfi'ites and had a cathedral mosque[3]. North of the river at a distance of one farsakh from Karmīnīya, was the village of Kharghānkath, and close beside it that of Madhyāmjakath. Tomaschek[4] connects Kharghānkath (present Kalkan-ata) with the name of the Ho-han territory, which, according to Chinese accounts, was situated between Kushānīya and Bukhārā.

The next large village, Ṭawāwīs, seven or eight[5] farsakhs from Bukhārā, was already within the wall encircling Bukhārā and its suburbs[6]. It received its Arabic name (literally "peacocks") in the year 91/710[7]; it was here that the Arabs first saw peacocks, which were kept, according to Narshakhī[8], in the houses of the local magnates, according to Ṭabarī in the village. The ancient name of the town was Arfūd[9]. Besides the idol
101 temple at | Arfūd, there was also a temple of the fire worshippers. In olden times a bazaar was held here annually in the late autumn, lasting ten days (seven, according to Bīrūnī[10]); articles bought at this bazaar were under no consideration taken back, even though deception was afterwards proved against the seller. At this bazaar gathered merchants from the various districts of Transoxania, even from Farghāna and Shāsh; these fairs were the source of the wealth of the inhabitants, who occupied themselves but little with agriculture. Ṭawāwīs possessed a cathedral mosque, although it was inferior in size to Karmīnīya; its fortress was in ruins[11] as early as the end of the tenth century,

[1] *al-Muẓaffarīya*, p. 21.

[2] In Iṣṭakhrī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 316, 343) غلوة; according to Ibn Rusta (*ibid.*, vii, 22) this measure equalled $\frac{1}{24}$ farsakh, or a little more than $\frac{1}{4}$ km.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الخديمنكنى.

[4] *Soghdiana*, 99–100; Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., pp. 137 and 273. A tradition is still preserved among the natives of a local ruler Khar-Khān (*Protokol. Turk. kruzh.*, Year III, p. 94).

[5] The latter figure is from Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الطراويسى.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 313; iii, 281.

[7] Tabarī, ii, 1230.

[8] Nerchakhy, p. 11.

[9] In the printed edition of Narshakhī ارقود, but in Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الأرقودى) and Yāqūt (i, 209) Arfūd is mentioned as a village near Karmīnīya on the road to Bukhārā. With the old name of Ṭawāwīs may perhaps be connected also Warqūd (Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الورقودى in Yāqūt (iv, 922) Waraqūd, a village in the neighbourhood of Karmīnīya.

[10] *Chronology*, trans. by E. Sachau, p. 221.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 281.

and by the fifteenth the village also had disappeared[1]. The village of Kūk or Kūkshībaghan, where the Turks once mustered in their raids on the province of Bukhārā, was, according to one account six[2], according to another three[3], farsakhs east of Ṭawāwīs.

The journey from Bukhārā to Ṭawāwīs was completed sometimes in one day, sometimes in two; in the second case the intermediate station was the village of Shargh or Jargh[4], four farsakhs from Bukhārā on the bank of the Sāmjan ariq, well-known in later times under the name of Ḥarāmkām. In the twelfth century Arslān-Khān Muḥammad built a substantial bridge here of burnt brick. Opposite Shargh, on the other bank of the ariq, was the village of Iskijkath or Sikijkath[5]. Both villages were important industrial trading centres, which was the cause of the prosperity of their inhabitants; the soil could not maintain them, as the land of Iskijkath, cultivated and uncultivated, amounted altogether to 1,000 jifts. There was a bazaar at Iskijkath every Thursday, and at Shargh every Friday; in early times there was a fair at Shargh in the middle of winter, which is mentioned also by Bīrūnī[6]. Iskijkath, like Ishtīkhan, belonged to the Caliph, and was given in fief to Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir, who sold his right to Sahl b. Aḥmad ad-Daghūnī. | The latter built on the bank of the ariq a large 102
palace, which was subsequently destroyed by the waters of the Zarafshān. In the eleventh century, under Shams-al-Mulk Naṣr, Khān-Sālār, one of the inhabitants of the village, built a cathedral mosque here, at his own expense, but in consequence of the protests of the Bukhārā Imāms, service was only once held in it. In the twelfth century Arslān-Khān Muḥammad built a rabāt in Iskijkath and a cathedral mosque at Shargh[7]. Near Shargh and Iskijkath were situated the villages of Bamijkath[8] (four farsakhs from Bukhārā, and half a farsakh north of the road), Sakbiyān[9] (near Bamijkath) and Dīmas (according to Maqdisī[10] on the road between Ṭawāwīs and Bukhārā, according to Sam'ānī[11] three farsakhs from Bukhārā).

[1] *al-Muzaffariya*, p. 21. With Ṭawāwīs must probably be identified the ruins of Shahr-i Wayrān ("the ruined city") near the wall, described by L. Zimin (*Protok. Turk. kruzh*, xx, 135 sq.).

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 19. [3] *Ibid.*, vi, 156.

[4] Yāqūt, iii, 276. The correct spelling should be Chargh.

[5] *Ibid.*, iii, 106. [6] *Chronology*, trans. by E. Sachau, p. 222.

[7] Nerchakhy, pp. 11–13.

[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 315, 342; Yāqūt, i, 737.

[9] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السكبانى; in Yāqūt (iii, 106) the position of the village is not indicated.

[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 342.

[11] Facs. Margoliouth, *s. v.* الديمسى; above (*s. v.* الديماسى) it is stated that ديماس (dīmās) means ḥammām (bath). In Yāqūt (ii, 713) the distance is not mentioned.

Bukhārā, unlike Samarqand, has always occupied its present position; even the plan of the town, in spite of frequent and devastating nomad invasions, has scarcely changed in a thousand years. In the Sāmānid period the town was of course divided into citadel, shahristān, and rabaḍ; the shahristān was situated close by the citadel, on rising ground which could not be supplied with running water[1]. From this it is evident that the shahristān occupied the high central part of the present town which is even now very conspicuous. The construction of the citadel[2] was somewhat different from that at present; it had two gates, the Rīgistān gate (on the west) and the cathedral mosque gate (on the east); the latter is called Ghūriyān in Narshakhī, and in the twelfth century the former was called "the gate of the hay sellers"[3] ('Alaf-Furūshān or Kāh-Furūshān). The western and eastern gates were connected by a street[4]. Inside the fortress, according to Iṣṭakhrī, was another, which served as a residence for the Sāmānid rulers. This is evidently the castle (kākh)
103 mentioned by Narshakhī, | built in the seventh century by the Bukhār-Khudāt Bīdūn[5], the builder or restorer of the citadel; the name of Bīdūn was for long preserved on an iron plate fastened to the gates of the castle. There existed a tradition that the castle was destroyed several times before it was finished, but finally, on the advice of the wise men, the palace was strengthened by seven stone columns, according to the number of stars in the Great Bear, and thereupon the building was successfully completed. Subsequently both citadel and castle were destroyed; Arslān-Khān Muḥammad restored them in the twelfth century. In the year 534/1139–40 the citadel was destroyed by the Khwārazm-shāh Atsiz; in 536/1141–2 it was restored by Alptagīn, the Qarā-Khiṭāy ruler of the town; in 538/1143–4 it was again destroyed by the Ghuzz. In 560/1165 the material was employed in constructing the walls of the Bukhārā rabaḍ. In 604/1207–8 the Khwārazm-shāh Muhammad restored the citadel, which stood thereafter till its destruction by Chingiz-Khān in 1220.

The shahristān, in contrast to those at Samarqand, Balkh, and Merv, had seven gates; it may be that here too the same religious considerations came into play as in the construction

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 305, 307.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 305–6; Nerchakhy, pp. 21–3.

[3] Thus Nerchakhy, pp. 7, 22. From Narshakhī's text in another passage (p. 21) it might be deduced that this name was borne by the eastern gate.

[4] The two gates (at present there is only one, the western) are mentioned also in the fifteenth century; cf. my *Ulughbeg i evo vremya*, p. 51.

[5] This is apparently the same person as the prince Bīdūn who came to the help of the queen of Bukhārā from Turkestan (Nerchakhy, p. 40). Balādhurī (ed. de Goeje, p. 413) calls Bīdūn the king of all Soghd. In Justi (*Iranisches Namensbuch*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 62 b and 219 b) the readings Bandūn, Baydūn, and Naydūn are quoted.

of the castle in the citadel. The shahristān gates are enumerated in Iṣṭakhrī[1] and in Narshakhī[2], by the latter in the following order: (1) Bazaar Gate (in Iṣṭakhrī Iron Gate), subsequently called Gate of the Spice Sellers (ʿAṭṭārān); (2) Shahristān Gate (in Iṣṭakhrī Bāb-al-Madīna); (3) Banū-Ṣaʿd Gate; (4) Banū Asad Gate, called in pre-Muslim times Muhra Gate; (5) Citadel Gate[3]; (6) Ḥaqq-rāh Gate; (7) New Gate, built later than the others[4]. Of the position of these gates, except of course of the citadel gate, which was situated opposite the citadel, we cannot gain any precise idea from the text of Narshakhī; it is clear only that the Bazaar gate, | the Banū-Ṣaʿd gate, and the 104
Banū-Asad gate were all close to one another. The Citadel gate was considered the strongest of the shahristān gates; near them was a fortification built by a certain Turkish ruler Sūbashi-tagīn[5] (i.e. "prince army-chief"). Here especially were the houses of the Arabs; in the tenth century this quarter, which was called Faghsadara, was already in ruins. The Ḥaqq-rāh gate (literally "Way to the truth") owed its name to the fact that here lived the famous sage Abū Ḥafṣ (d. 217/832[6]), to whom it was the custom to refer doubtful questions for solution. The tumulus where the sage was buried was situated near the New gate. Elsewhere[7] Narshakhī places close by the tumulus of Abū Ḥafṣ a large tumulus, which was considered to be the tomb of the mythological Afrāsiyāb, and which was near the "Maʿbid Gate," or "Gate of the palace of Maʿbid;" according to Narshakhī[8] this gate owed its name to the Arab governor of the town Maʿbid-al-Khayl (literally "object of worship of horsemen"). From the western gate of the citadel to the Maʿbid gate extended the Rīgistān[9]. Evidently the Maʿbid gate is identical with the Faghāskūn or present Imām gate[10], where there is even yet "a large and high mound with two smaller ones, long and narrow." The mounds and tumuli are even now

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 306. [2] Nerchakhy, pp. 52–6.

[3] In Schefer's ed., p. 54, كنديز should be read in place of كبريه; cf. Muḥammad Narshakhī, Russian trans. by N. Lykoshin, p. 72.

[4] So according to Narshakhī's explanation; in Schefer's ed. we find instead of نو also the reading نون (p. 52); de Goeje, on the ground of the spelling of the Arabic manuscripts, adopted the reading نور.

[5] In Schefer's ed. سوناس.

[6] This date is doubtful; the son of Abū Ḥafṣ is mentioned as chief of the town in 874 (cf. below).

[7] Nerchakhy, p. 15.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 51. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[10] This gate takes its name from the "Great Imām" Abū Ḥafṣ, and bears his name in literary works; cf. the MS. of the Public Library in Petrograd Khan. 81 (History of Naṣrullāh), f. 117 a. The tomb of the Imām is shown there even yet; the name is spelt to-day in Bukhārā (of course erroneously) Abū Ḥifṣ. In the modern inscription on the tomb the Imām is called "Teacher of the learned men of Transoxania" (استاد علماء ماوراء النهر). Cf. *Bull. de l'Acad*, &c., 1921, p. 215.

occupied by cemeteries[1]. The New gate therefore was in the northern part of the shahristān. The Ḥaqq-rāh gate was somewhat more to the west; the mosque of the Qurayshites was on the right hand on entering through the New gate, not far from the dwelling of Abū Ḥafṣ.

The wall of the rabaḍ[2] was already built in the Muslim period, in 235/849–50 to be exact, and, like the present city walls, had eleven gates. Iṣṭakhrī[3] enumerates them in consecutive order, beginning at the south-western corner of the town. The gates are as follows: (1) The Gate of the Square (al-Maydān), leading to the Khurāsān road; (2) Ibrāhīm Gate, to the east of the first; (3) Rīw; (4) Mardkushān (Iṣṭ. Mardqusha); (5)
105 Kallābādh; (6) Nawbahār[4]; | (7) Samarqand, from which the road ran to Samarqand and the rest of the Transoxania; (8) Faghāskūn; (9) Rāmīthan; (10) Ḥadshirūn, whence the road led to Khwārazm; (11) Ghushaj. The Mardkushān and Kallābādh gates led to the road to Nasaf (Qarshi) and Balkh. These data prove that:

The Gate of the Square corresponded to the present Qarākul Gate.
The Ibrāhīm Gate corresponded to the Shaykh Jalāl Gate.
The Rīw „ „ „ Namāzgāh Gate.
The Mardkushān Gate „ „ Sallakhāna Gate.
The Kallābādh „ „ „ Kawala (Qarshī) Gate.
The Nawbahār „ „ „ Mazār Gate.
The Samarqand „ „ „ Samarqand Gate.
The Faghāskūn „ „ „ Imām Gate.
The Rāmīthan „ „ „ Uglan Gate.
The Ḥadshirūn „ „ „ Talipach Gate.
The Ghushaj „ „ „ Shīrgīrān Gate.

Narshakhī states[5] that at the period of the Arab invasion the whole town consisted only of the shahristān. From his own words elsewhere[6], however, it is evident that even in pre-Muslim times other parts of the town were also of importance, though it is probable that they were not then incorporated in the city. The boundaries of the old town (*i.e.* the pre-Sāmānid town, going back perhaps as far as the time of Abū Muslim[7]), were

[1] *Sbornik materialov po Azii*, pt. xlvii, p. 56.
[2] Nerchakhy, pp. 33–4.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 306 sq.
[4] According to Tomaschek (*Soghdiana*, 103) the Sanskrit word Vihâra assumed in the Ephthalite empire, as subsequently among the Uighurs and Mongols, the form Bukhār, while among the Iranians in general we meet the form Bahār; as proof he quotes the name of the Nawbahār temple (see p. 79) and some other places in the neighbourhood of Balkh. The existence of a Nawbahār gate in Samarqand and Bukhārā shows that here also, at least at a certain period, the Iranian form was in use.
[5] Nerchakhy, p. 29.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 19–24.
[7] Cf. Nerchakhy, p. 63.

delimited by another wall, also with eleven gates[1], named as follows: (1) Iron Gate; (2) Gate of the Ḥassān Bridge; (3) and (4) Gates near the Mākh mosque; (5) Rukhna[2]; (6) Gate near the Castle of Abū Hishām al-Kinānī; (7) Gate near the Bridge of the little bazaar (Suwayqa); (8) Fārjak Gate; (9) Darwāzja Gate; (10) Gate of the Street of the Magians; (11) Samarqand Gate (interior). From Narshakhī's account[3] of the great fire of the year 325/937 it is evident that the Fārjak madrasa, and consequently also the gate of the same name, were to the north of the main city ariq (which flowed, as we | shall see farther on, 106
in approximately the same locality as at present), and the Mākh mosque to the south of it. In this case, therefore, the enumeration of the gates begins at the north-eastern part of the town, and their sites may be fixed in the following manner:

Iron Gate opposite Nawbahār (Mazār) Gate.
Gate of Ḥassān bridge opposite Kallābādh (Qarshī) Gate.
Gates of Mākh mosque opposite Mardkushān and Rīw (Sallākhāna and Namāzgāh) Gates.
Rukhna Gate opposite Ibrāhīm (Shaykh Jalāl) Gate.
Gate of the Castle of Abū Hishām opposite the Gate of the Square (Qarākul Gate).
Gate of the little bazaar bridge opposite Ghushaj (Shīrgīrān) Gate.
Fārjak Gate opposite Ḥadshirūn (Talipach) Gate.
Darwāzja Gate opposite Rāmīthan (Uglan) Gate.
Gate of the Street of the Magians opposite Faghāskūn (Imām) Gate.
Samarqand Gate opposite Samarqand Gate.

The double wall which surrounded the town was rebuilt first by Arslān-Khān Muḥammad in the twelfth century, subsequently by Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd in 560/1165, and in the beginning of the thirteenth century by Khwārazm-Shāh Muḥammad.

Before proceeding to enumerate the names which have been preserved of the quarters and streets, we must say a few words on the system of irrigation[4]. According to Narshakhī the main city ariq bore the name of Rūd-i-zar (literally "Golden" or "Gold-bearing" river). Maqdisī says, "The river enters the town on the Kallābādh side; here sluices are constructed, forming wide locks and built of timber. In the summer flood season one after another of the beams is removed according to the height of the water, so that the larger part goes into the

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 307; ii, 356; iii, 280.

[2] Very probably, however, here, as in *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 278 f., رحبة (courtyard, square) should be read instead of رخنة.

[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 93-4.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 31; *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, i, 307-9; iii, 331-2.

locks, and then flows to Paykand; without this skilful arrangement the water would have reverted to the town. This locality is called Fāshūn; below the town are other sluices, called Ra's al-Waragh ('Head of the sluice') built in the same manner. The river cuts through the town, passes through the bazaars and disperses (in canals) along the streets. There are large open reservoirs (ḥiyāḍ) in the town; on the edge are structures of planks with doors, which serve for ablutions. Sometimes the water which is diverted towards Paykand rises too high, and portions of ground are flooded in the middle of the summer. 97 In the year that I arrived there, there had been floods in | many parts, and the population had been ruined; the Shaykhs set about building a dam; Shaykh Abū'l-'Abbās al-Yazdādī is reckoned to have contributed a large sum of money towards it. The water is turbid and a lot of refuse is thrown into it."

From Maqdisī's words it is evident that the ariq entered the town near the present Qarshī gate, *i.e.* approximately at the same place at it does now. It is evident that the above-mentioned Ḥassān bridge was built over the ariq in the eastern part of the town. The position of "the gate of little bazaar bridge" leads us to assume that the ariq flowed out of the town near the present Shīrgīrān gate.

Iṣṭakhrī enumerates the following small city ariqs, derived according to his statement[1] from the large Zar ariq which bisected the town:

(1) Fashīdīza ariq; flowed from the Waragh locality (as the ariq entered the town from the eastern side this place probably corresponds to Fāshūn but not to the Ra's al-Waragh of Maqdisī), passed through the Mardkushān (now Sallakhāna) gate, past the Jubār (literally "watercourse") of Abū Ibrāhīm, reached the gate of "the famous Shaykh Abu'l-Faḍl" and fell into the Nawkanda ariq. On this ariq there were about 2,000 castles and gardens, not counting agricultural lots; the length of its course was about half a farsakh. Shaykh Abu'l-Faḍl is the famous Sāmānid wazir Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh Bal'amī (died 329/940); by the gate called after him we must probably understand the Ibrāhīm gate, which received from him its present appellation (Shaykh Jalāl). Near his tomb there is even yet the Jubār madrasa and cemetery.

(2) Jūybār-Bakār ariq (literally "useful watercourse"); it flowed from a locality in the middle of the town near the Aḥyad mosque, and also fell into the Nawkanda ariq after irrigating part of the rabaḍ. There were 1,000 gardens and castles on it.

(3) Jūybār al-Qawārīrīyīn ("watercourse of the glaziers");

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 307 sq.

this issued from the river at a place in the town known as "Mosque of the Army Paymaster" (ʿāriḍ) and irrigated part of the rabaḍ. It carried a larger volume of water than the preceding ariq and irrigated a large number of gardens.

(4) Jū-Ghushaj or Jūybār al-ʿāriḍ; it flowed out of the town near the Mosque of the Army Paymaster, irrigated part of the rabaḍ, and fell into the Nawkanda ariq. The first name of this ariq proves that its course lay in the western part of the town, where consequently the Mosque of the Army Paymaster was situated. |

(5) Paykand ariq, which issued near the beginning of the 108
"street of the Guide" (Khutaʿ), watered a part of the rabaḍ, and fell into the Nawkanda ariq. From the information given below it is evident that this Bukharan ariq only took its name from the town of Paykand (if the spelling of the name is correctly established by de Goeje) but, apparently, had no connexion at all with it.

(6) Nawkanda ariq, which issued from the river near the "house of Ḥamdūna." Into it flowed the waters of the other ariqs, and after irrigating part of the rabaḍ it lost itself in the steppe, without serving to irrigate any agricultural lands. The name of this ariq (literally "newly dug") leads to the supposition that it was dug later than the other ariqs, probably to drain off any superfluous water. It evidently flowed in the western, particularly the south-western, part of the town.

(7) The Mill (Ṭākhūna) ariq, which issued from the river inside the town at Nawbahār, and irrigated part of the rabaḍ. On this ariq stood many mills; its waters flowed to Paykand and the inhabitants of the latter made use of it. In all probability, therefore, the sluices mentioned by Maqdisī were near the Mazār gate.

(8) Kushna ariq; it also issued inside the town near the site of Nawbahār, where the rabaḍ made use of its waters. There were many castles, agricultural lots and gardens on it; it passed through Kushna and reached Māymurgh, a village situated at a distance of one long stage from Nasaf (Qarshi)[1].

(9) Rabāh (literally "revenue") ariq; flowed out of the river near Rīgistān and reached the castle of Rabāḥ; there were nearly 1,000 castles and gardens on it.

(10) Rīgistān ariq; issued near the Rīgistān which used its water together with the citadel and the palace; it reached the Jalāl-Dīza castle.

(11) An ariq, whose name is not quoted, issued from the river near the Ḥamdūna bridge (*i.e.* probably approximately the

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 337.

same place as the source of the Nawkanda ariq); it flowed underground to ḥawḍs situated near the Banū Asad gate (*i.e.* near the south-western side of the shahristān) and its surplus water was discharged into the citadel moat.

(12) Zughārkanda ariq; issued from the river in the locality called Waragh (here, probably, is meant the Ra's al-Waragh of
109 Maqdisī), passed near the | Darwāzja gate, through the bazaar of the same name, thence to the Samarqand gate, and reached the Sapīd-Māsha locality. Its course was a farsakh in length and there were many castles, gardens, and agricultural sections on it. It is plain that this ariq flowed through the north-western part of the town.

We shall leave the comparison of these data with the actual conditions of irrigation in Bukhārā to those who are able to prosecute topographical researches on the spot[1]. For the data on the quarters, streets, and edifices of the mediaeval city, we must linger first of all on the data relative to the shahristān which we find in Narshakhī[2]. Qutayba divided the shahristān among the Arabs, and assigned the area from the Gate of the Bazaar to the New Gate to the Muḍar and Rabī'a tribes, and the remainder to the Yemenites. On entering the town through the Gate of the Bazaar, "the street of the drunkards" (Kū-i-Rindān) was on the left; behind it was the Christian Church, which was subsequently converted into the Mosque of the Banū Ḥanẓala tribe. On entering through the Shahristān gate the street of Wazīr b. Ayyūb b. Ḥassān was on the right; it was also called "the street of the castle" (Kū-i-Kākh). Ayyūb b. Ḥassān, a contemporary of Qutayba, was the first Arab amīr of Bukhārā, and the succeeding amīrs also lived here. The street and castle belonged to the dihqān Khīnah, who afterwards took the Muslim name of Aḥmad. Near the walls of the shahristān were the "wooden vegetable stalls" (Chūba-i Baqqālān) and the "bazaar of the crackers of pistachio nuts." Near the Banū-Ṣa'd gate in the shahristān was the castle of Ḥasan b. 'Alā Ṣa'dī; the street and gate bore the name of his father, 'Alā. There was no other castle like it, not even of the princes; the locality within the enclosure built by Ḥasan brought in a monthly revenue of 1,200 dīnārs. Near the exit of the Banū-Asad gate was the palace of the Amīr of Khurāsān. Near the Ḥaqq-rāh gate, about the north-western corner of the shahristān, was still preserved and revered the cell of the Imām Abū Ḥafṣ, and close by it were many mosques and cells. Not far from it, on the right hand side of the entrance through the New Gate,

[1] Cf. now the paper of I. Umnyakov in *Sbornik Turk. Vost. Instituta*, Tashkent 1923, p. 148 sq.
[2] Nerchakhy, pp. 52–7.

was the mosque of the Qurayshites, whose founder was the Qurayshite Muqātil b. Sulaymān, patron (?)[1] of the famous Nabataean Ḥayyān, who fought along with Qutayba. |

The great tumulus mentioned above (p. 101), which was con- 110
sidered to be the tomb of Afrāsiyāb, was in the Sāmānid period regarded as pre-Islamic. The tomb of Afrāsiyāb's victim Siyāwush was situated near the eastern gate of the citadel, and the fire-worshippers sacrificed a cock here before sunrise on the day of Nawrūz. There existed songs in honour of Siyāwush, which were known under the name of "Lamentations of the Magians."[2] In addition to the well-known castle in the citadel, there were, even in pre-Islamic times, royal palaces also in the Rīgistān[3]. Besides this, great importance attached in pre-Islamic times to the locality in the south-east quarter of the town which was afterwards given the name of the "Gate of the mosque of Mākh." Here there was the Mākh-rūz bazaar, where twice a year fairs were held at which idols (probably Buddhist figures) were sold; this heathen custom existed even under the Sāmānids[4], and the demand for idols was still so considerable that 50,000 dirhams' worth were sold. The founder of this custom was supposed to have been the legendary prince Mākh; according to the tradition there used to be a grove here, and the fair was held under the shade of the trees; the prince sat enthroned on the spot where in later times the Mosque was built, and encouraged the people to purchase idols. Later on the temple of the fire-worshippers was built on the spot where on the days of the fair the people gathered for Divine worship; in Muslim times one of the principal mosques was built here[5]. Already by the twelfth century Sam'ānī[6] had heard this tradition in another version and recounts that Mākh was a fire-worshipper who accepted Islam and converted his house into a mosque. In Sam'ānī's time there was a permanent bazaar in the quarter of the "Gate of the Mosque of Mākh."

Finally, in the eighth century, great importance was acquired by yet another locality, to which after Qutayba's conquest of

[1] The word مولى, as is well known, has different meanings; it may signify client as well as patron. The second is the more probable in this case, as Ḥayyān was a Nabataean, but Muqātil a Qurayshite.

[2] Nerchakhy, p. 21.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 24.

[4] Narshakhī says that this custom "existed even in his own time." We may conclude from this that it was abolished at a date subsequent to the birth of the author, which occurred in 286/899 (Sam'ānī, *s. v.* النرشخي), and before the compilation of his book (332/943-4).

[5] *Ibid.*, pp 18–19. At the present day the mosque of Mākh is identified with the mosque of the fosse (Maghāk); cf. *Bull. de l'Acad.*, &c., 1919, p. 926, and *Sbornik Vost. Inst.*, p. 151. The modern name "Mosque of Maghāk" for "Mosque of Mākh" is already mentioned by Narshakhī, p. 63.

[6] *S. v.* الماخى; Yāqūt, iv, 380.

the town the rich merchants of foreign extraction who were called Kash-Kushans[1] retired; Tomaschek[2] supposes them to have been descendants of the Kushans or Ephthalites. They gave up their houses in the shahristān to the Arabs and built
111 for themselves elsewhere 700 castles, laid out | gardens round them and settled their servants and clients here, so that the population of the new town rapidly exceeded that of the old. The locality received the name of the "Castle of the Magians" (Kūshk-i Mughān), and here for the most part were to be found the temples of the fire-worshippers. When the Sāmānids settled in Bukhārā, the commanders of the Guard began to buy up ground in Kūshk-i Mughān and raised the price to 4,000 dirhams per jift; Narshakhī, however, quotes a statement of Nūḥ b. Naṣr, according to which the price was once still higher and reached 12,000 dirhams per jift. According to the tradition a dispute arose once between the inhabitants of the castles and the Muslim population; the castles were taken by storm, the gates broken down and subsequently used in the extension of the Cathedral Mosque. On the gate of each castle was the image of the owner's idol (probably the spirit-protector of his family); these figures were preserved also on the gates of the cathedral mosque, the faces only being erased. In the Sāmānid period two or three castles still remained; in the twelfth century only a single door with the figure of an idol was still preserved[3]. The site of the "Kūshk-i Mughān," unfortunately, is not indicated; as the "Gate of the street of the Magians" was opposite the present Imām Gate, the "Kūshk-i Mughān" should probably be sought for in the north-west part of the town. The "street of the Magians" is mentioned also by Narshakhī[4]; between it and the "street of the dihqāns" was the Kharqān bazaar.

Of the Muslim buildings the Cathedral Mosque must of course be the first to claim attention[5]. The first mosque was built by Qutayba in 94/713 in the citadel on the site where in former times there stood a temple of the idolaters, probably Buddhists. For the festival prayers, *i.e.* for divine service on the days of the two chief festivals ('īd), a place in the northern part of the Rīgistān near the Ma'bid Gate was set apart. A new Cathedral Mosque, between the citadel and shahristān, was built by the governor al-Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī (794–5). In 290/902 the edifice was rebuilt and considerably enlarged by the Sāmānid Isma'īl, who bought up the neighbouring houses for the purpose. The mosque fell down twice at the beginning of the reign of

[1] In Narshakhī, Āl-i Kathkatha or Kathkathān.
[2] *Sogdiana*, 106. The opinion of Tomaschek that the Kash-Kushans were Buddhists is refuted by Narshakhī's words quoted farther on.
[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 29, 47–8, 62.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 47–51.

Naṣr (914–43), on the first occasion during the Friday service, resulting | in the death of many people; the Government ordered 112
the building to be restored, and in addition a minaret was built in 306/918–19 at the expense of the wazīr Abū 'Abdallāh Jayhanī. It is this edifice which the Arabic geographers have in mind; according to Maqdisī's description[1] the mosque had several courts which were distinguished for their cleanliness. Close by this mosque was the chief weaving office in the town[2]. There was another building as well, erected in 340/951–2 by the Amīr Nūḥ b. Naṣr near "the palace of the Amīr of Khurāsān," probably in the south-western part of the shahristān. Of this building we know only that it was still in existence in the twelfth century; it is probably the building referred to in the story quoted above from the translator of Narshakhī of the only remaining door at that period with the image of an idol, as the road to the palace of the Amīr of Khurāsān ran past this door. For festival services the Amīr Manṣūr in 360/971 ordered a new place to be set apart at a distance of half a farsakh from the citadel gate, on the road to the village of Samtīn. The site of the latter is not known, but it seems that the new place for festival services was close by the old[3].

The Sāmānid cathedral mosque was burnt in 460/1068, during the struggle for the throne between the sons of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm; the wooden upper part of the minaret was set on fire by combustible material thrown from the citadel, and the mosque thus destroyed. In the following year it was restored, the upper part of the minaret being built of burnt bricks; besides this a new edifice containing a maqṣūra was built farther away from the citadel. This maqṣūra, like the pulpit and mihrāb, was carved in Samarqand. Arslān-Khān Muḥammad ordered a new cathedral mosque to be built in the shahristān; the edifice was constructed with great magnificence and completed in 515/1121, and seems to have lasted till the conquest of Chingiz-Khān. The minaret built in 521[4] is still in existence to-day, and had apparently suffered no damage until the revolution of Sept. 1920, when it was damaged by the fire of the besieging army. In 513/1119 Arslān-Khān constructed a new place for the festival services near the Gate of Ibrāhīm, *i.e.* in the same place where it is found to-day. In the eleventh century the site was occupied by the palace of Shams-al-Mulk (1068–80) together with gardens, pasture lands, and menageries; the locality was considered private (ghūruq for quruq) and from the name of the founder was called Shamsābād. Shamsābād was kept up under Shams-

[1] *Bibl., Geog. Arab.*, iii, 280. [2] Neıchakhy, p. 18.
[3] The village is mentioned in the 'Abdallāh Nāma, MS. Asiat. Mus. 574 age, f. 116 b.
[4] *Texts*, p. 172 (Kitāb-i Mullāzāda).

113 al-Mulk's successor Khiḍr, | but afterwards fell into disrepair and was finally destroyed during the invasion of the Saljūq Sultan Malik-shāh[1] (1089). There was also in Bukhārā a "Syrian mosque" (Masjid ash-Shām), which is mentioned by Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[2].

The number of royal palaces built in Bukhārā at different times was fairly considerable. The Amīr Isma'īl built himself a palace in the Jū-i-Mūliyān locality, not far from the citadel and Rīgistān, which was considered the best palace in Bukhārā[3]. Over the whole area from the Rīgistān gate to the reed-covered field of Dashtak lying near the citadel, there were palaces, hostels, gardens, and reservoirs. The name Jū-i-Mūliyān was probably applied to one of the two ariqs mentioned in Iṣṭakhrī as flowing near the Rīgistān, *i.e.* either the Rīgistān or the Rabāḥ ariq and probably the second, on which according to Iṣṭakhrī, there were 1,000 gardens and castles. At the present day the name Jū-i-Mūliyān is borne by a village a mile and a half from Bukhārā[4]. According to Narshakhī's account this appellation was altered by the natives from Jū-i-Mawāliyān[5] ("River of the clients") as Isma'īl built a house here for the members of his Guard[6], and assigned for their use the larger part of the revenues from these lands. The lands in ancient times were the private property of the Bukhār-Khudāts; Isma'īl bought Jū-i-Mūliyān and Dashtak from Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ṭālūt; the revenues from Dashtak were dedicated to the use of the cathedral mosque. The palace in Jū-i-Mūliyān was kept up until the end of the Sāmānid dynasty.

Another palace, built by Naṣr in the Rīgistān[7], remained in existence till the year 961; close by were the government offices. Under 'Abd-al-Malik (954–61) the wazīr Abū Ja'far 'Utbī[8] (to 348/959) built a magnificent mosque here. During
114 the disorders evoked by the sudden death of 'Abd-al-Malik | the palace was plundered and burnt by the rebels; the Amīr Manṣūr ordered it to be rebuilt, but before even a year had passed another fire broke out, caused this time by an accident, due to the custom preserved from heathen times of lighting wood

[1] Nerchakhy, pp. 27–8. On the word "qurug" see now A. S. Beveridge in her translation of the Bābur-Nāmah, p. 81 sq., and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 31.

[2] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الشامی; Yāqūt, iii, 244.

[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 25–7.

[4] Muḥammad Narshakhī, Russ. trans. of N. Lykoshin, p. 38.

[5] Double form of the broken plural from the word مولی.

[6] The word مولی is here used in the same sense as علام in Nerchakhy, p. 83.

[7] Nerchakhy, pp. 24–5.

[8] The translator of Narshakhī, erroneously confusing him with the author of the Ta'rīkhi Yamīnī (cf. above, p. 19), calls him Aḥmad b. Ḥasan; Gaidīzī in one passage (*Texts*, p. 8) Aḥmad b. Ḥusayn, in another (*Texts*, p. 10) Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad.

piles on certain festivals[1]. The edifice was burnt to the foundations; the property of the Amīr was transferred to Jū-i-Mūliyān, and the Rīgistān remained desolate thereafter. Maqdisī[2], however, writing at the very end of the tenth century, still places the palace in the Rīgistān, opposite the fortress in a westerly direction.

Some years after this fire, in 356/967, Manṣūr built a palace near the New gate, in the locality of Kārak-i-'Alawīyān[3]. This palace, like Isma'īl's, lasted to the end of the Sāmānid dynasty; the ground was considered to be the property of the sovereign until the reign of Shams-al-Mulk, who presented it to the 'ulamā of Bukhārā. Under the Qarā-Khānids[4] there is mention not only of Shamsābād, which has been described above, but of yet another palace of Aḥmad-Khān (d. 1095) at Jūybār, *i.e.* near the Ibrāhīm gate. Arslān-Khān ordered this palace to be pulled down and re-erected in the citadel; a few years later he built a new palace in the Darwāzja quarter (*i.e.* in the north-western part of the town) in the street of Bū-Layth; in the same place two baths were built. Subsequently Arslān-Khān turned this palace into a madrasa, and built a new one for himself near the Ṣa'dābād (Banū-Ṣa'd) gate, *i.e.* near the south-western side of the shahristān.

Besides the names of quarters and streets already mentioned Sam'ānī cites the following: the street Jadīd[5], street of the bench[6] (aṣ-Ṣuffa) ("opposite the Khānkāh"), the quarter of Rīw[7], and the castle of Fāriza near the Gate of the Square, *i.e.* the present Qarākul gate[8]. Narshakhī also, in his description of the fire of the year 937[9], mentions the street of Bakār (probably | near the ariq of the same name in the western part 115
of the town, between the Samarqand and Fārjak gates[10]).

The streets of Bukhārā were remarkable for their width[11], and were paved with stone, which was brought from the hill of Warka, near the village of the same name, at the beginning of the mountain chain which runs eastward and separates the provinces of Samarqand and Kish[12]. Sam'ānī[13] places Warka

[1] On this custom see Khanykov, *Opisanie Bukharskavo khanstva*, p. 208.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 280–1. [3] Nerchakhy, p. 27. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الجددى. [6] *Ibid.*, *s. v.* الذيموني.
[7] Yāqūt, ii, 892; Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الرىوى.
[8] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* العارزى. In Yāqūt (iii, 835) without the word "castle" and without indication of situation. [9] Nerchakhy, p. 93.
[10] Yāqūt mentions also (iii, 881) a place (موضع) in Bukhārā called Farqad.
[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 284 [12] *Ibid.*, i, 312.
[13] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الوركى. In Yāqūt (iv, 914) without definition of distance. On the preceding page (923) the same village is mentioned by Yāqūt under the names وَرْكَى and وَرْكَنْ.

two farsakhs from Bukhārā, on the road to Nasaf (Qarshi). Notwithstanding the broad streets, even at that time, owing to the density of population, the crowding in the town was noticeable; this want of space was more evident in Bukhārā than in all the other towns of the Sāmānid kingdom. For this reason there were frequent outbreaks of fire[1]; in Narshakhī's book we find a description of two such conflagrations which occurred in the reign of Naṣr, in the years 317/929 and 325/937[2]. The second outbreak was particularly devastating; it is noteworthy that although the fire enveloped a considerable part of the town and destroyed several bazaars, the damage was estimated at a little over 100,000 dirhams in all. The density of the buildings explains also other disagreeable features of the town (smells, bad water, &c), to which Maqdisī[3] and some poets[4] allude in the most vigorous terms.

The environs of the city are divided by Iṣṭakhrī[5] into twenty-two districts, of which fifteen lay within the long walls which here also, as at Samarqand and Balkh, gave protection to the nearest suburbs. The construction of these walls[6] was ascribed in the book of Abū'l-Ḥasan Nīshāpūrī (see above p. 15) to the governor Abū'l-'Abbās Faḍl b. Sulaymān aṭ-Ṭūsī (783–7). They were built to protect the town and its neighbourhood from the incursions of the Turkish nomads; the adoption of this measure was proposed by Yazīd b. Ghūrak, prince of Samarqand, who pointed to the example of Sughd, where, thanks to the building of such walls, complete immunity from danger had been attained.
116 Gates and towers were built at a distance of half a mile | between each. The whole construction was completed only in 215/830. Mas'ūdī[7], quoting the work of a certain Salmūya (or Salmaway-h) "On the dynasty of the 'Abbāsids and on the Amīrs of Khurāsān," says that the ancient wall which was built by some former Soghdian prince and had fallen into ruins was only restored in the time of Faḍl b. Sulaymān.

According to Iṣṭakhrī[8] the area protected by the wall of Bukhārā measured twelve farsakhs in length by as much in breadth. The wall crossed the Samarqand road to the east of Ṭawāwīs, *i.e.* at a distance of more than seven farsakhs from the city[9], and the Khurāsān road at a distance of three farsakhs

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 281. [2] Nerchakhy, pp. 93–4.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 281.
[4] *Journ. Asiat.*, 5, 1, 184–5; يتيمة الدهر, Eastern ed., iv, 8–9.
[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 309–10.
[6] Nerchakhy, pp 32–3.
[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, viii, 65; Maçoudi, *Le livre de l'avertissement*, trad. par. B. Carra de Vaux, p. 96.
[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 305. The erroneous statement made in the Russian original, that the length of the wall is not defined, was rectified by me in *Zapiski*, xix, 119.
[9] See above, p. 98.

from the city[1]. Besides this, within the circuit of the wall were included the villages of Mughkān (five farsakhs from Bukhārā and three farsakhs north of the Khurāsān road) and Zandān[2] (four farsakhs north of Bukhārā). The annual upkeep of the wall required a great deal of money and laid a heavy burden on the inhabitants; only in the time of Isma'īl was immunity from external danger so far secured as to render it possible to release them from the imposition. After this the wall fell into ruins, and in the twelfth century it was called Kempirak ("old woman"). The ruins of these walls remain to the present day in the shape of a rampart known to the natives under the name of Kempir-duval; they have been examined by N. F. Sitnyakovsky and more recently by L. Zimin[3]. On the north-east the rampart is "on the boundary of the cultivated tract and the bare steppe, which extends eastward from the rampart to Kermine"; its northern side runs partly along the high left bank of the Zarafshān.

The spelling of the names of the districts of Bukhārā and their positions are in some cases doubtful; some of them received the name of the ariqs irrigating them, which are enumerated in Iṣṭakhrī[4] and Narshakhī[5]. These ariqs are the following[6]:

(1) Karmīnīa ariq; the district of this town is called Yasīr (?) in Iṣṭakhrī.

(2) Shāpūrkām[7], which took its name from the Persian prince Shāpūr, who settled in Bukhārā, received | lands from the 117
Bukhār-Khudāt and built here the castle and village of Wardāna; the ariq was directed towards this village. The rulers of Wardāna, who bore the title of Wardān-Khudāts, were until the beginning of the eighth century the rivals of the Bukhār-Khudāts; Wardāna was even considered to be older than Bukhārā. The village was of great importance strategically (as a frontier point against the Turkish nomads), commercially, and industrially[8]. In later times this locality was the tümen (district) of Vardanzi, a considerable portion of which was buried by sand in 1868[9].

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 19; viii, 65. [2] *Ibid.*, i, 315.

[3] *Protok. Turk. kruzhka lyub. archeol.*, Year III, pp. 89–92; xx, 145 sq. L. Zimin states that remains of the wall are preserved not only on the north-east, where they were seen by Sitnyakovsky, but also on the south-west, on the road to Khurāsān.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 310–11. [5] Nerchakhy, pp. 30–31.

[6] Sitnyakovsky states (*Izvyest. Turk. otdyel. Ross. Geog. Obshchestva*, i, 121 sq.) that many of these ariqs have preserved their names down to the present day; cf. my review in *Zapiski*, xiii, 0115 sq., and *Oroshenie Turkestana*, 119 sq.

[7] *Kām* is a local term in Bukhārā for *ariq* (cf. *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 29). Sitnyakovski translated the words Kām-i Zar and Jū-i Zar by "large and small Zar," from this it may be concluded that the local word denotes larger channels than the Persian *Jū* (or *Jūy*) (*ibid.*, p. 120).

[8] Nerchakhy, p. 14.

[9] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, 108. The tümen was called also by the name of the channel (now Shāhrkām); 'Abdallāh Nāmah, cod. Mus. Asiat. 574 age, f. 385. Near the village of 'Arab-Khāna the channel now divides into two, the old and

(3) Upper Kharqāna. The district of this name was outside the great wall, probably near the village of Kharghānkath mentioned above (p. 98), north of the Zarafshān, opposite Karmīnīya.

(4) Kharqānrūd; this ariq probably irrigated Lower Kharqāna, a district situated within the great wall. Kharqānrūd, according to Iṣṭakhrī, extended to the village of Zūsh; the latter, according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[1] was near Nūr, *i.e.* approximately twenty farsakhs from Bukhārā.

(5) Ghāw-Khitfar; apparently the same ariq is called in Iṣṭakhrī Najjār-Khitfar (perhaps for Bukhār-Khitfar). It irrigated the district of the same name and extended to the village of Kharmaythan[2] (in Yāqūt) or Khurmīthan (in Sam'ānī), the position of which is nowhere indicated. According to Narshakhī Ghāw-Khitfar was not an artificial ariq; the water itself had made its own bed there. It is to be identified with the modern channel of Gudfar or Wābkand-Daryā (so named from the village of Wāfkand on the way to Khwārazm[3]); Khanykov also speaks of this channel as a natural bed of the river[4]. Branches from this channel irrigated also Zandāna and Rāmīthana.

(6) Sāmjan; this ariq, as we have seen, is also called Rūd-i Jargh (so in Iṣṭakhrī) and Ḥarāmkām, and crossed the Samarqand road four farsakhs from Bukhārā. In this locality probably were situated the districts of Hither Sāmjan and Farther Sāmjan mentioned in Iṣṭakhrī. The basin which received the remaining waters of the Zarafshān was also called Sārnjan[5].

(7) Paykān[6] ("arrow-head"); flowed to the village of Warka mentioned above (p. 111) whence the stone was taken for the streets of Bukhārā. |

118 (8) Upper Farāwīz (or Farāwaz); the district of this name, like the two following, lay within the great wall; the ariq reached the village of Ūbūqār (?)[7]. According to Narshakhī[8] this ariq had been dug in the Muslim period.

(9) Lower Farāwīz, with the district of the same name; the ariq bore also the name of Dhaymūn, which was the name of the ancient village two and a half farsakhs from Bukhārā along the road to Paykand[9].

the new Shīfirkām. J Marquart (*Chronologie*, p. 62, where he gives an erroneous translation: Shāhpūr kām "Wunsch des Shāhpūr") identifies Wardāna with the Chinese Fa-ti; cf. also Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., Index.

[1] Yāqūt, ii, 959; Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الزوشنی) appends the words فیما اظنّ ("in my opinion").

[2] Yāqūt, ii, 427; Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الخرمیثنی).

[3] Cf. Ibn Batoutah, iii, 21.

[4] *Opis. Bukhar. khanstva*, 32.

[5] Nerchakhy, p. 17.

[6] In de Goeje's edition تنکان.

[7] According to Ibn Ḥawqal (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 380) to the village of Rīwqān.

[8] Nerchakhy. p. 53.

[9] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الذیمونی. The name of the village to which the ariq flowed (in

(10) Arwān, with the district of the same name; it reached to the village of Bānab, of whose position there is no indication either in Yāqūt[1] or Sam'ānī.

(11) Gīfar; it is difficult to say with which of the ariqs mentioned in Iṣṭakhrī this should be identified. Probably the same ariq is mentioned in Sam'ānī[2] and Yāqūt by the name of Jīfar, in the account of the village of Ūdana.

(12) Zar (in Iṣṭakhrī adh-Dhar); this was the name of the main city ariq of Bukhārā (now Shāh-rūd); the same name was borne by one of the districts of Bukhārā.

(13) Nawkanda; according to Iṣṭakhrī this name was borne by two ariqs, one of which flowed to Farāna (?), the other to Nūbāgh al-Amīr (the new garden of the Amīr). The latter can hardly be identical with the village of Wanūfāgh, in the neighbourhood of Ṭawāwīs[3]; if it were, the second Nawkanda ariq would have irrigated the district of that town.

(14) Farakhshah; reached the village of the same name (other forms of the name met with are Barakhshah[4], Warakhshah[5], Afrakhshah, and Farakhshāh[6], which was situated at a distance of one day's journey, or four farsakhs from Bukhārā, on the road to Khwārazm, and was called also Dakhfandūn[7]. According to Narshakhī there were twelve ariqs here. Farakhshah | was 119
situated within the great wall; from very ancient times it was the private property of the Bukhār-Khudāts and was reckoned to be a more ancient town than Bukhārā. Here was the old palace of the Bukhār-Khudāts which had existed, according to the tradition, for more than 1,000 years. In the eighth century it was restored by the Bukhār-Khudāts Khunuk-Khudāt and Bunīyāt. The property of the Bukhār-Khudāts, which brought in an annual revenue of 20,000 dirhams, was confiscated by the Sāmānid Isma'īl, who proposed to the inhabitants to convert the palace into a cathedral mosque, but was unable to fulfil his aim. The palace was destroyed by order of Aḥmad, son of Nūḥ b. Naṣr, who required material for the construction of a palace

de Goeje's edition Fārāb, which is impossible) must probably be read Tārāb—a village near Khunbūn, situated at a distance of four farsakhs from Bukhārā on the Khurāsān road. Cf. Yāqūt, ii, 474; iii, 487; Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الطارابى. The two Farāwīz still bear the same name to-day.

[1] Yāqūt, i, 482.

[2] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الاودنى (بناحية جيفر وهو نهر بتلك الناحية); the word should perhaps be read خشقر. In Yāqūt (i, 399) these words are not found.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الونوفاغى. In Yāqūt (iv, 942) position not indicated.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 360; iii, 282.

[5] Nerchakhy, pp. 15–16, from which the following details of the village are taken.

[6] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الأفر خشى, Yāqūt, iii, 869.

[7] The pronunciation of this name is given in Sam'ānī and Yāqūt (ii, 558).

near the gates of the citadel of Bukhārā. In Warakhshah "the New Year of Agriculturists" was celebrated five days earlier than the New Year of the Magians. The name of the ancient village has been preserved in the name of a large hill near the village of Rāmīthan[1] (cf. below).

(15) Kushna; this ariq has already been mentioned in the list of the city ariqs (see p. 105).

(16) Ramitan (Rāmīthana), reaching to the village of the same name. The fortified village of Ramitan[2], which has retained its name to this day, was one of the most remarkable in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā. It was considered to be "Old Bukhārā[3]," *i.e.* the ancient residence of the rulers of the province of Bukhārā; even after the foundation of Bukhārā, the local rulers not infrequently passed the winter at Ramitan. Its foundation was attributed to the mythical Afrāsiyāb; his rival Kay-Khusraw founded opposite Ramitan, *i.e.* on the other bank of the ariq, the village of Rāmush where he built the temple of the fire-worshippers which was still in existence in the time of the Sāmānids. The temple at Rāmush is mentioned also by Bīrūnī[4]; it was here that the Magians celebrated one of their most important annual festivals. At Ramitan there was a temple of the idol worshippers[5]. In Maqdisī's time the neighbourhood of Ramitan was ruined and desolate[6].

(17) Khāma; reached the village of the same name, of whose position nothing is known.

Thus of the fifteen districts situated within the great wall (Zar, Farghīdad (?), Sakhar, Ṭawāwīs, Būrq or Būruq (?), Lower
120 Kharqāna, Būma (?), Najjār-khitfar or Bukhār-khitfar, | Gākhush-tuwān, Andiyār-Kandmān (?), Hither Sāmjan, Farther Sāmjan, Lower Farāwīz, Arwān, and Upper Farāwīz), six cannot be connected with definite ariqs, nor have we any data to enable us to define their geographical position. Of the six names only Gākhushtuwān (in Arabic Kākhushtuwān) is mentioned by Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[7], and that without defining its position. The names of villages are quoted by the Arabic geographers apart from those of the districts, and on that account we do not know in which districts Ramitan and Farakhshah, for example, were situated.

[1] Zimin in *Prot. Turk. kruzhka*, xx, 131.
[2] Nerchakhy, pp. 14–15.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, iii, 282.
[4] *Chronology*, trans. by E. Sachau, p. 221.
[5] Nerchakhy, p. 6.
[6] This is all that Maqdisī tells us; he does not say anything about "immense remains of the ancient city" (Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 462). Le Strange's mistake was rectified by me in *Zapiski*, xvii, 0106. On Ramitan at the present day cf. Zimin in *Protok. Turk. kruzhka*, xx, 146 sq.
[7] Yāqūt, iv, 222.

As regards the seven districts beyond the great wall (Jazza (?), Shāh-bakhsh ("gift of the prince"), Yasīr (the district of Kermine), Upper Kharqāna, Rāmand or Gharqand[1], Paykand and Firabr (Farab)), we can fix the positions of Yasīr, Upper Kharqāna (see above p. 114), and the two last, which lay on the Khurāsān road. The area from Bukhārā to the bank of the Amu-Darya is described in sufficient detail[2]. At a distance of one and a half farsakhs[3] from the town was the village of Māstīn, or Māstī, which was considered one of the most ancient villages of Bukhārā[4]; in the twelfth century it was deserted and waterless[5]. Two and a half farsakhs from Bukhārā lay the village of Dhaymūn, mentioned above; farther on, three farsakhs from the city, the road intersected the wall. On the right-hand side of the road, and still within the wall, was the village of Khujāda (three farsakhs from Bukhārā and one farsakh from the road), and that of Mughkān[6] (five farsakhs from Bukhārā and three farsakhs from the road). Outside the wall, four farsakhs from Bukhārā, was situated the village of Khunbūn, and close by it the village of Ṭārāb[7]. In the area between Khunbūn, Ṭārāb, and Ramitan Qutayba was once surrounded by the Soghdians and Turks[8]. |

Finally five farsakhs from Bukhārā lay the town of Paykand[9], 121
which was regarded already in the pre-Muslim period as a large trading centre. Like Ramitan and Farakhshah, Paykand was older than Bukhārā; it was called "the copper city" or "the city of the merchants[10]." The local merchants carried on trade with China, and even a maritime trade (probably with the trans-Caspian provinces). Each village of the province of Bukhārā possessed a rabāṭ (military station or kārawān-sarāy) near the gate of Paykand; there were more than a thousand of such rabāṭs, and in them were kept detachments to counter Turkish

[1] It is possible that قزغند should be read in place of غرقند. Sam'ānī (*s. v.* القرغندى) thinks that the village of Quzghund is situated in the neighbourhood of Samarqand.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 19.

[3] According to Qudāma (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 156) 5 farsakhs, in consequence of which the distance from Bukhārā to Āmul in this author is 3½ farsakhs more (22½ farsakhs) than in Ibn Khurdādhbih; but this is not confirmed by other data.

[4] Nerchakhy, p. 6.

[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الماستينى.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, i, 315.

[7] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الخنبونى and الطارابى; Yāqūt, ii, 474; iii, 487 (where the words خنبون عند are omitted). Khujāda is also mentioned by Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الخجادى) as a large village with a mosque.

[8] Nerchakhy, p. 44.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17; *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 314; iii, 282.

[10] Tabarī, ii, 1186. On the "copper town" or "copper castle" as a term of "mythical geography" cf. Marquart, *Z.D.M.G.*, xlix, 639 and *Ērānshahr*, pp. 83, 93.

assaults. The beginning of the decay of the rabāṭs (they were obviously no longer necessary when immunity from external danger had been secured) is put by Narshakhī in 240/854–5; by the time of Maqdisī a number of the rabāṭs were in ruins, though the town was in a flourishing condition in the Sāmānid period. It was surrounded by strong walls, and the town within the inner wall[1] had only one entrance; there were two bazaars, one in the town, the other in the suburbs. The cathedral mosque was celebrated for its miḥrab, which was gilded and ornamented with precious stones, surpassing in its gilding all other miḥrabs in Transoxania. The town was on the edge of the steppe and for that reason there were no villages in the neighbourhood; only westward from it and at the very edge of the steppe was the fortified village of Amdīza. Near Paykand flowed the Ḥarāmkām ariq which did not always reach as far as the town; its waters fell into Lake Sāmjan. The names Ḥarāmkām and Sāmjan show that this is the same ariq as that which intersected the Khurāsān road four farsakhs from Bukhārā (see above pp. 99, 114); its superfluous water, according to Iṣṭakhrī[2], returned to the river. The Sāmjan basin is mentioned in the twelfth century also under the name of Bārgīn-i farākh ("extensive basin") and finally under its present Turkish name Qarā-kūl ("black lake"); there was a vast quantity of fish and birds here. Between Paykand and Firabr, which has already been described above, stretched a sandy steppe, occupying an area of twelve farsakhs[3].

The town of Paykand, like many others, fell into decay after the fall of the Sāmānid kingdom; at the beginning of the twelfth century Arslān-Khān made an attempt to restore it, even built
122 himself a palace here, and wished to dig a new ariq for the town. The town was situated on a hill, but not a high one. The Khan ordered it to be cut through, to provide a channel for the water; but it turned out that the hill was composed of stony strata, and after vain attempts which swallowed up much money and cost many lives, the enterprise was abandoned. The impracticability of making a conduit for the water was probably one of the causes of the impermanence of Arslān-Khān's buildings;

[1] This is evidently the sense of the word حصن in this passage, as often in Maqdisī (cf. on the same page قهندز وحصن and حصن وقهندز, and p. 291, 8 الجامع فى الحصن والقهندز خارج منه).

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 311. From these data, it would seem, it may be deduced that the Zar ariq and the Mill ariq (pp. 104–5) were branches of the Ḥarāmkām ariq.

[3] Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الكبرى) and Yāqūt (iv, 234) mention also a "large village," Arabic al-qaryat al-kabīra, Pers. dih-i buzurg, near the Jayḥūn (Amu-Darya) in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā (so Sam'ānī).

Sam'ānī[1] already only found ruins here, in which some Turkmen families were living. Sam'ānī saw also traces of the rabāṭs, whose number, according to his statement, formerly reached 3,000.

Narshakhī describes also the following villages of Bukhārā:

(1) Nūr[2], present Nur-ata, to the north-east of Bukhārā; near the hills. The village had a cathedral mosque and many rabāṭs; it was famous for its tombs of saints, to which pilgrimages were made. Being situated on the frontier between the cultivated region and the steppe, the village must also have been very important strategically; it is mentioned as a fortress in the history of the struggle of Muntaṣir, the last Sāmānid, against his enemies[3]. At a distance of one farsakh from Nūr and twenty from Bukhārā, was the village of Sichār or Chichār[4].

(2) Afshīna, a fortified village[5]; Maqdisī[6] places it to the west of Bukhārā. Qutayba even built a mosque here, and Afshīna may therefore be identical with the station of Masjid mentioned in Ṭabarī[7], at a distance of a farsakh from Bukhārā.

(3) Barkad[8], an old village with an ancient fortress. The Amīr Isma'īl bought this village and divided its revenues among | the descendants of 'Alī (5/7), the poor of Bukhārā (1/7), and his 123
own heirs (1/7).

In different places in his work Narshakhī mentions the villages of Iswāna[9], Sakmatīn, Samtīn[10] (see p. 109), Sāmdūn[11] (perhaps identical with the former), Sufna, Sīwanch[12], and Ghijduwān or Ghujduwān[13], which is put by Sam'ānī (who spells it Ghujdawān[14])

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السكندى (where the letter و after the numeral has probably been inserted by error). A very brief account of the present state of the ruins is given by N. F. Sitnyakowsky (*Prot. Turk. kruzhka*, 11th Dec. 1896, p. 20). According to this there are nine small villages on the Paykand ariq, and two miles distant from them, "on rising ground, are preserved the ruins of a fortification, in the shape of a rectangular quadrangle, and ruins of human habitations." The picture and description in Pumpelly, *Explorations in Turkestan*, 1903, p. 10, give a totally erroneous view of the remains. A detailed description, with an account of the excavations made by him, was published by L. Zimin in *Protokoly*, &c., xviii, 59–89; xix, 63–131. The ruins of the ancient city are called Old Paykand (Paykand-i kuhna); there is also a modern Paykand which appears as a fortress in the history of the nineteenth century. The ancient town had a circumference of no more than 678 sazhens (a little over seven furlongs) and one gate (as in Maqdisī's description); the objects found by the excavators (especially the copper coins) seem to belong to the Sāmānid period.

[2] Nerchakhy, pp. 10–11, Yāqūt, iv, 822.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 225.

[4] Yāqūt, iii, 40.

[5] Nerchakhy, p. 14. In Sam'ānī and Yāqūt (iii, 902) فشنة; Yāqūt has also (i, 330) أفشنة.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, iii, 282.

[7] Tabarī, ii, 1516.

[8] Nerchakhy, p. 14. The village is mentioned in Sam'ānī (*s. v.* البركدى) and Yāqūt (i, 589) without indication of its position.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[10] *Ibid*, p. 6.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 5–10. Sīwanch may be identical with Iswāna.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[14] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الغجدوانى: قرية من قرى بخارا على ستّة فراسخ منها وبها سوق فى كل اسبوع يوما يجتمع فيها اهل القرى للبيع والشرا.

at a distance of six farsakhs from Bukhārā, and credited with great commercial importance. The village has preserved the name of Ghijduwān to the present day, and it is irrigated by the Kharqān-rūd or Kalkan-rūd; it is the "Lower Kharqāna" of the medieval geographers. In modern writings the district (tümen) is named sometimes after the village (tümen of Ghijduwān), and sometimes after the ariq (tümen of Khanqān-rūd)[1]. Narshakhī mentions also the village and fortress of Narshakh or Narjaq[2] (on whose position see below). In Maqdisī[3] also we find some names which are not mentioned by the other geographers, namely, Awshar (a big village with many gardens, on the frontier of the Turkish territories), Zarmītan (a fortified village with a cathedral mosque), and Wakhsūn (a big fortified village). According to Maqdisī there were several large villages in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā which were fully equal to towns, but had no cathedral mosques; in accordance with the Hanafite doctrine permission to build a cathedral mosque outside large towns was very unwillingly given; even the inhabitants of Paykand obtained this right with great difficulty[4].

To conclude our survey of the Zarafshān basin it remains for us to enumerate in alphabetical order the villages named in the dictionaries of Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[5], which are not mentioned by the geographers.

These names are as follows[6]:

[1] Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 120. [2] Nerchakhy, p. 67.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 282.

[4] Cf. Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الشامى, on the question of building a Friday mosque in Karmīnīya.

[5] As is well known, Sam'ānī's dictionary was Yāqūt's chief source; some villages named by Sam'ānī are, however, not mentioned at all by Yāqūt, and Yāqūt sometimes omits Sam'ānī's statements regarding the position of the villages. In drawing up our list we have taken as our model the list of villages in the district of Merv drawn up by Professor V. A. Zhukovsky (*Razv. Staravo Merva*, pp. 35–48).

[6] The task of determining the exact pronunciation of the names is complicated by the fact that the Arabic writers tried to adapt these names to the laws of Arabic pronunciation, by not allowing two consonants after a long vowel or three after a short vowel. The traces of this endeavour are visible in both Sam'ānī and Yāqūt in the case of those words which they knew only from written sources; Sam'ānī, for example, gives a totally incredible reading, Sangabāt for Sangbāt and Surkhakath for Surkhkath. In such cases we have found it possible to pay no attention to his vocalization. Sam'ānī is somewhat less dependent on Arabic phonetics than Yāqūt; for example, where Sam'ānī writes Sūtkhan, Yāqūt has Sūtakhan (iii, 183). In those names whose pronunciation they had themselves heard, both Sam'ānī and Yāqūt leave Arabic phonetics aside; a particularly characteristic example of this is the name Ghawshfinj quoted by Yāqūt (iii, 825). It is especially important to fix the pronunciation of the terminations which recur in a large number of names, and which undoubtedly have themselves a meaning as words. In this matter, Sam'ānī enables us to correct some inaccuracies in Yāqūt, as, for example, to restore the reading *faghn* for *faghan*.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*	
Afshawān	الافشوانى	i, 330	4 farsakhs from Bukhārā.	123–
Aghdūn	الاغدونى	i, 319	Village in neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	133
Aghzūn	الاغزونى	i, 319	Probably the same as the preceding, as Yāqūt rightly remarks.	
Anbarduwān	الانبردوانى	i, 369	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Andāq	الانداقى	i, 371	3 fars. from Samarqand; probably identical with the modern Urgut (the western part of the village is even now called Andak), though the distance is somewhat greater.	
Andaq	الاندقى	i, 374	10 fars. from Bukhārā.	
Anikfaidar (?)	—	i, 393	Without indication of spelling. Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Anīsūn	الانبسونى	i, 393	,, ,,	
Anjāfarīn or Anjufārīn	الانجافرينى	i, 371	,, ,,	
Asmand, *see* Usmand.				
Bāb	—	i, 437	,, ,,	
Bāba	البابى	i, 452	,, ,,	
Bābish	البابشى	i, 445	,, ,, in Sam'ānī's opinion.	
Bādākad or Badākadā	البداكدى	i, 523	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Bādan	البادنى	i, 460	,, ,, or perhaps of Samarqand (so Yāqūt).	
Badhīkhūn	البذيخونى	i, 531	4 fars. from Bukhārā, near Mughkān (see above, p. 117) (in the facs. مغطان). Sam'ānī passed here on his way back from Surmārā (see below). The village had formerly been inhabited by Shāfi'ites, but in the twelfth century it was inhabited by Ḥanafites.	
Bandīmash	البنديمشى	i, 745	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion.	
Barākad or Barākadān	البراكدى	i, 538	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā (probably identical with	

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–133				Badākad, or perhaps with Barkad, see p. 119).
	Bardād	البردادى	i, 551	3 fars. from Samarqand on the road to Ishtīkhan.
	Bārdīza	الباردیزى	i, 463	In the cultivated area (sawād) of Bukhārā.
	Barfashkh	البرفشخى (facs. 74 b)	i, 568	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Barrān, Burānā, or Fawrān	البورانى (facs. 70 b)	i, 540	5 fars. from Bukhārā.
	Barskhān (in Yāqūt Barsukhān)	البرسخى (facs. 74 b)	i, 565	2 fars. from Bukhārā. Sam'ānī halted here on his way back from Barrānīya (prob. Barrān, see above).
	Basba	البسبى (the facs. has البسبنى)	i, 611	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Basikāyir	البسكايرى	i, 624	,, ,,
	Binkat	البنكتى	i, 746	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan.
	Birmas	MS. As. Mus. f. 69 (not in facs.)	i, 785	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā. The names Birmas and Dīmas (see p. 99) may be taken to be Turkish words (lit. "will not give" and "will not speak"). We do not, however, definitely put forward this explanation as we have no ground for the supposition that there were already Turkish villages in Transoxania in the twelfth century.
	Buram	—	i, 594	Name of a district, called ابغر by Iṣṭakhrī (*B.G.A.*, i, 322) and mentioned under this name by Yāqūt himself (i, 93).
	Bursān	—	i, 565	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Butayīn or Butanīn	البتنينى and البتيينى	i, 490	Half a fars. from Dabūsiya, between this town and Arbinjan.
	Dakhfandūn	الدخفندونى	ii, 558	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
Darzīw	الدرزيوى	ii, 567	3 fars. from Samarqand on the road to Qaṭwān (see below).
Dhakhīnawa	الذخينوى	ii, 717	3 fars. from Samarqand.
Dhammā	الذمّى	ii, 721	2 fars. from Samarqand.
Dhar'ayna	الذرعينى	ii, 719	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Dhībadwān	الذيبدوانى	ii, 727	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Dīzak	الديزكى	ii, 710	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Fāgh	الفاغى	iii, 845	" " in Sam'ānī's opinion.
Faghāndīza (in Y. Faghāndīz)	الفغانديزى	iii, 904	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Faghdīn or Faghdīz (in Yāqūt Fighdīn or Fighdīz)	الفغديرى (*sic*) and الفغدنى	iii, 904	" "
Faghīfad	—	iii, 904	In Soghd.
Faghīṭūsīn or Faghīṭīsīn	الفغيطوسينى	iii, 904	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Fāmīn	الفامنى	iii, 848	" "
Farāb	الفرابى	iii, 860	8 fars. from Samarqand, at the foot of the mountains near the dam; the same name is even yet borne by a village in the district on the former frontier between Russian and Bukharan territory.
Fardad	الفرددى	iii, 870	Neighbourhood of Samarqand near Yazn (in the facs. يزن —perhaps Muzn?).
Farjayā	الفرجائى	iii, 869	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Fāshūq	الفاشوقى	iii, 844	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Fawrān see Barrān.			
Fayy	الفيى	iii, 936	Between Ishtīkhan and Kushānīya; it is, of course, the name of the ariq mentioned above.
Fūrfāra	الفورفارى	iii, 923	1½ fars. from Samarqand, in neighbourhood of Arbinjan (?).
Fuyādhsūn (in Y. Fiyādasūn)	الفياذسونى	iii, 926	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–	Gāgan or Jājan	الجاجنى	ii, 4	Neighbourhood of Bukhāra
133	Ghadhān or Ghadhāna	الغذانى	iii, 776	,, ,,
	Ghashīd, Ghashīda, Ghashtī or Ghashīta	الغشيدى	iii, 803	,, ,,
	Ghīshtī, perhaps Ghīshtā (in Y. Ghīshatī)	الغيشتى	iii, 828	,, ,, (probably identical with Ghashīd).
	Ghudhashfardar (in Y. Ghudhashfard)	الغذشفردرى	iii, 776	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Ghujdawān (in Y. Ghujduwān)	الغجدوانى	iii, 775	6 fars. from Bukhārā.
	Ghunjīr	الغنجيرى	—	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Ghūrajk	الغورجك	iii, 821	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan.
	Ghūrashk	الغورشكى	iii, 823	Neighbourhood of Samarqand (probably identical with the preceding).
	Ghurmīnawā	الغرمينوى	—	District of Māymurgh, 2 or 3 fars. from Samarqand.
	Ghushdān	الغشدانى	iii, 803	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, near Shāwdār mountains.
	Īdhaj or Īdhūj	الايذجى and الايذوجى	i, 417	3 fars. from Samarqand, near Shāwdār mountains.
	Isbiskath	الاسبسكثى (facs. 29 b)	i, 238	2 fars. from Samarqand.
	Isfaranj	الاسفرنجى	i, 248	In Soghd.
	Iskāran	الاسكارنى	i, 252	1 or 2 fars. from Dabūsiya; reckoned as in neighbourhood of Kushānīya (i.e. situated to the north of the Zarafshān).
	Ismīthan	الاسميثنى	i, 265	Neighbourhood of Kushānīya, not far from Samarqand.
	Istān (in Y. Istā)	استانى	i, 240	3 fars. from Samarqand.
	Jakhzan or Jakhzana	الجخزنى	ii, 36	,, ,,
	Jīrākhasht	الجيراخشتى	ii, 173	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Jūybār	الجويبارى	ii, 163	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*	
Kabūdh	الكبوذى	iv, 234	4 fars. from Samarqand, near Fāiān (?).	123–133
Kafsīsiwān or Kafshīshiwān	الكفسيسوانى	iv, 292	Neighbourhood of Bukhāra. (In facs. of Sam'ānī spelled probably by error Kafīsīsiwān.)	
Kamara or Kamarā	الكمرى	iv, 304	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Kamard	الكمردى	iv, 304	Neighbourhood of Samarqand or (generally) in Soghd; Idrīsī (see p. 15) was already uncertain of its situation.	
Kamarja	الكمرجى	iv, 304	7 fars. from Samarqand. In this fortress an Arab army was besieged in 110/728–9[1].	
Kāmdad or Kāmdiz	الكامددى	iv, 230	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Kandasarwān	الكندسروانى	iv, 309	,, ,,	
Kandukīn	الكندكينى	iv, 310	Half a fars. from Dabūsiya.	
Kārzan (in Y. Kārazn)	الكارزنى	iv, 224	Neighbourhood of Arbinjan.	
Kasādun	الكسادنى	iv, 273	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.	
Kaththa	الكثوى	iv, 239	4 fars. from Bukhārā on way from Surmārā to Mughkān.	
Kāyishkan (in Y. Kāshkan)	الكايشكنى	iv, 228	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Khakanja	—	ii, 457	,, ,,	
Khākhsar (in Y. Khākhasr)	الخاخسرى	ii, 385	2 fars. from Samarqand, in district of Dargham.	
Kharādīn	الخرادينى	ii, 408	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Kharājar or Kharājara	الخراجرى	ii, 408	1 fars. from Bukhārā, in district of Upper Farāwīz; perhaps the same as the village called Khayrākhara or Khayzākhaza (S. *s.v.* الخيراخزى, with lacuna in the facs., Y. ii, 506), 5 fars. from Bukhārā near Zandāna.	
Kharghūn	الخرعونى (ع in error for ع)	ii, 423	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in district of Abghar.	
Kharqān	الخرقانى	ii, 424	8 fars. from Samarqand, with a rabāṭ called قرحرقان (?).	

[1] Tabarī, ii, 1516–23.

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–133	Khartang	الخرتنكى	ii, 418	3 fars. from Samarqand. The famous scholar Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, author of the collection of Ḥadīths, died and was buried here (256/870).
	Khāwuṣ	الخاوصى	—	Town above Samarqand.
	Khaydhashtar or Khandashtar (so Y.: S. does not indicate the vowel on the first letter)	الخيذشترى	ii, 506	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan.
	Khazwān or Khazhwān	الخزوانى	ii, 440	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Khudābād	الخدابادى	ii, 405	5 fars. from Bukhārā on the edge of (Y.) or on the way to (S) the steppe, one of the chief villages.
	Khudfirān (in Y. Khudfarān)	الخدفرانى	ii, 406	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Khudhānd	الخذاندى	ii, 407	1½ fars. from Samarqand.
	Khudīsar	الخديسرى	ii, 406	One of the frontier-stations (ثغود) of Samarqand, in province of Ushrūsana.
	Khumīthan	الخميثنى	iii, 472	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Khumkhīsara (in Y. Khumkhaysara)	الخمخيسرى	ii, 470	Neighbourhood of Buhkārā.
	Khunāmata	الخنامتى	iii, 474	,, ,,
	Khurmīthan (in Y. Kharmaythan)	الخرمبثنى	ii, 427	,, ,,
	Khushāghar (?)	—	ii, 444 (without vowels)	,, ,,
	Khushūfaghn (in Y. Khushūfaghan)	الخشوفغنى	ii, 447	Large and rich village between Ishtīkhan and Kushānīya [1]. In the twelfth century it was called "The Bridgehead" (ra's al-qanṭara) and was considered to be the most agreeable place (اطيب موضع) in Soghd. A fortress of the same name (in Persian Sar-i pul) is mentioned, as we

[1] Judging from this description the Khushūfaghn of Sam'ānī and Yāqūt is not identical with the Khushūfaghn of Ibn Khurdādhbih and Qudāma (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*,

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqut.*	*Remarks.*
			shall see later, in the account of Chingizkhān's campaign; the village of Sar-i Pul is mentioned in Miyānkal[1] again in the sixteenth century. In 1885 Prof. N. I. Veselovsky examined the ruins of this fortress, "very interesting in its construction", which are situated 4 m. from Katta-Kurgan[2]. 123–133
Khushurtā	—	ii, 445	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Khuzānd	الخزاندى	ii, 436	2 fars. or less from Samarqand, perhaps the same as Khudhānd.
Kufīn	الكفينى	iv, 293	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, or a place in Bukhārā itself.
Kunda or Kund	الكندى	iv, 309	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Kundīkath	الكنديكثى	—	In district of Dargham.
Mājandān	الماجندانى	iv, 379	5 fars. from Samarqand.
Mājarm	الماجرمى	iv, 379	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Majbas or Majbast (in S. Majubs or Majubsat)	المجبسى and المجبستى	iv, 418	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Mąnkath	—	iv, 671	„ „
Marghbūn	المرغبونى	iv, 500	„ „
Mazrankan or Mazranjan (i.e. Mezrengen)	المزرنكنى (or المزرنكى)	iv, 521	„ „
Midhyāmajkath (in Y. Madhyāmajkath)	المذيامجكثى	iv, 472	Neighbourhood of Karmīnīya.
Mīgh	الميغى	iv, 717	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Mīghan	الميغنى	iv, 717	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion.

vi, 20, 156), who locate it 8 fars. from Samarqand on the road to Zāmīn; between Bārkath (see p. 94) and Khushūfaghn lay the Qaṭwān steppe. It is possible that there is a mistake here on Sam'ānī's part, which if it were so would be explained by the fact that Khushūfaghn, exactly like the village between Ishtīkhan and Kushānīya, bore the name of Sar-i pul (the existence of a bridge in this locality is proved by the name of the station *K'amennyi most* (Stone Bridge)).

[1] MS. As. Mus. 574 age ('Abdallāh-Nāmah), f. 275 a.

[2] *Zapiski*, ii, 225. Prof. Veselovsky writes incorrectly Sary-pul (Yellow Bridge).

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–133	Mijdūn	المجدونى	iv, 419	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā. The name of this village was pronounced Bizdūn by the Bukharans.
	Mīz	—	iv, 822 (from 'Umrānī)	Village three days' journey from Bukhārā and Samarqand.
	Mudhyānkan (in Y. Madhyānkan)	المذيانكنى	iv, 472	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Mudhyānkath (in Y. Madhyānkath)	المذيانكثى	iv, 450	" " (obviously identical with the preceding).
	Murzīn (in Y. Mazrīn)	المرزينى	iv, 521	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Muzn	المزنى	iv, 521	3 or 4 fars. from Samarqand.
	Muznuwā (in Y. Maznawā)	المزنوى	iv, 521	4 fars. from Samarqand.
	Nāfakhs (in Y. Nāfakhsh)	النافخسى	iv, 732	2 fars. from Samarqand.
	Naḥl	النحلى	iv, 765	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Nakabūn or Naqabūn (in Y. Nakbūn or Naqbūn)	النقبونى and النكبونى	iv, 803, 811	" "
	Narshakh	النرشخى	—	" " (not far from Wābkana—see below).
	Nawa	النوى	iv, 815	2 (in Y. 3) fars. from Samarqand, not far from Wadhār (see p. 94). Sam'ānī passed here on his way back from Wadhār to Samarqand.
	Nawfar	—	iv, 824	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Nawjābādh (in Y. Nūjābādh)	النوجاباذى	iv, 821	" "
	Nawkadak (in Y. Nūkadak)	النوكدكى	iv, 826	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan.
	Nawkhas (in Y. Nūkhas)	النوخسى	iv, 821	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Nawzābād (in Y. Nūzābād)	النوزابادى	iv, 822	" "
	Nujānīkath	النجانيكثى	iv, 744	Small town in neighbourhood of Samarqand near Ushrūsana, in Sam'ānī's opinion.
	Nūkand	النوكندى	iv, 826	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
Panj or Panj-rūdak	البنجى	i, 742	Neighbourhood of Samarqand (birthplace of the poet Rūdakī). 123–133
Qaṭwān	القطوانى	iv, 139	5 fars. from Samarqand. In Sam'ānī's time there was a cathedral mosque here and the tombs of the Believers who fell in the celebrated battle of 1141[1].
Quzghund	الفزغندى	iv, 87	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion[2].
Rāghin (in Y. Rāghan)	الراغنى	ii, 734	Neighbourhood of Dabūsiya.
Rakhīnawā (in Y. Rakhīnūn)	الرخينوى	ii, 772	3 fars. from Samarqand.
Rakund	الركندى	—	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Rāman (in Y. Rāmanī)	الرامنى	ii, 738	2 fars. from Bukhārā, not far from Khunbūn; in Sam'ānī's time this village was lying in ruins.
Rastaghfar (in Y. Rastaghfir)	الرستغفرى	ii, 778	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan, perhaps the same as Rustufaghn or Rustaghfaghn (see below).
Razmānākh	الرزماناخى	—	1 fars. from Bukhārā.
Razmāz or Razmān	الرزمازى	ii, 776	6 or 7 fars. from Samarqand, between Ishtīkhan and Kushānīya.
Rīghdamūn (in Y. Rīghadmūn)	الريغدمونى	ii, 888	4 fars. from Bukhārā.
Rīkhshan (in Y. Rīkhashn)	الريخشنى	ii, 885	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, in Sam'ānī's opinion.
Rīwartūn	الريورتونى	ii, 891	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā; mentioned in fourteenth century as residence of Bahā ad-Dīn Naqshband.
Rīwda or Rīwd	الريودى	ii, 890	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Rūdhfaghkad (so Yāqūt)	الروذقغكدى (*sic* obviously in error for روذفغكدى)	ii, 833	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.

[1] For the site of the plain of Qaṭwān see the description of the Syr-Darya basin below.
[2] See above, p. 117, n. 1.

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–133	Rufūn	الروني	ii, 796	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Rustufaghn (in Y. Rustaghfan, probably in error for Rustaghfaghn)	الرستغني	ii, 778	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, now the village of Beili-Ata, where there is shown the grave of Abu'l-Ḥasan Rastafighanī (*sic*), who is called in Sam'ānī Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Sa'īd ar-Rustufaghnī [1].
	Sabadhmūn, Subadhmūn, or Sabadhūn	السذموني	iii, 31	Half a fars. from Bukhārā.
	Sabīra or Sibāra	السبري	iii, 36	In the cultivated area of Bukhārā.
	Sāghaij	الساغرجي	iii, 11	5 fars. from Samarqand, in the neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan [2].
	Sakān or Askān	السكاني	iii, 106	Neighbourhood of Arbinjan.
	Sakbiyān	السكبياني	iii, 106	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, near Bamijkath (see p. 99).
	Samījan	السمجني	iii, 147	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, near Merv (?—so in Sam'ānī).
	Sangbāth or Sangabāth	السنكباثي	iii, 168	Neighbourhood of Arbinjan.
	Sanjufīn (in Y. Sanjafīn)	السنجفني	iii 162	In Usrūshana, near Samarqand (i.e. probably in district of Būrnamadh, see above, p. 94).
	Sardar (in S. سردری)	السردری	iii, 74	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Sārkūn	الساركوني	iii, 9	In cultivated area of Bukhārā.
	Shābjan (in Y. Shābajn)	الشابجني	iii, 225	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Shamīdīza	الشميديزكي	iii, 324	,, ,,
	Sharafdan (locally pronounced Shīrafdan)	الشرودني	iii, 227	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Shāwkān	—	iii, 245	,, ,,

[1] See Vyatkin, *Materialy, &c.*, p. 49

[2] Cf. the description given by Vyatkin (*Ref. Bk. Samar. prov.*, vi, 252): "Sāgharj was situated N.W. of Samarqand in the valley of the Zarafshān, about four versts from the village of Yangi-kurgan, where at the present day there are to be seen ruins and gravestones covering a large area." The most flourishing period in the history of Sāgharj was when, under Uzbeg rule (especially that of the Janids), it was the capital of a separate principality.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*	
Shikān	الشكانى	iii, 310	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā; in Sam'ānī's opinion. In Sam'ānī's copy of the book *Qand* (see above, p. 15) it was stated that this village belonged to Kish, but in the margin was the correction that it was really situated in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	123–133
Shikistān	الشكستانى	iii, 311	Between Ishtīkhan and Kushānīya.	
Shīrghāwshūn	الشبرغاوشونى	iii, 352	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Shīrwān	الشيروانى	iii, 352	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, near Bamijkath.	
Shiyā or Shiyān	الشيائى	iii, 345	4 fars. from Bukhārā.	
Shūkhnāk (in Y. Shūkhanān)	الشوخناكى	iii, 333	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.	
Siyāra or Siyāza	السيازى	iii, 207	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā (probably identical with Sabīra).	
Subīdhghuk	السبذغكى	iii, 36	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Sufradān (in Y. Sufrādan)	السفردانى	iii, 97	,,	,,
Sughdān	—	iii, 94 (from 'Umrānī)	,,	,,
Surkhkat	السرخكنى	iii, 72	In Gharjistān of Samarqand (i.e. probably in the mountain district of the Upper Zarafshān). Surkhkat is mentioned by 'Awfī (Lubāb, i. 179) as the birthplace of Majd ad-Dīn 'Adnān.	
Surmārā	السرمارى	iii, 82	3 fars. from Bukhārā.	
Sutīfaghn or Sutīfaghna	الستيفغنى	iii, 39	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	
Sutīkan	الستيكنى	iii, 39	,,	,,
Sūtkhan	السوتخنى	iii, 183	,,	,,
Sūyanj	—	iii, 202	,,	,,
Tādhan	التاذنى	i, 810	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā (probably identical with Bādan)	
Tādīza	النادزى	i, 810	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.	

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
123–133	Ṭaghāma	—	iii, 832	In the cultivated area (sawād) of Bukhārā.
	Takhsānjkath	التخسانجكثى	i, 828	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Takhsī	التخسيجى	i, 828	5 fars. from Samarqand, in district of Abghar.
	Ṭārāb	الطارابى	iii, 487	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, near Khunbūn.
	Tarwākh or Tirwākh or Tarākha or Tazākha (in Y. Tarākha and Turwākhā, locally pronounced Tarākhā or Tirākhā)	النراخى and الطرواخى	i, 833, 847; iii, 534	4 fars. from Bukhārā.
	Tīm	—	i, 908 (on authority of Ibn al-Faqīh, not in de Goeje's edition)	Village in Soghd.
	Tūdh	التوذى	i, 891	3 fars. from Samarqand, near Wadhār.
	Tumtar	—	i, 873	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Tumushkath	—	i, 874	" "
	Turbān	التربانى	i, 833	5 fars. from Samarqand, near Farankath.
	Turnāwadh	الترناوذى	i, 844.	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
	Ṭūsan	الطوسنى	iii, 562	" "
	Tushkīdaza	—	i, 852	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Tūskās (in Y. Tūsakās)	التوسكاسى	i, 894	1 fars. from Samarqand.
	Ūdana	الاودنى	i, 399	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, in district of Jīfar (? Gīfar) on the ariq of the same name (see p. 115).
	Urukhs	الارخسى	i, 197	4 fars. from Samarqand, near the Shāwdār mountains.
	Usmand (in Y. Asmand or Samand)	الاسمندى	i, 265	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
	Wābkana (in Y. Wābakna)	الوابكنى	iv, 872	3 fars. from Bukhārā; mentioned also by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa[1]

[1] *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, iii, 21.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
			on the journey from Khorezmia to Bukhārā; now Vafkend. 123–133
Wanandūn	الونندونى	iv, 942	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā, on the Ḥarāmkām ariq; Sam'ānī stayed here on his way back from Barrānīya (see above).
Wanūfāgh	الونوفاغى	iv, 942	Near Ṭawāwīz.
Wazāghar	الوزاغرى	iv, 926	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Wazwīn	الوزوينى	iv, 926	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Wībawd (in Y. Waybawdha)	الويبودى	iv, 944	„ „
Yasīrkath	اليسركثى	iv, 1021	1 fars. from Samarqand.
Yūghank	اليوغنكى	iv, 1044	Neighbourhood of Samarqand.
Yūkhasūn (in Y. Yūkhashūn)	اليوخسونى	iv, 1043	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Zabaghduwān or Sabaghduwān	الزبعدوانى	ii, 914	„ „
Zāgharsars (in Y. Zāgharsawsan)	الزاغرسرسى	ii, 907	Neighbourhood of Samarqand or Nasaf.
Zakān	الزكانى	ii, 938	Neighbourhood of Samarqand, between Zaimān and Kamarja (see above).
Zāmīthan or Zāmīthana	—	ii, 909	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā; elsewhere (ii. 739) Yāqūt himself calls the form Zāmīthan, a mistaken spelling (on the part of 'Umrānī) of the village of Rāmīthan (see above, p. 116).
Zand	الزندى	ii, 951	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.
Zandarmīthan	الزندرميثنى	ii, 951	„ „
Zarakhsh	الزرخشى	ii, 923	„ „
Zarangara or Zaranjara	الزرنجرى	ii, 926	5 fars. from Bukhārā.
Zarkarān	الزركرانى	ii, 925	In Būzmājan district of Samarqand.
Zarūdīza	الزرورديزكى	ii, 928–929	4 fars. from Samarqand, near the Kish pass.
Zāwir	الزاورى	ii, 910	Neighbourhood of Ishtīkhan.
Zāz (in Y. Zār)	الزازى	ii, 906	„ „
Zimliq (in Y. Zimliqa)	الزملقى	ii, 944	Neighbourhood of Bukhārā.

The roads uniting Bukhārā and Samarqand with Balkh passed through the valley of the Kashka-Darya, which, though yielding in importance to the valley of the Zarafshān, was nevertheless remarkable for its fertility. In modern times, when the richest part of the Zarafshān valley was included in Russian territory, the Kashka-Darya valley was the granary of the Khanate of Bukhārā, and the town of Qarshi was reckoned the second town in Bukharan territory.

The name Kashk-rūd, which is evidently connected with the present name of the river, was borne, according to Ibn Ḥawqal[1], by the district in which the head-waters of the river that flows
134 past the southern gate of Kish[2] were situated. | By its northern gate passed another branch, the Asrūd, flowing from the Siyām or Sinām mountains; as we have seen, this name was borne by the mountains from which the Karatagh-Darya flows, so that it was probably applied to all the northern part of the Ḥiṣār chain. In the Siyām mountains was the fortress where, in the seventies of the eighth century[3], the prophet Muqanna' shut himself up with his adherents, and for some years successfully repulsed the attacks of the Arabs. Besides the streams already named the following also are mentioned: Jāj-rūd, one farsakh north of Kish, the present Uizel, on which now stands the town of Kitab; Khushk-rūd, one farsakh to the south of Kish, the present Kyzyl-su or Yakkabagh-Darya; Khuzār-rūd, eight farsakhs south of Kish, the present Khuzar-Darya or Katta-uru-Darya[4].

The town of Kish[5], now Shahrisabz (according to the local pronunciation Shaar-sabiz), was once regarded, if Ya'qūbī is to be believed[6], as the most important town in Soghd; in the Sāmānid period it was falling into decay, which is perhaps to be attributed to the rise of Samarqand and Bukhārā. Here too

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, ii, 376.

[2] In de Goeje (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 324; iii, 282) Nahr al-Kaṣṣāiīn. The MSS. also give the name Nahr al-Kaṣṣābīn to the channel and the adjoining gate; in the Persian translations as well we find the names Rūd-i Kazurān (corresponding to the Arabic kaṣṣār) and Rūd-i Kaṣṣābān.

[3] The year of the beginning and of the end of the insurrection are differently reported in different sources. In support of Narshakhī's account (p. 72), according to which Muqanna' took refuge in his fortress for fourteen years, only the testimony of Bīrūnī can be quoted (*Chronologie*, ed. Sachau, p. 211, trans., p. 194).

[4] The main river is called by the Chinese Ta-mo (Chavannes, Documents 146), and is mentioned under the same name (نوم) even in the history of Tīmūr (*Zafar-Namah*, Calc. ed., i, 158).

[5] *Brit. Geog. Arab.*, i, 324; ii, 375–7; iii, 282. The name should properly be spelled Kishsh; the local pronunciation, quoted by Yāqūt (iv, 274) on the authority of Ibn Mākūlā (on the latter see above, p. 10) was Kiss. The modern spelling Kesh is confirmed by the epithet *dilkesh* (Kesh-i dilkesh). The modern name (Shahrisabz, "Green City") appears for the first time on coins of the fourteenth century.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 299; cf. Marquart, *Chronologie, &c.*, p. 57. From Chinese sources Marquart states that the city was built only in the seventh century (*Ērānshahr*, p. 304).

we have, as usual, a shahristān with four gates: (1) Iron Gate, (2) Gate of 'Ubaydallāh, (3) Gate of the Butchers, (4) Gate of the inner city. We have no data to determine the situation of these gates; only the name of the river affords some reason for the belief that the "Gate of the Butchers" was on the southern side. In the Sāmānid period the shahristān and citadel were in ruins, and the only inhabited part was the rabaḍ, with two gates, those of the outer town and of Barkanān; the village of Barkanān was in the immediate vicinity of the town. Near the rabaḍ the building of a new town was proceeding. The length of each side of the town was a third of a farsakh (about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles). The houses were built of clay and wood. In the shahristān was the prison and the cathedral mosque, and in the rabaḍ were the bazaars; the palace of the governor was outside the shahristān and rabaḍ, in the Muṣallā locality, i.e. near the place where the festival prayers were held. The climate of Kish was considered to be very unhealthy. |

Ibn Ḥawqal enumerates sixteen districts in the province of 135
Kish: (1) Miyān-Kish, (2) Rūdh, (3) Balāndarān, (4) Rāsmāyin, (5) Kashk, (6) Arū, (7) Būzmājan, (8) Siyām (or Sinām), (9) Arghān, (10) Jāj-rūd, (11) Khuzār-rūd, (12) Khuzār, (13) Sūrūda, (14) Inner Sang-gardak, (15) Outer Sang-gardak, (16) Māymurgh. The order in which these districts are enumerated evidently bears no relation to their situation. The names of the districts prove that included in the province of Kish were the modern Khuzar Beghate, and even the valley of the river Sang-gardak, though the town of the same name, as we saw (p. 74), is mentioned among the towns of Ṣaghāniyān. The Kashk-rūd and Siyām districts were probably on the upper reaches of the Kashka-Darya; the name Miyān-Kish was probably that of the district of the town of Kish, the name Sūrūda that of the area along the course of the river Arsūd or Surūd[1]. Of the greatest importance was the district of Khuzār, which included the towns of Sūbakh[2], Nawqad-Quraysh, and Iskīfaghn (or Iskīfaghan). Sūbakh was, according to Iṣṭakhrī[3], on the main road between Nasaf and Balkh, at a distance of one stage from the former, and, according to Ibn Ḥawqal[4], at a distance of two farsakhs from Kish. In spite of de Goeje's view, the second figure is undoubtedly wrong, and instead of "two farsakhs" should be read "two marches," as in Iṣṭakhrī[5]. On this basis Sūbakh may be located on the site of the present Guzar (a more accurate transcription would be Khuzar). According to Sam'ānī it was six farsakhs from Nasaf to Sūbakh. Nawqad-Quraysh

[1] The latter form is found in one MS. of Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 282).
[2] According to Sam'ānī (*s. v.* السوبخي) and Yāqūt (iii, 182).
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 337. [4] *Ibid.*, ii, 403. [5] *Ibid.*, i, 343.

was on the road from Kish to Nasaf, five farsakhs from Kish according to Iṣṭakhrī [1], and six from Nasaf according to Sam'ānī [2], perhaps on the site of the present village of Qara-bagh [3]. Iskī-faghn was one farsakh from Sūbakh, and somewhat more from Nasaf; this name is possibly preserved in that of the village of Eski-bagh. Nawqad-Quraysh was still a large village in the time of Sam'ānī.

The word Nasaf [4] was apparently transformed by the Arabs from the native Nakhshab; the present name, Qarshi, was given
136 to the town | only in the fourteenth century, when the Jaghatāy-khān Kabak built a palace two-and-a-half farsakhs from the town [5] (Qarshī in Mongol meaning palace). In the tenth century, it seems, Nasaf did not possess a shahristān, as the geographers speak only of the rabaḍ and citadel, but the shahristān (madīna) of Nasaf is mentioned by both Sam'ānī and Yāqūt [6]. The town had four gates: Najjār (perhaps Bukhāra), Samarqand, Kish, and Ghūbdīn; the last name was that of a village two farsakhs from Nasaf [7]. The river flowed through the centre of the town; on its bank, near the "Bridge-head," was the palace of the governor. The cathedral mosque was near the Ghūbdīn gate, the place of festival prayers near the Najjār (Bukhārā?) gate, the bazaars between the palace and the cathedral mosque [8]. In the district of the town were two large villages, Kasba and Bazda, both containing cathedral mosques; Kasba was even larger than Nasaf, and was situate four farsakhs from it, on one of the roads to Bukhāra; Kasba was six farsakhs from Nasaf [9],

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*

[2] *S. v.* النوقدى; Yāqūt, iv, 825. Sam'ānī says that there was still another Nawqad in Transoxania, and himself a little farther on mentions two villages of this name, Nawqad Khurdākhur (also in the district of Nasaf) and Nawqad Sāwaf (?), in Yāqūt Khurdākhun and Sāza.

[3] The village of Nawqad is mentioned even in the eighteenth century in the Tuḥfat al-Khānī of Muḥ. Wafā Karmīnagī, cf. my *Oroshenie*, 126.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 325; ii, 377–9; iii, 282–3.

[5] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 95; *Zafar-Namah*, Calc. ed., i, 111.

[6] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* المدينى; Yāqūt, iv, 458.

[7] So Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الغوبدينى); according to Yāqūt (iii, 820) one farsakh. Ghūbdīn is mentioned in a "waqf-nāmah" of the sixteenth century (MS. As. Mus. e 574 ag, f. 78 b) as one of the upper villages (qurā-i 'uljā) of Nasaf, probably to the east of the town.

[8] The ruins of Nakhshab of the pre-Mongol period are now called Shulluk (or in Kirgiz spelling Shulduq); cf. L. Zimin in *Prot. Turk. kruzh.*, xxi, 103 sq., and Logofet, *V gorakh: na ravninakh Bukhary* (St. P., 1913), p. 583. They are situated sixteen versts north-west of the present town (according to a MS. correction by Zimin; the printed article has north-east), and are mentioned by Mahdī Khān, *History of Nādir Shāh*, Teheran ed., 1260 A. H., p. 324, and by Muḥ. Wafā Karmīnagī, MS. As. Mus. c 581 b, f. 17 b. The ruins of Qarshī of the fourteenth century are to the south of the modern town, close to the railway station, and bear the name of Ḍaḥḥāk-i Mārān; Zimin, *Protok.*, *loc. cit.*, and Castagné, *ibid.*, p. 27.

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 242.

and four days' journey from Bukhārā, on the road to Kālif[1]. Both villages are still mentioned in the twelfth century; at Kasba there was even then a cathedral mosque[2], and Bazda was a strong fortress[3]. The number of villages in the neighbourhood of Nasaf was considerable in spite of the insufficiency of running water; the waters of the Kashka-Darya did not always reach Nasaf, and there was no other river in the province. The fields were irrigated by water from wells, but for the most part by atmospheric moisture only.

The journey from Bukhārā to Nasaf[4] (about ninety miles, according to Maqdisī thirty farsakhs) took four days; the intermediate stations were Qarāchūn[5], Miyānkāl, and Māymurgh[6]. Māymurgh was still in the time of Sam'ānī (who stayed here on his journey back to Bukhārā) a large and flourishing village. There is mentioned also another route through Kasba; finally, Maqdisī speaks of a road from Bukhārā through Bazda to Kālif (nine days), on which the intermediate stations were: | (1) Jikam, 137
(2) Ancient ribāṭ (Ribāṭ 'atīq), (3) Sa'īd's well, (4) Bazda, (5) Ribāṭ Khwārān, (6) Village of the Bukharans, (7) Village of the Khorezmians, (8) Balkhān. The village of the Bukharans and the village of the Khorezmians are probably identical with the crossings of Bukhariyān and Khārazmiyān on the Amu-Darya, mentioned elsewhere in Maqdisī[7]. All these roads ran, as they still do, through desert localities; the country between Nasaf and the Amu-Darya also shared this desert character[8].

From Nasaf roads ran to Kish[9] (three days) and to Sūbakh (one day); after passing Sūbakh (Khuzar) the road entered the mountains. From Sūbakh it was reckoned one day's journey to the village of Dīdagī[10], and another day thence to Kandak, where the road from Nasaf was joined by the road from Samarqand through Kish. From Samarqand to Kish was reckoned two days' journey; Maqdisī[11] places between these towns the station of Dirizdah, which evidently lay south of the mountains, as Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[12] include this village in the province of the town of Nasaf. The pass between Kish and Samarqand is

[1] *Ibid.*, iii, 343. [2] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الكسبوى; Yāqūt, iv, 273.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البزدوى; Yāqūt, i, 604.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, i, 337.

[5] This name should perhaps be read Farāchūn or Farājūn; in the biography of Bahā ad-Dīn Naqshband the "wood of Farājūn" (bīsha-i Farājūn) is mentioned; Anīs aṭ-Ṭālibīn, MS. Univ. Petr. 386, f. 174 a.

[6] In one of the MS. of Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 345) still another station ("Ribāṭ-Āstāna") is placed between Miyānkāl and Māymurgh, so that according to this reckoning the journey from Bukhārā to Nasaf took five days.

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 292. [8] *Texts*, p. 82 (Jahān-nāmah).

[9] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 313.

[10] Spelt in Iṣṭakhrī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 337) دادكى and ديدجى.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 342. [12] Sam'ānī, *s v.* الدرزدهى; Yāqūt, ii, 566.

famous in the history of the Arab conquest as the site of one of the chief battles between the Arabs and the Turks[1]. There existed yet another road, through the village of Muḥtariqa (lit. "the burnt"), which received its name from the fact that it was burnt by the Arab commander Ḥabīb, who after defeating a Bukharan army rejoined his father Muhallab, then besieging Kish[2] (80/699). Elsewhere, however[3], Ṭabarī ascribes the burning of the village to Qutayba, and refers this event to the year 91/710; the village was formerly called Faryāb (or Qaryāt). In 730 the Arabs were averse to marching through Muhtariqa, as the whole locality was densely wooded, and it was feared that the Turks might set fire to it; death by the sword was regarded by the Arabs as preferable to death by fire[4]. Muḥtariqa was
138 evidently north of the mountains, | as Ḥāfiz-Abrū included it in the province of Samarqand[5]. It is difficult to say whether the name Faryāb should be connected with the above-mentioned village of Farāb (see alphabetical list of villages in the Zarafshān valley).

Kandak was three days' journey from Kish[6], probably in the Kichi-uru-Darya valley, perhaps on the site of the village of Karahoval. It is not mentioned by Sam'ānī and Yāqūt, the former of whom apparently neglected to visit this mountain district, but went from Nasaf to Tirmidh via Kālif. This possibly explains why Sam'ānī (followed by Yāqūt) places in the district of Nasaf even villages which were certainly much nearer to Kish. In the history of Tīmūr's campaigns[7] we already find a totally different nomenclature; the places most frequently mentioned are the district of Tang-i ḥarām, the river Chakdālīk or Shakdālīk (now Kichi-uru-Darya), whose arms met at Qātlish, and the locality of Chakchak to the north of the Iron Gate, now the Chakcha valley, along the bottom of which flows the stream of the same name.

From Kandak it was one day's journey to the famous Iron Gate, in Persian Dar-i Āhanīn[8], now the Buzgala defile; passing through the defile Tirmidh was reached in three days, the intermediate stations being the rabāṭ of Rāzīk and Hāshimgird (p. 73). In Maqdisī the names of the rabāṭ of Rāzīk and Hāshimgird are omitted, and the name of the village of Qarna inserted instead. There existed yet another road from the Iron Gate to Ṣaghāniyān (Denaw), through the present Baisun; it was

[1] Marquart, *Chronologie d. altturk. Inschr.*, S. 35.
[2] Tabarī, ii, 1041. [3] *Ibid.*, 1229. [4] *Ibid*, 1533.
[5] *al-Muzaffarīya*, pp. 15, 18; مختزق should evidently be read instead of متغرق.
[6] According to Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 342) only one stage, which is impossible.
[7] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 108–11, 123, 125, 128. *Zafar-namah*, i, 123–5, 138, 140, 142.
[8] In Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 290) درياهنمن.

by this road that the Bukharan army marched in the autumn of 948[1]. Finally, there was a road from Kish to Ṣaghāniyān through the valley of the Sang-gardak; by this road the journey took six days.

In the dictionaries of Sam'ānī and Yāqūt we find the names of several villages in the Kashka-Darya valley, especially in the neighbourhood of Nasaf, where Sam'ānī spent about two months (see above, p. 34), and in addition to these the names of several of the quarters and streets in this town are quoted. These names are as follows:

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s. v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
Āfurān	الآفرانى	i, 64	1 (in Y. 2) farsakhs from Nasaf. 138–141
Andadī	الاندى	i, 372	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
Anshamīthan	الانشمثنى	i, 380	,, ,,
Bāyān	الاباني	i, 488	Street and quarter in Nasaf.
Bashtān	البشنانى	i, 628	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
Batkhudān (in Y. Butkhadān)	البتحدانى	i, 488	,, ,,
Bīrān	—	i, 782	1 fars. from Nasaf.
Buzghām	البزغامى	i, 605	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
Dujākan	الدجاكنى	ii, 551	,, ,,
Fankad	الفنكدى	iii, 920	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; Sam'ānī thought (but was not certain) that he passed through this place.
Farkhūrdīza	الفرخوردنزجى	iii, 870	2 (in Y. 1) fars. from Nasaf, in the upper district (العوالى); Sam'ānī spent a night here.
Fījkath or Fījakath	الفيجكثى	iii, 926	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
Fuwaydīn	—	iii, 924	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; perhaps a mistake for Ghuwaydīn.
Ghardiyān (in S. Ghardyān?)	الغردياني	iii, 784	Neighbourhood of Kish.
Ghaznayān	الغزنبانى	iii, 798	,, ,,
Ībasan (in Y. Ībasn)	الايبسنى	i, 415	1 fars. from Nasaf.
Jūbaq	الجوبقى	ii, 142	Locality in Nasaf; the same name was applied also in Merv and Nīshāpūr to small markets for fruit, &c., and to Khāns (Kārawānsarāys).

[1] *Text*, p. 8 (Gardīzī).

	Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*
38–141	Juwīk	—	ii, 164	Quarter in Nasaf. Sam'ānī mentions Juwīk only as the name of a street in Ba'lbak.
	Jūybār	الجويبارى	ii, 163	Street (sikka) and quarter in Nasaf, in which Sam'ānī had himself been.
	Kājar	الكاجرى	iv, 222	2 fars. from Nasaf.
	Karmuchīn (in Y. Karmachīn)	الكرمجينى	iv, 267	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
	Kāsan	الكاسنى	iv, 227	,, ,,
	Khashyandīza (in Y. Khashīndīza)	الخشيندیزى	ii, 447	,, ,,
	Khushminjakath	الخشمنجكثى	ii, 446	Neighbourhood of Kish.
	Khushūnanjakath	الخشونجكثى	ii, 447	Neighbourhood of Kish, in proximity to the villages of Samarqand; this village was formerly included in the province of Samarqand.
	Khūzyān or Khūziyān	الخوزيانى	ii, 497	Castle in neighbourhood of Nasaf, in the district of Ghūbdīn.
	Kubindā-Ma'qal	الكبندوى	iv, 234	Neighbourhood of Nasaf (mentioned in the forms Kabinda and Kabanda).
	Marghibān	المرغبانى	iv, 499	Neighbourhood of Kish.
	Misnān	المسنانى	iv, 533	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
	Mūdā	المودوى	iv, 678	Neighbourhood of Kish; Sam'ānī thought, but was not sure, that he had been there.
	Mujduwān in (Y. Majduwān)	المجدوانى	iv, 419	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; in Sam'ānī's time it was lying in ruins.
	Muwān	الموانى	—	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
	Niyāza	النيازى	iv, 854	Large village between Kish and Nasaf; Sam'ānī spent one night there "in snow and cold."
	Padyāna (in Y. Badyāna)	البديانوى (fol. 69a)	i, 527	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.
	Qalāsī	القلاسى	—	Famous house (or family) in Nasaf.
	Rāghsirisna (?) or Rāghsirsana[1]	الراغسرسنى	ii, 734	Half a fars. from Nasaf.
	Sākbadyāzū (?) (in Y. Sākabdiyāz)	الساكبديازوى	iii, 13	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.

Name.	*References.* *Sam'ānī, s.v.*	*Yāqūt.*	*Remarks.*	
Sānjan	السانجنى	iii, 23	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.	138–141
Sarkath	—	iii, 82	Neighbourhood of Kish.	
Sharghiyān or Jarghiyān	الشرغيانى	iii, 277	Street in Nasaf, whose name was derived from the emigrants living in it from the Bukharan trading village of Shargh or Jargh (see above, p. 99).	
Shāwkharān (in Y. Shāwakhiān)	الشاوخرانى	iii, 245	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; in the twelfth century only traces of it remained.	
Shīrkath	الشركثى	iii, 352	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.	
Shūzyān (or Shūziyān)	الشوزيانى	—	Neighbourhood of Kish.	
Sūnaj	—	iii, 197	Neighbourhood of Nasaf, probably identical with Sūbakh.	
Tadyāna	التدبانى	i, 832	Neighbourhood of Nasaf, probably identical with Padyāna.	
Tūban	التوبنى	i, 888	Near Sūbakh.	
Ustughdādīza	الاستغدادزى	i, 243	4 fars. from Nasaf; Sam'ānī passed through this village on the way from Nasaf to Bukhārā.	
Utshund (in Y. Utshand)	الاتشندى	i, 112	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.	
Wana or Wanaj	الونجى	iv, 941, 942	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; there was a rabāṭ here.	
Waraghchan (in Y. Warghajan or Wazaghjan)	الورغجنى	iv, 921	Neighbourhood of Nasaf, in Sam'ānī's opinion; perhaps identical with Wazghajn.	
Warthīn	الورثينى	iv, 920	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.	
Waṣṣāf or Darb-Waṣṣāf	الوصافى	iv, 931	Street in Nasaf.	
Wazghajn	الوزغجنى	—	Neighbourhood of Nasaf, in Sam'ānī's opinion (see Waraghchan).	
Yaghnā	اليغنوى	iv, 1022	Neighbourhood of Nasaf; Sam'ānī thought that he passed through it on the way to Bukhārā.	
Zādhak	الزاذكى	ii, 906	Neighbourhood of Kish.	
Zandiyā (?)[1] (in Y. Zandīna)	الزنديانى	ii, 952	Neighbourhood of Nasaf.	
Zīkūn (in Y. Zaykūn)	الزيكونى	ii, 966	"	"

[1] In Sam'ānī: الزاى والدال المهملة بين النون (*sic*) والالف بين اليايين اخر الحروف

In addition to this, in the biography of the Shaykh Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Mu'ādh b. Ya'qūb (d. 219/834), a native of the village of Kāsan, mention is made of the ancient cathedral mosque (al-jāmi' al-'atīq) and of the rabāṭ built by him at Nasaf, in the "street of the anchorites" (سكّة الزهاد), which was at one time called, after the shaykh, the street of Abū 'Abd ar-Rahmān. Sam'ānī visited his grave [1].

We shall now return to the provinces lying along the course of the Amu-Darya. We have seen that the continuously cultivated strip on the left bank began from Āmul; the first town in Khorezmia, Ṭāhirīya, was situated five days' journey below Āmul, the intermediate stations being Wīza, Mardūs, Asbās, and Sifāya or Sipāya [2] (not Sifāna, as in the printed edition); the last village is mentioned again in the history of Tīmūr [3]. Ṭāhirīya was probably on the site of the ruins of Ketmenchi. In the following centuries, from the eleventh onwards [4], the southernmost town of Khorezmia was usually considered to be Darghān, two days' journey below Ṭāhirīya; halfway between them was the village of Jigarband [5], where the road from Bukhārā to the capital of Khorezmia approached the Amu-Darya [6]. In Abu'l-Ghāzī [7] Darghān is mentioned under the name of Darūghān or Darūghān-atā (now the ruins of Darghan-
142 ata). In the tenth century | Darghān was regarded as the largest town on the left bank after Gurgānj; it had a beautiful cathedral mosque, the best in the province, with articles ornamented with precious stones and gilt. For a distance of two farsakhs along the bank there stretched the vineyards of the town, numbering over five hundred, from which raisins were exported. Darghān is described also by Yāqūt, who visited it on his way from Merv to Khorezmia. The town was situated on a terrace two miles from the river; between the terrace and the

[1] Sam'ānī, *s.v* الكاسنى.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 301, 338. De Goeje, *Das alte Bett des Oxus*, Leiden, 1875, S 95.

[3] *Pétis de la Croix*, i, 232, 260; *Zafar-namah*, i, 236, 261.

[4] Baihaki, ed. Morley, p. 859 (where درغان should be read instead of درخان); *Texts*, pp. 29, 42 (Inshā').

[5] In his monograph (*Das alte Bett*) de Goeje decides in favour of that reading of the MSS. according to which Jigarband was situated between Darghān and Sadūr (the correct spelling is Sadwar, cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 80). This supposition is supported also by the distance between Sadwar and Darghan-atā, but in that case it is equally incorrect that it was three days' journey from Jigarband to "the place where the river narrows" Maqdisī also mentions Jigarband after Darghān in his list of the crossings of the Amu-Darya (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 292). Cf. also Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī's route quoted below.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 343. Jigarband was on the left bank of the river (*ibid.*, iii, 287).

[7] *Aboul-Ghazi*, trad. par Desmaisons, pp. 277, 300, 349.

river were the actual fields and gardens of the inhabitants[1]. There was a cathedral mosque also in Jigarband, which was a place of great commercial importance[2].

One stage below Darghān (according to the printed edition of Iṣṭakhrī, although in fact Jigarband was situated between Darghān and Sadwar) lay the town of Sadwar, which contained a cathedral mosque[3], and is mentioned again in the seventeenth century[4] (now the ruins of Sadvar). Another day's journey farther on was the well-known town of Hazārasp, which has preserved its name to the present day. Three farsakhs from Hazārasp lay Kardarān-Khās, and five farsakhs from the latter Khīwa[5], the present capital of the province, it being reckoned as one day's journey from Hazārasp to Khīwa. Khīwa was situated on the edge of the steppe region, and contained a cathedral mosque; Kardarān-Khās and Hazārasp were fortified towns, with wooden gates and a moat[6]. The Hazārasp ariq began "in the region of Āmul"[7]; the Kardarān-Khās ariq was two farsakhs from Hazārasp, the Khīwa ariq lower down. According to Maqdisī[8] the distance between the Hazārasp and Kardarān-Khās ariqs was two farsakhs. The largest of the ariqs was that of Khīwa, which was used by boats as far as the town[9]. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the inhabitants of Khīwa were still Shāfi'ites, though the other inhabitants of Khorezmia were Ḥanafites[10].

Below the heads of these ariqs, at Abūqsha, the river passed through a mountainous gorge, where it narrowed to one third of its former breadth; this place was considered dangerous for boats[11]. According to Maqdisī[12] "the place where the river narrows" was three days' journey from Jigarband; the intermediate stations were the rabāṭ | of Ḥasan and Nābādghīn. 143
The gorge in question is evidently Duldul-atlagan, between the Uch-chuchak (or Uch-uchak) and Ichke-yar localities, where the width of the river decreases to 392 yards. Three farsakhs (or, according to Ibn Ḥawqal[13], one stage) below the gorge, the large

[1] Yāqūt, ii, 567. Much the same description is given of modern Darghan-ata by A. Kalmykov, in *Protok. Turk. Kruzh*, xii, 70.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 289.
[3] *Ibid.*, 288. Maqdisī (*ibid.*, 286) places this town on the right bank of the river, which can hardly be correct.
[4] *Aboul-Ghazi*, trad. par Desmaisons, p. 349.
[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 341. [6] *Ibid*, iii, 289.
[7] مما يلي آمل; Iṣṭakhrī uses (p. 301) the same phrase to describe the situation of Ṭāhirīya, five days' journey below Āmul; we have therefore no right to conclude that the head of the Hazārasp canal was then near the modern Charjui.
[8] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, iii, 292. [9] *Ibid.*, i, 302.
[10] Yāqūt, ii, 512. [11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i. 304.
[12] *Ibid.*, iii, 343. This figure is very doubtful; cf. above, p. 142, n. 5.
[13] *Ibid.*, ii, 354.

Gāw-khwārah ("Cow-fodder") canal[1], which was twice the size of the Hazārasp canal, was taken off from the river; its width was five dhirā's (3–4 yards), and its depth equal to two qāmas (see above, p. 86). The Gīra ariq branched off from this canal five farsakhs below its head. Six farsakhs below the head of the Gāwkhwārah, and on the right bank of the Amu-Darya, lay the town of Ghārābkhashna or Ghārāmkhashna; it was only from here that the cultivated strip began on the right bank. Between the Gāwkhwārah canal[2] and the main bed of the river was the district of the capital of Khorezmia, Kāth, the town itself being situated twelve farsakhs from the bed of the Gāwkhwārah. From the left bank of the river were taken off the Madrā ariq, which reached the town of the same name, flowing at a distance of a mile[3] ($\frac{1}{3}$ farsakh) from the Khīwa ariq, and, one mile north of the Madrā ariq, the Wadhāk ariq, which reached Gurgānj; from the bed of the Wadhāk to Kāth was two farsakhs. The Madrā canal was twice the size of the Gāwkhwārah. We have no information on the situation of the town of Madrā; according to Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[4] the village of Farnīfthān was at a distance of two farsakhs from it.

Kāth, the ancient capital of Khorezmia, was situated on the right bank of the main bed at a distance of one day's journey from Khīwa[5]. According to Yāqūt[6] the word Kāth was used by the Khorezmians for a rampart or mound in the steppe, though there might be nothing inside it; it was employed therefore with the same significance as the word turtkul[7] to-day in Central Asia. At the time of the Arab invasion the town consisted of three parts, of which the most strongly fortified, *i.e.* the citadel, bore the name of Fīl or Fīr[8]. According to Bīrūnī, Fīr was surrounded by three parallel walls of the same height; above all the fortifications rose the palace of the Khwārazmshāhs, which could be seen from a distance of ten miles and more. The fortress was built of clay and brick[9]. This citadel

144

[1] On the canals, see *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i. 301–3.

[2] According to Yāqūt (iv, 230–1, but of course erroneously) the Gāwkhwārah canal flowed near Darghān, which by his statement was two miles from the river (ii, 567; *Das alte Bett*, S. 113).

[3] According to Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 292) $\frac{1}{3}$ fars., and as much again between it and Wadhāk.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الفرنيفثاني; Yāqūt, iii, 885. In Yāqūt the position of the village is not mentioned. In this passage Sam'ānī calls the town Madrā-kāth; in de Goeje's opinion the same town is mentioned by Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 287, n. f) under the name of Madrāmīthan.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 341.

[6] Yāqūt, iv, 222.

[7] Cf. my *Otchet, &c.*, p. 12. Even recently, the town built and named Petro-alexandrowsk by the Russians was, after the revolution, given the name of Turtkul.

[8] Sachau, *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwārizm*, i, 20, 24.

[9] *Ibid.*, 10, 12.

was gradually undermined by the waters of the Amu-Darya; in the time of Iṣṭakhrī[1] the citadel and the whole of the old town had already been abandoned by the inhabitants; the gates of the old town had already been carried away by the water, and the citadel was threatened with complete destruction. The inhabitants built themselves houses to the east of the ruins; close by the citadel were the cathedral mosque, palace of the Khwārazm-shāhs, and prison. Through the centre of the town flowed an ariq, on both banks of which there were bazaars; the length and breadth of the town equalled ⅓ farsakh, or according to another reading (Ibn Ḥawqal and the Persian version of Iṣṭakhrī) three farsakhs. Ibn Ḥawqal[2] says that in his day no traces were left either of the citadel or of the cathedral mosque and prison beside it; we know, however, from Bīrūnī that the last traces of Fīr disappeared only in the year 994.

Maqdisī[3] gives the following description of the capital of Khorezmia: "Kāth is (also) called Shahristān; it is situated on the bank of the river, and corresponds (in size) to Nīshāpūr[4] (in another edition: "is larger than Bukhārā"). The town lies to the east of the river, and contains a cathedral mosque in the midst of bazaars[5]; the columns are made of black stone to the height of a qāma (five feet), and upon these are placed wooden pillars[6]. The palace of the amīr is in the centre of the town; the citadel has already been destroyed by the river; there are ariqs flowing through the midst of the town. The town is magnificent; it contains many learned men and men of letters, many wealthy persons, and many fine commodities and merchandise. The architects are distinguished for their skill; the readers of the Koran have no equals in 'Irāq for beauty of voice, expressiveness in recitation, deportment, and learning. On the other hand, the town is constantly flooded by the river, and the inhabitants are moving (farther and farther) away from the bank. The town is dirtier than Ardabīl, and contains many refuse drains, | which everywhere overflow the high road. The inhabi- 145
tants use the streets as latrines, and collect the filth in pits, whence it is subsequently carried out to the fields in sacks. On account of the enormous quantity of filth strangers can walk about the town only by daylight; the inhabitants kick the dirt into heaps (simply) with their feet[7]." The ruins of old Kāth

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 301. [2] *Ibid.*, ii, 351. [3] *Ibid.*, iii, 287–8.
[4] According to Iṣṭakhrī (*ibid.*, i, 254) Nīshāpūr was one farsakh in length and breadth.
[5] Judging by this indication Maqdisī's description relates to a new edifice not mentioned by Iṣṭakhrī. This confirms the above-quoted statement from Ibn Ḥawqal about the destruction of the former mosque.
[6] I. e. the lower part of the columns was made of stone and the upper part of wood.
[7] In de Goeje's translation (*Das alte Bett*, S. 102), "They carry the dirt on their feet into the mosques."

are now known as Shāh 'Abbās Walī[1]; the small modern fort occupies only a quarter of the old citadel, and there are still remains of a minaret and of the walls of the town.

We have seen that the large Wadhāk canal (according to de Goeje[2], the present bed of the Kunya-Darya) was taken off from the river somewhat above Kāth; below the town flowed the Buwwah ariq, which joined the Wadhāk near the village of Andarastān, one day's journey from Gurgānj; it was smaller than the Wadhāk canal. At a distance of one ghalwa (see above, p. 98, n. 2) from Gurjānj a wooden dam was built over the river, deflecting its course to the east; formerly the water came up to the town itself. From this it is evident that in the Sāmānid period the bed of the Urun-Darya between Kunya-Urgench and Lake Sary-Kamish was not full of water, and Mas'ūdī's account[3] of the "Lake of Jurjānīya" (Sary-Kamish) must be regarded as an anachronism. An arm of the river, diverted eastwards, flowed towards the village of Farātagīn or Barātagīn. This village was situated five days'[4] journey from Kāth, to the east of the river, and at a fairly considerable distance (more than four farsakhs)[5] from it; it was reckoned one day's journey from Farātagīn to the Sea of Aral[6]. According to Maqdisī[7], Barātagīn was a large village situated in the steppes near the mountains. Stone was exported from it; the cathedral mosque was in the midst of the bazaars, and the houses were built of excellent clay. To the east of the main bed flowed the large Kurdar ariq, whose head was four farsakhs below Kāth. Ibn Rusta[8] says of this place that "here the river forms basins, reedy marshes and meadows." The ariq was led off at four
146 localities, and equalled in size | the Buwwah and Wadhāk ariqs after the junction of those streams; nothing is said of its length, but that it was considerable is evident from the fact that the Kurdar formed the eastern boundary of the Mizdākhqān district, which lay opposite Gurgānj, and that the town of Kurdar, as we shall see later, was situated right in the delta of the Amu-Darya.

Gurgānj, called by the Arabs Jurjānīya and by the Mongols and Turks at a later day Urgench, was situated one ghalwa from the dam mentioned above, and one farsakh from the main bed of

[1] They have been described by A. Kuhn (under the name Shah-Abbad-Weli) in *Materialy dlya statist. Turkest. kraya*, iv, 251 sq.

[2] *Das alte Bett*, 71. But, of course, the Wadhāk was only a canal, and must not be identified with the main bed of the river in the tenth century.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, viii, 65; Maçoudi, *Le livre de l'avertissement*, trad. par Baron Carra de Vaux, Paris, 1896, p. 96.

[4] Thus in Iṣṭakhrī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 341); in Maqdisī the distance is greater (see below).

[5] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, i, 341–2.

[6] *Ibid.*, iii, 343.

[7] *Ibid.*, iii, 288.

[8] *Ibid.*, vii, 91.

the river[1]. The town was considered the most important on the left bank of the Amu-Darya, and moreover, according to Maqdisī[2], it grew in size from day to day. It had four gates; the waters of the ariqs came as far as the gates, but were not carried into the town on account of lack of room. Among the separate buildings mentioned is the palace of Ma'mūn, near the gate of Ḥajjāj; the gates of the palace were of particularly beautiful workmanship, there being none to equal them in all Khurāsān. Ma'mūn's son 'Alī built another palace in front of his father's, and laid out a square before the gates in imitation of the Rīgistān at Bukhārā; in this square sheep were sold. This notice evidently refers to Ma'mūn b. Muhammad, amīr of Gurgānj, who subsequently, in the year 995[3], invaded also the southern part of Khorezmia and assumed the title of Khwārazm-shāh, which had till then belonged to the representative of the ancient dynasty which ruled in Kāth. Ma'mūn's son 'Alī succeeded his father in 997; the palace was evidently built by him in the lifetime of his father. In the Sāmānid period Gurgānj was still inferior to Kāth in importance though it increased in size daily[4]. For the eleventh and twelfth centuries we have no detailed information on either city. In the thirteenth century Gurgānj acquired fresh importance as the capital of the powerful dynasty of the Khwārazm-shāhs; when this dynasty became the most powerful in the whole Muslim world, its capital must have been enriched by the treasures of the conquered lands. Yāqūt[5], who lived here at the end of 1219 and beginning of 1220, considers Gurgānj as perhaps the most extensive and the richest of all the towns he had seen.

The most detailed list of the towns and villages in Khorezmia, with indications of the distances between them, is to be found 147
in Maqdisī[6], who gives also different itineraries for the left and right banks of the river. On the road from Hazārasp to Gurgānj the stages are arranged in the following order:

Hazārasp
Zardūkh[7] . . . . . 2 drives[8]
Kardarān-Khās[9] . . . . . 1 drive

[1] *Ibid.*, 1, 342. [2] *Ibid.*, iii, 288–9.
[3] On this date see below.
[4] A minaret preserved among the ruins of Old Gurgānj, was built by the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn b. Ma'mūn in 401/1010–1; the Arabic inscription found on an iron tablet at the base of the minaret has been edited by N. Katanov in *Zapiski*, xiv, 015 sq.
[5] Yāqūt, ii, 54, 486. [6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 343–4.
[7] In the general list of the towns in Khorezmia (*ibid.*, 286) Zardūkh is, however, placed on the right bank of the river.
[8] A drive (barid) was in the Eastern provinces equal to two farsakhs (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iv, 187).
[9] De Goeje (*Das alte Bett*, 84) identifies Kardarān-Khās with the village of Gardan-Khāst mentioned in Abu'l-Ghāzī between Khīwa and Hazārasp (in de Goeje by mistake "unterhalb Khîwa"; cf. *Aboul-Ghazi*, trad. par Desmaisons, pp. 242–3).

Khīwa	2 drives
Rakhushmīthan or Ardakhushmīthan[1] .	1 stage
Daskākhān-Khās	1 stage
Uzārmand or Wazārmand . . .	2 drives
Rūzūnd	1 drive
Nūzwār	1 stage
Zamakhshar	1 stage
Gurgānj	1 stage

A shorter itinerary is quoted by Iṣṭakhrī[2], according to whose statement it was only three days' journey from Kāth to Gurgānj, of which one day's journey was to Ardakhushmīthan and one thence to Nūzwār. Iṣṭakhrī reckons one day's journey from Hazārasp to Khīwa, and as much again from Khīwa to Kāth, but at the same time quotes in farsakhs a more considerable distance:

Hazārasp	
Kardarān-Khwāsh	3 farsakhs
Khīwa	5 farsakhs
Sāfardiz	5 farsakhs
Kāth	3 farsakhs

Sāfardiz is not named in Maqdisī's itinerary, but in de Goeje's opinion it is mentioned by him among the towns on the left bank under the name of Sadfar[3]. Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[4] strangely
148 enough place | Sāfardiz "not far from Āmul, on the road to Khwārazm". It would seem almost certain that the position of Zamakhshar is indicated by the ruins of Zmukshir, but from this point to Khīwa the distance is over fifty miles, and to Kunya-Urgench about eighty-five miles, which bears little correspondence to the figures supplied by Maqdisī[5], though the whole distance from Khīwa to Kunya-Urgench *via* Zmukshir approximates very closely to the distance he gives between Khīwa and Gurgānj.

Of some of the places mentioned Maqdisī[6] gives a few details. Zardūkh was a large fortified village with a rabaḍ; Rūzūnd a fortified village of medium size with a moat; the high road ran through it; the cathedral mosque was near the bazaar, and the inhabitants used water for drinking from a special source. Nūzwār was a small fortified village with a moat and iron gates; the town was traversed by the high road, had two gates and a drawbridge, which was raised every night. Near the western

[1] In Yāqūt (i, 191; here Arta-Khushmīthan) three stages from Gurgānj. Yāqūt crossed the river from Kāth to Artakhushmīthan in Shawwāl 616 (10 Dec. 1219–7 Jan. 1220), when the river was covered with blocks of ice.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 341. [3] *Ibid.*, iii, 287. [4] Yāqūt, iii, 12.

[5] According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (*Voyages*, iii, 6) from Khwārazm (Gurgānj) to Zamakhshar was only four miles.

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 288–90.

gate there were baths, the like of which were not to be found in the whole province; the cathedral mosque was in the midst of the bazaars, and with the exception of a small portion was roofed-in. Zamakhshar was exactly the same sort of small fortified village with a moat, iron gates, prison, drawbridge, and fine cathedral mosque. In Sam'ānī's time Zamakhshar was a big village resembling a small town[1]. In Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[2] still another village, Sāwkān, is mentioned on the left bank of the river, near Hazārasp, according to Yāqūt between Hazārasp and Khushmīthan, *i.e.* Ardakhushmīthan[3]. Yāqūt, who stayed here in 1220, calls Sāwkān a populous village, with a large bazaar, fine cathedral mosque and minaret. |

As regards the right bank of the river, Maqdisī quotes the 149
following itinerary from "the place where the river narrows" to Mizdākhqān, situated opposite Gurgānj, two farsakhs from the bank of the river[4] (*i.e.* near Khojeili):

Mash Rabāṭ	1 stage
Sanda Rabāṭ	1 stage
Baghirqān	1 stage
Shurākhān	1 stage
Kāth	1 stage
Khās	1 stage
Nūzkāt	2 drives
Wāykhān	1 stage
Nūbāgh	1 stage
Mizdākhqān	2 stages through the steppe

In addition to this road two other roads are mentioned. The first led from Mash Rabāṭ to the following points:

Amīr	1 stage
Bārāb-Sār	2 stages
Ardakhīwa	1 stage

The second road started from Kāth; the following stations and distances are mentioned on it:

Ghardmān	1 stage
Wāykhān	2 drives
Ardakhīwa	1 drive
Nūkbāgh	1 stage

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الزمخشري. [2] Yāqūt, iii, 24.

[3] In some sources Khushmīthan and Ardakhushmīthan are named separately (see *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 299).

[4] *Ibid*, i, 342. Mizdākhqān is mentioned several times, not only in Abu'l-Ghāzī, but even in the history of Khīwa in the nineteenth century. The high plain (qir) of Mizdākhqān lies one farsakh to the west of Khojeili. Here there is now shown the grave of the prophet (nabī) Shamun, who is identified with the apostle Peter. In the same place there are the ruins of a fortress called Gyawr-Qal'a (fortress of the infidels). Cf. A. Kuhn in *Materialy dlya statist.* &c., iv, 217, and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 83.

From "the place where the river narrows" to the present Shurakhan is about sixty miles, which corresponds approximately to the four stages mentioned by Maqdisī; from Shurakhan to the ancient Kāth (now the village of Shāh-'Abbās-Walī) is about twenty miles. Maqdisī's Baghirqān is in no way identical with the Baqirghan of Abu'l-Ghāzī, which formed the northern boundary of the settlements of the Uzbegs of Khīwa[1]. From Shāh-'Abbās-Walī to Khojeili is about 105 miles, so that in the second section of the road (especially if the nearer road from Kāth to Wāykhān through Ghardmān is taken) the distances mentioned in Maqdisī are also fairly accurate. Ghardmān may be placed near the present Gurlen. In Iṣṭakhrī Khās is
150 called Darkhās[2] | and located two days' journey from Kāth; in the time of Abu'l-Ghāzī, owing to the change of course of the main river-bed, it was already situated on the left bank[3]. Wāykhān was probably near Mangit, Ardakhīwa, one drive distant from Wāykhān, and, as we shall see later, at the foot of a mountain, near the post-station of Khoja-kul. The direct road from Mash-Rabāṭ to Ardakhīwa evidently ran at first along the right bank of the Gāwkhwārah canal, and subsequently on the right bank of the Kurdar, *i.e.* the present main bed[4]. To cover this distance (about 115 miles) in five days was quite possible.

Details are given of the following points[5]: Ghardmān had two gates, and was surrounded by a moat filled with water, the width of which equalled an arrow-flight. There was a moat also at Wāykhān, and catapults stood near the gate. Ardakhīwa was on the edge of the steppe; its walls, lying at the foot of a mountain, had only one gate. Round Nūkfāgh (Nūkbāgh) ran a canal, led off from the Amu-Darya, which flowed on towards the steppe. Mizdākhqān was a large town with an extensive district round it; there were as many as 12,000 forts (?), and the town itself was almost equal in size to Gurgānj. Ibn Rusta[6] places the village of Harāwaz (or Harwāz) in the Mizdākhqān district right on the bank of the river. All the villages mentioned were fortified.

[1] *Aboul-Ghazi*, trad. par Desmaisons, pp. 298, 300, 301. As the form Baqirghan-ata is already met with here, the birthplace of the saint Ḥakīm-atā is, of course, identical with the Baqirghan of Abu'l-Ghāzī, and not with the Baghirqān of Maqdisī, in spite of K. G. Zaleman's view (*Izvyestiya Imp. Akad. Nauk*, 1898, ix, no. 2, p. 106). The grave of Ḥakīm-atā is shown to-day not far from modern Kungrad; cf my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, pp. 88 sq.

[2] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, i, 341.

[3] De Goeje, *Das alte Bett*, S. 79.

[4] It is interesting that in the tenth century the Kurdar was supposed to have been in former times the main bed of the river, cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 303. The town of Kurdar (cf. below) is mentioned by Ṭabarī (ii, 1525) in A. H. 110 as the residence of a prince (malik). It is, therefore, highly improbable that the river flowed through the Uzboi to the Caspian in the last century before the Arab conquest. Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 82, and the opposed view of A. Hermann (*Alte Geographie des unteren Oxusgebiets*, Berlin, 1914; reviewed by me in *Zapiski*, xxii, 357 sq).

[5] *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, iii, 288.

[6] *Ibid.*, vii, 92.

For the locality below Mizdākhqān the following points and distances are given:

Mizdākhqān	
Darsān	2drives
Kurdar	1 stage
Juwīqān	2 drives
Barātagīn	1 stage
Shore of the Lake	1 stage

Between Mizdākhqān and Kurdar there is quoted still another road of identical length:

Wardrāgh (?)	1 stage
Kurdar	1 stage

Iṣṭakhrī[1] reckons only one day from Darkhās to Kurdar and 151
two days from Kurdar to Barātagīn; the first figure is undoubtedly incorrect. The distance from Khojeili to the shore of the Sea of Aral, *i.e.* through Kungrad to the Taldyk estuary (about 100 miles), corresponds to a five days' journey; if the main stream of the river emptied itself at that period at Aibugir a shorter distance would have been indicated. As the geographers do not give us any information on the delta of the Amu-Darya or on the number and position of its arms, it is hardly possible to fix the situation of the separate points. On the basis of the data quoted above (p. 146) one who is familiar with the district will perhaps be in a position to determine the situation of Barātagīn[2]. Of Kurdar we know only that it was bigger than Nūkfāgh and better fortified[3].

Not far from Barātagīn, somewhat nearer the river, but still at a distance of four farsakhs from it[4], was situated Madhmīnīya, in Maqdisī[5] Madhkamīnīya, the most northerly settlement in the country. Opposite Madhmīnīya, on the left bank of the river, was the village of Gīt or Jīt, near a mountain, behind which began the steppe. The distance between Gīt and Gurgānj is not defined; it is stated only that Gīt was five farsakhs from Kūjāgh (?)[6]. Maqdisī[7] locates it in the steppe, on the borders

[1] *Ibid*, i, 341.

[2] From the distances Barātagīn might perhaps be located near the heights of Kashkana-tau, but the geological structure of these mountains, in which there are "no petrifications" (Mushketov, *Turkestan*, i, 637) would hardly allow of the existence of stone quarries. Kashkana-tau is the highest part of the high plain (qir) of Kara-tau; there are other hills called Kube-tau, Payghamber-kiz, and others. Cf. A. Kuhn in *Materialy, &c.*, iv, 224 sq.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 288. [4] *Ibid.*, i, 303, 341–2. [5] *Ibid.*, iii, 286.

[6] *Ibid.*, i, 302. A place of this name is nowhere mentioned. In his monograph on the Amu-Darya (*Das alte Bett*, S. 64), de Goeje suggests reading Gurganj or Gurganjak (Little Gurganj, see below). It would be difficult, however, to explain why just here Iṣṭakhrī should make use of the Persian form of the name, which is not found either in him or any of the other Arabic tenth-century geographers.

[7] *Ibid.*, iii, 289.

of the territories of the Ghuzz, and calls it a large fortified village, with extensive districts. De Goeje[1] identifies Gīt with Wazīr, a town which acquired great importance in the sixteenth century, and regards as the remains of this town either the ruins of Dew Kesken on the Ust-Urt slope, in the immediate vicinity
52 of the Chink, or the ruins | of Shervan, twenty-four miles south-west of Kunya-Urgench[2]. Gīt, however, lay farther to the east "opposite Madhmīnīya". According to Iṣṭakhrī[3], Madhmīnīya was incorporated in Gurgānj (province); its position (on the right bank of the river) was due only to the fact that the river had changed its course from the Kurdar and flowed between Gīt and Madhmīnīya. From this statement (which is repeated by Ibn Ḥawqal) it is clear only that Madhmīnīya lay farther west than the other towns and villages on the right bank of the river. On the shore of the Sea of Aral itself, near the estuary of the Amu-Darya, was situated Khalījān. There was no village here, but only a few fishermen's huts. The name Khalījān was, according to Ibn Rusta[4], borne not by the main bed of the river but by the numerous basins in its lower course; the fish caught here were exported from Khorezmia throughout the land. It is very probable that Ibn Rusta describes the branch of the river flowing to the Sary-Kamish, and that his Khalījān must be identified with this depression, not with the Aibugir, though Iṣṭakhrī speaks of the Khalījān as the place where the Amu fell into the Aral Sea[5]. The Sea of Aral was, according to Ibn Rusta's figures, eighty farsakhs in circumference, according to Iṣṭakhrī[6] 100 farsakhs; the heights along the western shore of the sea are called Siyāh-kūh (Black Mountain) in Ibn Rusta, and Chakir-oghuz in Iṣṭakhrī. The latter name is probably to be connected with that of the Chaghirāq or Chaghrāt tribe, which is sometimes mentioned in Bayhaqī[7] as neighbouring on Khorezmia. The marsh of the right shore was covered with dense forest, traversed only by a narrow path, traced by wild boar. It was reckoned four days' journey from the estuary of the Amu-Darya to that of the Syr-Darya.

Besides the towns and villages mentioned above, Maqdisī[8] names (without indicating their position) on the left bank Wajāz or Jāz (a large fortified village with a broad moat and bridges,

[1] *Das alte Bett*, S. 63–4.

[2] The ruins of Wazīr were well known even in the nineteenth century; in their neighbourhood were the ruins of the fortress of Shamākhā, on Russian maps Shimaki; cf. my *Oroshenie*, p. 100. Wazīr was built shortly before 1464; *ibid.*, 92.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 303.

[4] *Ibid.*, vii, 92.

[5] *Ibid.*, i, 303; cf. *Encyc. of Islam*, article "Āmū-Daryā," and *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 84.

[6] *Ibid.*, i, 304. [7] Ed. Morley, pp. 91, 398. [8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 286–9.

standing apart from the high road; the cathedral mosque was situated on the edge of the town), Little Gurgānj [1] (?), another Jīt, Masāsān and Kārdār; on the right bank Jashīr (a large fortified village). Ibn Rusta [2] places the village of Waraghdih four farsakhs below Gurgānj, and still farther down, somewhat above Khalījān, | the village of Barābīḍ (?) [3]; on the right bank 153
there were still two villages below Harāwaz, but their names are not given [4]. Sam'ānī and Yāqūt mention in addition the following Khorezmian villages:

1. Bāf [5]. 2. Barqān or Birqān [6], on the right bank of the river in the neighbourhood of Kāth, two days' journey from Gurgānj; the greater part of the village was already in Sam'ānī's time destroyed and covered by fields. 3. Bughaydid [7], in other sources Baghdād or Baghdādak ("Little Baghdād"), between Jand and Khwārazm; this village was the birthplace of the famous shaykh Majd ad-Dīn and his brother, the author of the well-known collection of official documents (see p. 33). 4. Ghawshfinj [8], nearly twenty farsakhs from Gurganj. 5. Ghazīniz [9], in the district of Barāghūd (?). 6. Ishsh [10]. 7. Junqān Akhashsha [11]. 8. Kharūr [12] in the neighbourhood of Sāwkān. 9. Rūdhān [13]. 10. Saraqusṭa [14]. 11. Sīb [15], a place or island in the lower districts of Khorezmia. 12. Suburnā or Sūbarna [16], according to Yāqūt the last place in Khorezmia, twenty farsakhs from Gurgānj on the road to Shahristān (*i.e.* to Khurāsān). 13. Tumurtāsh [17]. There are mentioned further in the collection of documents referred to above [18] the villages of Nūkhās and Sangān-Akhsak.

[1] According to Yāqūt (iv, 261) 3 fars. from Gurgānj proper.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 92. [3] In the MS. برابيض.

[4] This information refers to the left branch of the river flowing to the Sary-Kamish, as explained above.

[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البافى; Yāqūt, i, 475.

[6] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البرقانى; Yāqūt, i, 570.

[7] Yāqūt, i, 698. The town must have been irrigated by a channel from the Amu-Darya, which is mentioned as the canal (nahr) of Baghdādak in the description of Tīmūr's expedition of 1388 (*Zafar-nāmah*, i, 447). We are not told whether this canal derived from the Kurdar or from the Gāwkhwārah; cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 87. The site of this town is perhaps marked by the ruins of Guldursun Qal'a, on the way from Petroalexandrowsk to the wells of Kukcha (Masalsky, *Turkestan*, p. 749).

[8] Yāqūt, iii, 825, where the vocalization, in spite of the laws of Arabic phonetics, is as given.

[9] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الغزيزنزى. [10] Yāqūt, i, 279.

[11] *Ibid.*, ii, 133. [12] *Ibid.*, ii, 429. [13] *Ibid.*, ii, 830, from al-'Umrānī.

[14] *Ibid.*, iii, 80, from al-'Umrānī. [15] *Ibid.*, iii, 209, from al-'Umrānī.

[16] *Ibid.*, iii, 32, 182. Shahristān was 3 miles or 1 fars. north of Nasā, near modern Askhabad. From these statements we may conclude that at the beginning of the thirteenth century the cultivated area extended much farther south than in the tenth; Maqdisī (p. 344, n. *o*) mentions on the same road only one village (Ardakuwā), one stage from Gurgānj; the other stages were marked only by rabāṭs.

[17] Yāqūt, i, 873. [18] *Texts*, pp. 75, 76.

The historical isolation of Khorezmia is due, as is well known, to its geographical position. At the present time the country is surrounded on all sides by steppes; it may be concluded from the statements of Iṣṭakhrī [1] that in the Middle Ages a narrow but uninterrupted cultivated strip, starting from Amul, united it to Khurāsān and Transoxania, though even so much is improbable [2]; in any case, such a strip presented no danger as regards foreign conquest, as it could easily be flooded, a measure to which the rulers of Khorezmia actually resorted on several occasions. As regards the roads through the steppe, according to Iṣṭakhri [1] it was possible to go from the Bukharan village of Farakhsha to Khorezmia in eight days; on the whole length of the journey there were no rabāṭs and nothing but pasturages. Maqdisī [3] quotes still another road from Bukhārā to the bank of the Amu-Darya at the rabāṭ of Jigarband, which was probably situated opposite the village of the same name: |

154 Bukhārā

Amza [4]	2 drives
Tāsh (rabāṭ)	1 stage
Shūrūkh	1 stage
Sands (ar-raml)	1 stage
Ṭughān rabāṭ [5]	1 stage
Jigarband rabāṭ	1 stage

In one of the editions of Maqdisī's work [6] still another road from Gurgānj is quoted, by which Khurāsān was reached in nine days; the terminal point on this road was Afrāwa or Farāwa rabāṭ, consisting of three interconnected forts, four stages distant from the town of Nasā [7]. According to Sam'ānī [8] this rabāṭ was built by 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir (d. 844). Part of the road evidently ran along the old bed of the Amu-Darya (the Uzboi), and the following places on it are mentioned, each one day's journey from the other:

Ardakuwā
Bāhān rabāṭ
Mahdī rabāṭ
Miyān-shāh rabāṭ
Well of al-Ḥākim
Abū Sahl rabāṭ
Dūghāj rabāṭ
Ja'far rabāṭ.

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i. 338.
[2] Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 79.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 343.
[4] De Goeje conjectures that this village is identical with Andīza (see above, p. 118).
[5] In one edition the words "the place where the river narrows" are inserted between Ṭughān rabāṭ and Jigarband, which is, however, hardly possible. In the route quoted below "the place where the river narrows" is placed, apparently with accuracy, between Jigarband and Sadwar.
[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 344, note *o*.
[7] *Ibid*, iii, 320; cf. also i, 273.
[8] *S. v* الفراوى; cf. Yāqūt, iii, 866.

Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī and Ḥājjī Khalīfa quote the following itinerary for the road from Merv to Gurgānj[1]:

Suqrī or Safarī	5 farsakhs
Ābadān-kanj	2 farsakhs
Sūrān rabāṭ	8 farsakhs
Well of Bīrūn	8 farsakhs[2]
Nūshākir or Nūshākird rabāṭ	7 farsakhs[3] 155
Sangābād	7 farsakhs
Ṭāhirīya[4]	6 farsakhs
Bud rabāṭ[5]	10 farsakhs
Darghān	10 farsakhs
Jigarband[6]	7 farsakhs
Dahān-i shīr rabāṭ[7]	5 farsakhs
Sadūr or Sadwar	4 farsakhs
Hazārasp	10 farsakhs
Dih-i Azraq (*i.e.* "Blue Village")	10 farsakhs[8]
Ardakhushmīthan	7 farsakhs
Andarāstān	6 farsakhs
Nūzwār	2 farsakhs
Gurgānj	6 farsakhs.

It still remains for us to review the basin of the Syr-Daiya. As the headwaters of this river (which was called by the Arabs Sihūn or Sayhūn[9]) the medieval geographers took the Qara-Darya, which even now is regarded by the majority of the population as the true source of the Syr[10]. The more voluminous source of the river, the Naryn, then bore the name Khaylām; the part of Farghāna situated between these two rivers formed the district of Miyān-rudān[11], to which the present Turkish appellation of the locality (Iki-su-arasi) is exactly equivalent. The places situated on the frontier next to the Turkish territories

[1] Nuzhat al-Qulūb, ed. Le Strange, pp. 179 sq., trans. p. 172; de Goeje, *Das alte Bett*, S. 112, Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny*, &c., pp. 58–61, 81.

[2] The printed text of Nuzhat al-Qulūb has (probably more correctly): Well of Earth (Chāh-i Khāk, in the trans "Dry Well"), 5 fars.; Well of Ṣāchī, 7 fars.; Well of Hārūn, 7 fars.

[3] On this stage there was moving sand for the distance of 2,000 paces.

[4] In the printed edition Ṭāhirī-rabāt. [5] In the printed edition Būdīna.

[6] In the printed edition Jigarband is placed before Darghān; the distances are given as 9 fars. from Būdīna rabāt to Jigarband and 5 fars. farther to Darghān.

[7] Here the river narrowed. [8] In the printed edition 9 farsakhs.

[9] On the old names of the river see Marquart, *Chronologie*, &c., S. 5, and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 130. The old name rendered by the Greek "Yaxartes" is preserved in the Chinese transcription Yo-shu (Chavannes, *Documents*, &c, p. 140), and in the خشرت of the Tumansky MS., f. 24 a. The same word is perhaps to be read in the mutilated text of Ibn Khurdādhbih, Text, p. 178. 3.

[10] Kostenko, *Turkestanskii Krai*, i, 230.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 334; ii, 396.

here were, besides Ūzgand, the towns of Bīskand and Salāt[1] and the Haft-dih (*i.e.* "Seven villages") district, which was not conquered by the Muslims until the tenth century; near these points was the passage into the country of the Turks, not actually on the Ūzgand road although not far from it; the reference is probably to the Kugait pass. The chief town of the district was Khaylām (in Maqdisī[2], Khayrlām), evidently on the river of the same name. Regarding the position of these places, we
156 find | the following data in the geographers[3]: From Akhsīkath (then the capital of Farghāna, ten miles south-west of Namangan, near the junction of the Kasan-sayi with the Syr-Darya) it was reckoned nine farsakhs to Shikit, the first village in Miyān-rudān, and five stages to Salāt; from Khaylām to Salāt was seven farsakhs. Seven farsakhs north-west of Akhsīkath, on the frontier between Farghāna and Īlāq (*i.e.* the valley of the Angren), was the town of Wānkath; from Wānkath to Khaylām was three farsakhs; the latter figure is evidently erroneous or else refers to the other Wānkath (see below). Khaylām, according to Maqdisī, was a large town with a fine cathedral mosque; according to Iṣṭakhrī, it was the birthplace of the Sāmānid Abu'l-Ḥasan Naṣr, Isma'īl's elder brother. Shikit also was a large village with a cathedral mosque among the bazaars; the village was famed for its nuts, a thousand of which could sometimes be had for one dirham[4].

As regards the two chief towns on the Turkish frontiers, Ūsh and Ūzgand[5], Ūsh was considered the third town of Farghāna in size; it consisted of a shahristān, citadel, and rabaḍ; the palace and prison were in the citadel. The town had three gates: (1) Mountain Gate, (2) River Gate, (3) Mughkada Gate (*i.e.* Gate of the Fire-temple). The cathedral mosque was among the bazaars. In the neighbourhood of the town there was a large rabāṭ, to which Warriors for the Faith resorted from all quarters; this rabāṭ is probably identical with the guardhouse on the summit of a hill[6] at the base of which the town was built, and where subsequently Bābur built himself a house[7].

[1] According to Ibn Ḥawqal (*ibid.*, II, 395) Bīskand and Salāt were separate districts.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 272.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 346–8.
[4] *Ibid.*, III, 271.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 333; II, 394, III, 272.
[6] From the text of Ibn Ḥawqal it might be inferred that there was a Turkish guardhouse on the hill, whence they kept watch on the preparations of the inhabitants for a holy war; but it can scarcely be supposed that in the Sāmānid period the mountain, which dominated the town and its environs, was left in the hands of the Turks.
[7] Baber-namah, ed. Ilminski, p. 3; ed. Beveridge, p. 2 b, trans. p. 5; *Memoirs of Babcr*, trans. Erskine, p. 2. In Bābur the mountain is called براكوه; in Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 148) براكه; on it and on the neighbouring mountain of Ḥanaf there were tombs of saints; according to some accounts the tomb of Asaf, the wazīr of Solomon,

Ūzgand[1] was two-thirds of the size of Ūsh, and it too consisted of a shahristān, citadel, and rabaḍ. The citadel was included | 157
in the shahristān, this feature, according to Maqdisī, distinguishing Ūzgand from all the other towns in Farghāna. The city had four gates, and was well provided with water in all parts; the river, which flowed past the gate of the town (the Qara-Darya), had to be forded, as there was no bridge. Ūzgand was a centre for the trade with the Turks; from here, as is well known, a road led to Semiryechye, through the Yasi Pass to Ātbāsh[2]. The actual town of Ūzgand belonged in the ninth century to the Dihqān Chūr-tagīn, evidently a Turkish prince. The name "Dihqān Chūr-tagīn" was borne also by a locality between Ūzgand and the pass[3]; at the present day, according to N. F. Petrovsky[4], it is the name of a locality on the road from Ūzgand to Old Ātbāsh, behind the Yasi Pass, at the Uraz-Khan Pass. Ūzgand's most flourishing period was under the first Qarā-Khānids, when it was the capital of Transoxania, but the ancient monuments which have been preserved there[5] must be referred, not to this period, but to the latter half of the twelfth century, when Ūzgand was only the capital of Farghāna. Under the Qarā-Khiṭāys and the first Jaghatāy-Khāns it was at Ūzgand that the imperial treasury was preserved[6]. The distance between Ūsh and Ūzgand was seven farsakhs[7]; there were no other towns near Ūzgand, but in the neighbourhood of Ūsh, and two farsakhs from it was the town of Madwa (now the village of Mady[8]).

The main road from Khojend to Ūsh[9], through the southern part of Farghāna (six days' journey), ran through the following towns (each one day's journey from the preceding): Kand, Sūkh, Rishtān, Zandarāmsh, Qubā; the longest distance was that between Qubā and Ūsh. The town of Kand is mentioned in later times under the name of Kand-i Bādām ("Almond Town"), the present Kan-i Badam; in the Sāmānid period it was not reckoned to Farghāna but incorporated in the province of the town of Khojend[10]. The distance from Khojend to Kan-i Badam

was here. At the present day the tomb of Solomon himself is pointed out, and the mountain is called "Solomon's throne" (Takht-i Sulaymān). Cf. *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, iv, pt. iv, p 53; also the "Risāla" on Ūsh, trans. by L. Zimin, with notes from personal observations (*Protok. Turk. kruzh*, xviii, p. 3 sq.).

[1] Is also written Yūzgand.

[2] See my *Otchet, &c.*, pp. 41–3.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 22, 159; in de Goeje's translation there is a slight omission.

[4] *Zapiski*, viii, 357.

[5] See *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov*, iv, pt. iv, p. 53; *Protok. Turk. kruzh*, 16 Oct. 1897, Supplement, pp. 1–9

[6] *Handbook of Semiryechye*, 1898, pt. ii, pp. 109, 129; separate print of my article, pp. 36, 56.

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, v, 328.

[8] *Ibid.*, i, 347; ii, 396.

[9] *Ibid.*, i, 335.

[10] *Ibid.*, i, 333.

(about forty miles) is very considerable for one day's journey; possibly the town was somewhat more to the west than the
158 present | village, the more so that according to Bābur as well the distance from Khojend to Kand-i Bādām was five or six agachs (farsakhs) in all. According to Maqdisī[1] there was a river (or canal) flowing in the midst of the bazaars in Kand. Sūkh and Rishtān were included in Farghāna, in the district of Upper Nasyā. Sūkh[2] was near the mountains, evidently on the river of the same name, probably to the west of the present village of Sary-kurgan; in its neighbourhood there were as many as sixty villages[3]. Rishtān, which has kept its name to the present day, was a large village with two gates; one was near the bazaars, beside the cathedral mosque, the other near the square. In the same district are mentioned the towns of Khūqand and Wānkath; the first was a long march from Sūkh, and five farsakhs from the Syr-Darya (evidently on the site of the present Khokand), the second three farsakhs from Khaylām (?), and more than a farsakh from the Syr[4]. According to Maqdisī's account Wānkath was equal in size to Rishtān.

The towns of the district of Lower Nasyā were more numerous; in it there are mentioned, besides Zandarāmsh, Marghinān, Barang, Ushtīqān, and Andukān. The first three are named also by Maqdisī as small towns (or villages): the cathedral mosque of Ushtīqān was among the bazaars, at Barang outside the town in the direction of Samarqand, at Marghinān far from the bazaars; there was a river at the gates of the latter. The position of Marghinān (Margelan) and of Andukān (Andijan) is well known; Ushtīqān was on the road from Qubā to Akhsīkath, three farsakhs from the former, and seven from the bank of the Syr[5]; on the position of Barang we have no information. The distance between Marghinān and Zandarāmsh is not indicated, so that we cannot fix the position of the latter with any accuracy. As early as the Qarā-Khānid period, apparently, Marghinān had become the most important town in the district; Sam'ānī[6] refers to it as "one of the well-known towns of Farghāna", and even mentions one of the quarters of Marghinān, Ghandāb[7]. By Bābur Marghinān is mentioned among the eight chief towns of
159 Farghāna; | even Rishtān was at that time a village subordinate to Marghinān. Amongst the villages in Farghāna Sam'ānī

[1] *Bib. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 272.
[2] On the towns of the southern part of Farghāna, *ibid.*, ii, 395–6; iii, 272.
[3] On the river Sokh, twenty miles west of Sary-kurgan, there have been found the remains of an ancient city called Mugh-tepe or Mugh-kurgan (hill or fortress of the fire-worshippers), which have been described by A. Petrow and L. Zimin in *Protok. Turk. kruzh.*, xix, 19 sq.
[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 335, 347.
[5] *Ibid.*, i, 347.
[6] *S. v.* المرغيناني; cf. Yāqūt, iv, 500.
[7] *S. v.* الغنداني; cf. Yāqūt, iii, 820.

mentions Lāmish[1], called Ilāmish by Jamāl Qarshī[2], located in the neighbourhood of Andijan. According to Juwaynī it was in the Ilāmish steppe (saḥrā) that the battle between Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad and the Qaıā-Khiṭāys was fought; the same historian says elsewhere that the battle was fought near Ṭarāz (Talas)[3], from which we may conclude that Ilāmish was in the northern part of Andijan district. The town of Qubā (now the village of Kuva) was the capital of an isolated district in which there were no other towns; it was reckoned the second town of Farghāna, and in quantity of water and number of gardens it even exceeded Akhsīkath; according to Maqdisī it excelled Akhsīkath even in size and wealth. Of the town itself Maqdisī says only that there was a square in the centre, and that the cathedral mosque was among the bazaars; according to Ibn Ḥawqal[4] the town was divided into citadel, shahristān, and ıabaḍ; the first was in a ruined condition, and contained the cathedral mosque[5]; bazaars, palace, and prison were located in the rabaḍ. The town stood on a stream of the same name, which at that time reached the Syr-Darya; of the three little streams now called Aravan, Abshura, and Isfayram it is not quite certain which watered Qubā, when, as in former times, it was a town, not as it now is and was already in Bābur's time, a village[6]. From Qubā to Ūsh was seven farsakhs[7] (by another somewhat exaggerated reckoning ten farsakhs[8]); within this area also was apparently situated the town of Ūrast with its district (this name may probably be connected with the name of the Ἀριστεῖς, a tribe living, according to Ptolemy[9], at the headwaters of the Syr-Darya). The river Ūrast, one of the tributaries of the Syr-Darya, is apparently identical with the Ūsh river (the Aq-bura), which, according to the Tumansky MS., flowed "between Ūsh and Ūrast". To the east of Ūsh there was, besides Madwā, the town of Khurshāb[10], situated on the stream of the same name, which is mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal[11] in the

[1] *S. v* الاميشى; cf. Yāqūt, iv, 343. [2] *Texts*, p. 149.

[3] Cf my *Otchet, &c.*, p. 17; Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-Gushāy, ed. Mīrzā Muḥ. Qazwīnī, ıı, 77 and 91.

[4] *Bibl. Geog Arab*, ıı, 394.

[5] Apparently the only example of this in Farghāña; the fact indicates that at Qubā, as at Bukhārā and Samarqand, the citadel was formerly occupied by an Arab garrison.

[6] Bābur-nāmah, ed Beveridge, f. 16 b, trans p. 30 sq., where the name is erroneously spelled Qabā. We do not know why the town lost its importance after the tenth century. Ḍawlatshāh's story (ed Browne, p. 174 sq, with reference to Nāṣır ad-Dīn Ṭūsī) about the "five brothers" of Qubā and their war with Maḥmūd of Ghazna can hardly be considered historical fact, as Maḥmūd never entered Farghāna. Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, pp. 132 sq. In the time of Bābur there was at Qubā "a stagnant, morasslike water passable only by the bridge."

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 159. [8] *Ibid.*, vi, 22.

[9] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, p. 48.

[10] The town is mentioned in the Tumansky MS. [11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 392.

160 first place among the tributaries of the Syr-Darya; | at the present time, as is well known, of the left tributaries of the Qara-Darya one only, the Kurshab (Khurshāb), reaches it. All the other tributaries empty into the large canal called Shahrikhān, which, like the other large canals derived from the Qara-Darya and the Naryn in the nineteenth century, existed neither in the tenth century nor in the time of Bābur.

In spite of the fact that Farghāna was not finally conquered by the Muslims until the ninth century, already in medieval times Muslim shrines were pointed out in the neighbourhood of Andijan. The tomb of the prophet Ayyūb (Job) in Farghāna (now the medicinal springs of Hazrat-Ayyub, a mile and a half from the village of Jalalabad[1]) was already known to Maqdisī[2]. Jamāl Qarshī[3] tells of the tomb of 2,700 Companions of the Prophet and their followers at Ispīd-bulān; these had been sent by the Caliph 'Othmān under the command of Muḥammad b. Jarīr, and all fell in battle with the infidels. The place is still in existence under the same name (Shcherbina-Kramarenko has by mistake Safid-bulend) in the valley of the Kasan-sai; N. N. Shcherbina-Kramarenko[4] heard a tradition here from the natives which closely resembles the account in Jamāl Qarshī. The latter also locates in Khokand the tomb of 'Abdallāh, the grandson of the Imām Ḥusayn and brother of the Imām Muhammad Bāqir who died in 113/731. Finally, the tomb of the Arab conqueror of Transoxania, Qutayba, killed in 96/715, was an object of veneration. Qutayba's tomb is mentioned in Narshakhī[5] (in the Rabāt-i Sarhang locality, in the village of Kākh) and in Jamāl Qarshī[6]. Even yet the natives point out the tomb of "the Imām Shaykh Qutayba" in the Jalal-Kuduk circuit of the Andijan district[7].

To the south of the main road were the mountainous districts of Isfara (Ispara), Awāl, and Naqād[8]. The name Isfara as applied to a town (the latter is already mentioned in Bābur) did not exist at that time; the towns of the Isfara district were called Ṭamākhush and Bāmkākhush. Bāmkākhush was at a distance of five farsakhs from Sūkh, Ṭamākhush one mile (some-
161 what more than an English mile) from Bāmkākhush[9]; | both

[1] In the article by Shcherbina-Kramarenko (*Ref. Bk of Samarkand prov.*, iv, pt. iv, p. 52) Djallalabad.

[2] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, iii, 46.

[3] *Texts*, p. 148.

[4] *Ref. Bk. Samarkand prov.*, iv, pt. iv, p. 51. Cf. also V. Masalsky, *Turkestan*, p. 702.

[5] Nerchakhy, ed. Schefer, p. 57.

[6] Here spelled كليج.

[7] *Prot. Turk. krush.*, iii, p. 4. Down to 1893 the circuit was included in the district of Osh.

[8] In Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 262) Nawqād.

[9] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, i, 247; in the same place the distances between other towns in Farghāna are given.

towns were probably a little to the north of the present village of Isfara. The Isfara district lay partly in the plain and partly in the mountains. Ibn Ḥawqal devotes special attention to the "parti-coloured mountains" in this locality[1]; in the same place, according to Iṣṭakhrī[2] and Ibn Ḥawqal, there were coal mines, that is "Mountains of black stone, which burns like (wood) fuel; the cinders serve for bleaching clothes." Three donkey loads (wiqr) of coal cost one dirham (franc); the weight of a donkey load was usually as much as eighty to ninety kilogrammes; even if a smaller measure be adopted (fifty-five kg.) the price of coal must still be considered extremely low, especially when compared with the prices that obtained in the early period of our rule in Turkestan[3].

The town of Awāl, capital of a district of the same name, was ten farsakhs from Sūkh on the road to Ūjna (or Ūjana?); of the latter place we know nothing[4]. The village of Awāl still exists to the south of Margelan. In the mountainous region of Naqād there was only one town, Miskān[5]; from Qubā to Naqād (probably Miskān) was seven farsakhs in an easterly direction. Naqād probably corresponded to the locality watered by the Chile and Kirgiz-ata streams.

Passing now to the northern part of Farghāna, we must stop first of all at the capital of the whole province, Akhsīkath. The town, which was situated on the right bank of the Syr-Darya, is described in Ibn Ḥawqal and Maqdisī[6], who distinguish in it a citadel, shahristān, and rabaḍ. The citadel is located by Ibn Ḥawqal in the shahristān, by Maqdisī in the rabaḍ. The palace and prison were in the citadel, the cathedral mosque in the shahristān and close by the citadel (as in Samarqand and Bukhārā), the place for festival prayers on the bank of the Syr-Darya, and the bazaars in the shahristān and rabaḍ, those in the shahristān being distinguished by their vast extent. The shahristān had five gates, of four of which we know the names: Mardkushān Gate (as in Bukhārā), Kāsān Gate, | Gate of the 162

[1] *Ibid.*, II, 397. Cf. Mushketov, *Turkestan*, I, 509.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 334.

[3] Cf Kostenko, *Turkestanskii Kraĭ*, III, 173–5.

[4] De Goeje in the edition of Iṣṭakhrī's text (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 347), proposes to read Ūzjand, i. e. Ūzgand.

[5] *Bibl Geog. Arab*, II, 396.

[6] *Ibid*, II, 393–4; III, 271. On the present condition of the ruins of Akhsīkath see *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, June 1896, pp. 30–31, and my article "Akhsīkath" in *Encyc. of Islām*, where a description is given of the remains of the old citadel (Iskī-Akhsī). 1,000 paces from west to east, 600 from north to south, 150 feet above the level of the Syr-Darya. Mrs. A. S. Beveridge, in the first appendix to her translation of the *Memoirs of Bābur*, refers to the "disappearance of Old Akhsī" as a fact needing explanation, but there has not in fact been any such disappearance Akhsīkath is mentioned by the Chinese T'ang-shu under the name of Sī kien; cf. Chavannes, *Documents, &c*, p. 148.

Cathedral Mosque, and Gate of Pledge (*rihāna*). The shahristān was irrigated by numerous canals which discharged themselves into beautiful reservoirs, the sides of which were lined with brick and lime. The buildings were made of clay, the principal edifices being situated in the shahristān. According to Ibn Ḥawqal the town extended (probably along the bank of the river or else in circumference) over three farsakhs; according to Maqdisī, Akhsīkath was half as large again as the famous town of Ramla in Palestine; of the latter we are told[1] that it was a mile in breadth and somewhat more in length. The gardens extended for another two farsakhs in the neighbourhood of the town; on the other side of the river there were meadows and pastures, and behind these sands for a distance of one day's march.

Akhsīkath was united to the southern part of Farghāna by several roads. There existed a direct road from Khokand to Akhsīkath across the steppe and sands (seven farsakhs); by this road the traveller reached the "Gate of Akhsīkath," and thereafter crossed the river; from this it may be deduced that part of the rabaḍ of Akhsīkath lay on the southern bank of the Syr. It was possible also to proceed from Khokand to Bāb, the present Pap (five farsakhs), and thence to Akhsīkath[2] (four farsakhs). From Qubā to Akhsīkath was ten farsakhs, of which it was three to Ushtīqān and seven from Ushtīqān to the bank of the Syr. As regards the road from Khojend to Akhsīkath, we find the following itinerary[3] in the geographers:

Khojend	
Ṣāmghār	5 fars. (1 stage)
Khājistān	4 fars. (2 drives)
Turmuqān	7 fars. (1 stage)
Bāb	3 fars. (½ stage)
Akhsīkath	4 fars. (2 drives).

Ṣāmghār, which still preserves its name, was a large village situated in the plain, Khājistān a fortified point near the mountain chain which links on to the Īlāq mountains; in the neighbourhood there were large salt mines, the output of salt from which was sufficient for the requirements of Shāsh, Khojend and the other provinces. Rock salt, as is well known, is still mined in the mountains near Ṣāmghār. Turmuqān and Bāb
163 (a large and rich | town) were situated on the Syr; in the ninth century travellers frequently traversed the distance between Khājistān and Bāb in one day, avoiding the halt at Turmuqān for fear of the Turks.

Five farsakhs north of Akhsīkath[4] stood the town of Kāsān,

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 165.
[2] *Ibid*, i, 335–6.
[3] *Ibid*, iii, 341; vi, 21, 159.
[4] *Ibid.*, i, 346.

situated on the river of the same name; the little town still exists, together with the ruins of the old town[1]. At the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries Kāsān was the capital of the princes of Farghāna[2]; an investigation of the ruins, especially of the old fortress of Mugh, would therefore be of great interest.

Finally, in the northern part of Farghāna there are still to be mentioned the districts of Najm and Karwān, with the towns of the same name, and the district of Jidghil with the town of Ardlānkath. From Kāsān to Najm was one day's march to the north-east, from Kāsān to Karwān four farsakhs; from Akhsīkath seven farsakhs to the border of the Karwān district, and nine to the town of Karwān[3]. Najm was perhaps on the site of the present village of Nanai: the district of Karwān probably occupied the northern portion of the present district of Chust. Jidghil is mentioned as one of the sources of the Parak stream, *i. e.* the Chirchik[4]; the district of Jidghil evidently corresponds to the Chotkal valley, which at that time was reckoned in Farghāna; the name Ardlānkath, as we shall see farther on, was borne also by one of the towns situated between the Parak and Īlāq streams, *i. e.* between the Chirchik and the Angren[5]. From Kāsān to Ardlānkath in Farghāna was one day's march[6], or two stations[7].

Maqdisī[8] reckons forty towns and villages in Farghāna with cathedral mosques; in his enumeration of the towns he quotes thirty-one names, these being divided, excluding the capital, into three categories District of Miyān-rudān (Naṣrābād, Mināra, Ranjad, Shikit, Zārkān, Khayrlām, Bashbashān, Ushtīqān, Zandarāmsh (or Zandarāmish) and Ūzgand). District of Nasyā (Ūsh, Qubā, Barang, Marghīnān, Rishtān, | Wānkath and Kand), and 164
District of Wāghiz (Būkand, Kāsān, Bāb, Chārak, Asht[9], Tubkār,

[1] *Ref Bk. Samarkand prov.*, iv, pt iv, p. 49. A more detailed account is given by A. Brianov in *Prot. Turk. kruzh*, iv, pp 142 sq.; the fortress of Mugh consists of three small squares, 500, 2,000, and 3,200 square sazhens respectively (approximately 6 acres or nearly 2½ hectares in all). Kāsān is mentioned by the Chinese under the name of K'o-sai (Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, 148) it is probably to the same town that the statement of the earlier work *Pei-shi* refers (Russian translation by Iakinth, iii, 186), that the capital of Farghāna had a circumference of 4 li (about a mile) only. Cf. also my article "Farghāna" in the *Encyc. of Islām*.

[2] *Ja'qubi Historiae*, ii, 478. *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 294

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 246–7; ii, 405.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 388. The reading Turk adopted by de Goeje is erroneous, and the name should be spelt ترك for فرك (Parak); the name Parak is mentioned as late as the sixteenth century (*Ta'rīkh-i Rashīdī*, English trans., p. 116; 'Abdallāh-Nāmah, MS As. Mus. 574 age, f. 253 a and freq.; cf. my review of Vyatkin's *Materialy* in *Zapiski, &c.*, xv, 053, and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 139). Chirchik is the diminutive of Chir; this name appears for the first time in the history of Tīmūr; cf. *ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, i, 345; ii, 385, 404.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 405.

[7] *Ibid.*, i, 346.

[8] *Ibid.*, iii, 262, 272.

[9] Is still in existence.

Awāl, Dijaıkard, Nawqād-Miskān, Bīgān, Tiskhān (?) [1], Jidghil, Shāwdān). The author evidently wished to place in the first category the towns situated between the Naryn and the Qara-Darya, in the second the towns in the southern part of Farghāna, and in the third the towns in the province north of the Syr-Darya. Some of his locations are undoubtedly erroneous, as is shown by his placing Ushtīqān and Zandarāmsh in the first category and Awāl and Miskān in the third. Of the towns which are not mentioned by the earlier geographers some particulars are given about the following [2]: Naṣrābād, a large town with dense gardens, was built by some prince (probably Aḥmad b. Asad) for his son Naṣr. Near Ranjad there was much arable land; a fine cathedral mosque was situated amidst the cobblers' bazaar. Tiskhān was a large and populous town; the cathedral mosque was situated in the bazaar of the dealers in cotton goods. Zārkān was a town of medium size, with many rice fields and abundant irrigation; at the gate of the cathedral mosque there was a shady garden. Bashbashān was a large town; the gate of the cathedral mosque opened on a square. Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal [3] mention also the town of Bārāb or Fāıāb on the Syr-Darya, Sam'ānī and Yāqūt [4] that of Yadhukhkath (in Yāqūt Yadhakhkath) without indicating its situation. In no district of Transoxania did single villages occupy so remarkable an area as in Farghāna; one village sometimes stretched out over an entire day's journey [5]. The province was renowned for its mineral riches; near Akhsīkath, at Naqād and elsewhere there were gold and silver mines; near Sūkh there were quicksilver workings, and in Upper Nasyā mines of tar, asbestos, gold, silver, turquoise, iron, copper, and lead; finally, Farghāna was one of those few
165 provinces in the Muslim | dominions where sal ammoniac [6] was obtained (near Ūzgand, according to the author of the Jahān-Nāmah [7]).

The town of Khojend (Khujanda) [8], which was in later times occasionally reckoned in Farghāna, formed in the tenth century an independent administrative unit; a "prince (malik) of Khu-

[1] On p. 262 spelt اشحهاں; on p. 271 تسحاں; the name should perhaps be read آتشخان (Ātashkhān, *i. e.* Temple of the Fire-worshippers).

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 271–2. [3] *Ibid.*, i, 347; ii, 406.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البذحكثي; Yāqūt, iv, 1014. The name is probably only a misspelling for نُدَخكث mentioned by the two authors elsewhere (Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البدخكثي; Yāqūt, i, 524; Sam'ānī says that it was a village "in Isfījāb or Shāsh"). We know from Ibn Khurdādhbih that it was situated 9 fars. north-east of Isfījāb, on the way to Ṭarāz. For further details cf. my *Otchet, &c.*, p. 9

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 333–4; ii, 394–5. [6] *Ibid.*, ii, 397–8; cf. i, 334.

[7] *Texts*, p. 81. Cf. also the statements above (p. 161) on the coals and industry of Farghāna.

[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 333; ii, 391–2; iii, 272.

janda"[1] is also mentioned in the pre-Muslim period, though he seems to have been dependent on the prince of Farghāna. Khojend was one of the large towns of Transoxania, with a citadel, shahristān, and rabaḍ; in the citadel was the prison, in the shahristān the cathedral mosque, in the rabaḍ, in the centre of a square, the palace. The town was famed for its vineyards and gardens; the population was so large that the produce of the neighbouring fields did not suffice for its needs, and corn for the town had to be imported from Farghāna and Ushrūsana. In the centre of the town flowed an ariq, taken off not, probably, from the Syr-Darya, but from the Khoja Baqirghan[2]. As we have seen, the town of Kand was also included in the province of Khojend.

Almost the whole area between Samarqand and Khojend (184 miles by the present highway) was included in the province of Ushrūsana or Sutrūshana[3]. The Arabic geographers give us several itineraries for this journey. According to Iṣṭakhrī[4] the journey from Samarqand to Khojend took eight days, the intermediate stations being Bārkath[5] (Abārkath), Ṣa'd rabāṭ, Būrnamadh, Zāmīn, Sābāṭ, Arkand, and Shāwkath[6]. The journey between Bārkath (which, as we have seen, was four farsakhs from Samarqand) and Būrnamadh is somewhat differently described by Ibn Khurdādhbih and Qudāma[7]; by their accounts the road led from Bārkath through the Qaṭwān steppe to Khushūfaghn (four farsakhs), thence through a mountainous locality to Būrnamadh (five farsakhs), and then through steppe to Zāmīn (four farsakhs). From this it is evident that Khushūfaghn lay somewhat south of the present Yany-Kurgan station, and that it was from this point, | and not from Jīzak, that the road at that period 166
branched off to the east, across mountain and steppe, to Zāmīn. The road through Ṣa'd rabāṭ, of which Iṣṭakhrī speaks, probably ran farther south. According to Iṣṭakhrī it was between Bārkath and Ṣa'd rabāṭ, near the Abū Aḥmad rabāṭ, that the road to Shāsh *via* Dīzak (Jīzak) branched off from the Farghāna road; on this road a point Qaṭwān-dīza is mentioned[8], at a distance of one day's journey from Bārkath, which is probably identical with Khushūfaghn. On the journey between Bārkath and Dīzak it was possible to halt also at Kharqāna instead of at Qaṭwān-dīza;

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 1439. [2] Cf. my *Oroshenie Turk.*, p. 136.
[3] The old spelling Sutrūshana, known from Chinese sources, is found also in many MSS. readings in tenth-century works; cf. Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 379, note b; the Tumansky MS. has the same reading; cf. my *Oroshenie Turk*, p. 104.
[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 334-5. [5] Cf. above, p. 94.
[6] Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 342) reckons only one day's journey from Sābāṭ to Shāwkath. Ya'qūbī (*ibid.*, vii, 294) also says that the journey from Samarqand to Khojend was made in seven days.
[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, vi, 20, 156.
[8] *Ibid.*, i, 336.

from Kharqāna it was reckoned nine farsakhs to Samarqand, five to Dīzak, and nine to Zāmīn[1].

Between Zāmīn and Khojend there were also several roads. From Sābāṭ[2] it was possible to proceed[3] to Khojend *via* Arkand or Rukund (three farsakhs from Sābāṭ) and Gālūk-Andāz (three farsakhs from Rukund and four from Khojend). There was also a road[4] from Zāmīn to Kurkath *via* Khāwas (seven farsakhs from Zāmīn and six from Kurkath). The villages of Zāmīn, Sābāṭ (Savat), Khāwas (Khavast), Rukund, Kurkath[5], and Gālūk-Andāz have preserved their names to the present day.

The chief town of Ushrūsana, Būnjikath (probably for Panjikath) lay off these roads. According to Ibn Khurdādhbih and Qudāma[6] the way lay from Sābāṭ two farsakhs over the plain and then still another five along the river that flowed from the town; on both sides of the road were mountains covered with villages. As I have had occasion to remark elsewhere[7], this information authorizes us to take as the remains of the capital of Ushrūsana the ruins of Shahristān (sixteen miles south-west
167 of Ura-tube)[8]. These | ruins were surveyed by me in 1894[9], and afterwards described in greater detail by P. S. Skvarsky[10]. In the tenth century[11] the town contained as many as 10,000 male inhabitants; it was composed of a citadel, shahristān,

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 343; II, 382, 403.

[2] From Zāmīn to Sābāt Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab*, III, 342) reckons 2 drives, Iṣṭakhrī (*ibid.*, I, 343), 3 fars, Ibn Khurdādhbih, Ibn Faqih and Qudāma (*ibid.*, V, 328; VI, 21, 158), 2 fars. In the opinion of Skvarsky (*Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, Oct. 1896, p. 50) this Sābāt is perhaps identical not with the present station of the same name but with the village of Iski-Sabat, eight miles farther north.

[3] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, V, 328; VI, 158. Kurkath is only a conjecture of the editor (text, p. 207, note d); the MS. has ركد, *i.e.* ركند, the same as اركند in Iṣṭakhrī, p. 335, where de Goeje himself (note e) rightly identifies the town with ركند (the reading is given as ركد) in Qudāma. Rugunt (*sic*) is mentioned as a village north of Ura-Tube by A. Kushakevitch in the *Izvyestiya* of the Russian Geog. Soc., IV, p. 215 and map). The same village is mentioned as Rugūn (ركون) by Muḥ. Wafā Karmīnagī, Tuhfat al-Khānī, MS. As. Mus. 0581 b, f. 150 b. The distance between Sābāt and Kurkath is more considerable.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 343; II, 382, VI, 20.

[5] In Maqdisī (*ibid.*, III, 265) Kurdkath.

[6] *Ibid*, VI, 21, 159. According to Iṣṭakhrī (*ibid.*, I, 343) it was three farsakhs from Sābāt to Būnjikath.

[7] *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, June 1896, p. 32.

[8] The more popular opinion, already expressed by Bābur (ed. Beveridge, f. 8 b, trans. p. 17), identifies it with Ura-tube itself, and the same view is strongly maintained by the modern explorer J. Castagnié and his fellow-members of the Turkestan Archaeological Circle; cf. their *Prot.* XX, 32 sq., 159 sq. The modern Ura-tube, like the ancient capital of Ushrūsana, has a gate called Gate of Nūjkath (*ibid.*, p. 32). But it is difficult to bring this view into agreement with the statement quoted above that the road ran along the river for five farsakhs between mountains.

[9] Cf. my *Otchet, &c.*, pp. 75–6.

[10] *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, Oct 1896, pp. 47–51.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 326–7; II, 379–80; III, 277.

through which ran the river, and rabaḍ. The citadel, according to Maqdisī, was outside the shahristān (Ibn Ḥawqal's text is somewhat ambiguous here). The prison was situated in the citadel, the cathedral mosque in the shahristān, the bazaars partly in the shahristān and partly in the rabaḍ, the palace in the rabaḍ on crown property. The shahristān had two gates, the Upper and Town gates; the rabaḍ had four: Zāmīn Gate, Marsmanda Gate, Nūjkath Gate, and Kahlābād Gate. The diameter[1] of the wall of the rabaḍ was approximately one farsakh; the buildings were of clay and wood. The town was supplied with water by six watercourses[2], derived from a common source at a distance of half a farsakh from the town; the names of these watercourses were Sārīn (which flowed through the shahristān), Burjan, Mājan, Sankjan, Rūyjan, and Sanbukjan; there were many mills on them.

The second largest town in Ushrūsana was Zāmīn[3], situated on both banks of a river near its point of issue from the mountains. Close by it was the old town, which in the tenth century had already been abandoned by its inhabitants; the new town, which was called also Sarsanda, had no walls. The bazaars were on both sides of the river and interconnected by small bridges; the cathedral mosque was on the right of the road leading to Samarqand, *i.e.* to the north of the high road.

The third town, Dīzak or Jīzak[4], was in the plain, in the district of Faknān, and was noted as one of the rallying-points of "Warriors for the Faith," for whom many rabāṭs and khāns had been built; among these is specially mentioned the rabāṭ of Khudaysar, built by Afshīn, one farsakh from the town.

The remaining towns of Ushrūsana were all much of a size; the sites of the following[5] are indicated. Nūjkath, two farsakhs south-east of Kharqāna, | *i.e.* in the western part of the province; 168
Faghkath, three farsakhs[6] from Būnjikath on the road to Khojend; Ghazaq, two farsakhs from Faghkath and six from Khojend; Aisyānīkat or Arsubānīkat[7], nine farsakhs from Būnjikath on the frontier of Farghāna, Khisht in the mountains near

[1] Or circumference (so Ibn Ḥawqal, 380, 2).
[2] According to Maqdisī "by six watercourses as well as a large river"
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, II, 380–1; III, 277.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, 327, II, 381. [5] *Ibid.*, I, 343–4.
[6] According to Ibn Ḥawqal (*ibid.*, II, 404) nine fars., which is rather improbable. Faghkath and Ghazaq are probably identical with the towns of Gaza and Baga mentioned in the history of Alexander of Macedon (cf. Lerch in Berezin's *Russian Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, sect. iii, vol. i, p. 578). The site of Faghkath (in Iṣṭakhrī, in one passage, p. 326, Waghkath) is probably occupied by the present village of Vagat, whose inhabitants are regarded as the descendants of king Kashtasib (Gushtasp); cf. *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, Oct. 1896, p. 50. Yāqūt (iii, 797) places Ghazaq in Farghāna, on the authority of Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الغزقي).
[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 265; cf. below, p. 176.

the silver mines[1], *i.e.* in the north-west part of the province. On the whole urban life was but little developed in Ushrūsana; the province came less under the influence of the Arabic culture than the others[2], and necessarily therefore preserved for a longer time the peculiar features of the old Aryan aristocratic organization. According to Ya'qūbī[3] there were as many as 400 fortifications in Ushrūsana, probably, that is, castles of the dihqāns; Ibn Ḥawqal and Maqdisī[4], on the other hand, enumerate a whole list of districts in which there was not a single town. There were many forts and villages in the Buttam mountains, *i.e.* in the province of the Upper Zarafshān, which was also reckoned in Ushrūsana, although at one time Buttam apparently formed a separate province; Ibn Khurdādhbih[5] speaks of it as an independent tributary unit; in one passage[6] he even mentions a "prince (malik) of Buttam." It is possible that Marsmanda (in Ya'qūbī[7] Arsmanda), the exact position of which is not indicated, was one of the towns in this district. Ibn Ḥawqal[8] tells us that the town was built on the bank of a broad river, covered in winter with thick ice; owing to the cold climate vine growing and horticulture were not possible here, but the inhabitants engaged with complete success in the cultivation of cereals and laying out of flower beds; there was, moreover, a well-attended fair held here every month, and the cathedral mosque was near the bazaar.

169 Among the districts in which | there were no towns at all those of Maskha' (probably Mascha, in Bābur Macha) and Burghar (see below, p. 182) undoubtedly lay in the Upper Zarafshān region. The Arabic term Burghar is probably a mutilation of Parghar or Farghar (compare Būnjikath and Panjikath, Quwādhiyān and Qabādhiyān, &c.). We have here, to all appearances, the same word as in the ancient name of Kchi-Surkhab (cf. above, p. 68); the same word is preserved in the present name of the Falghar district. According to Bābur[9] the boundary between Macha and Palghar passed somewhat below the village of Ubburdan, which is still in existence. To the same locality may probably be assigned the district of Mīnk (in Ya'qūbī Mānk), where, according to Ibn Ḥawqal[10], the fortress of Afshīn was situated, and where Qutayba fought "the wearers of black garments[11];" on this latter event we find no information in the

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 278.
[2] *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, June 1896, p. 32.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, vii, 294.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 382; iii, 265–6.
[5] *Ibid.*, vi, 27.
[6] *Ibid.*, 29.
[7] *Ibid.*, vii, 294.
[8] *Ibid.*, ii, 381–2; cf. also iii, 278.
[9] Ed. Ilminski, p. 121; ed. Beveridge, f. 99, trans. p. 152; Erskine, *Memoirs of Baber*, p. 101.
[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 383–4.
[11] In Iṣṭakhrī (*ibid.*, i, 328) it is stated only that here Qutayba "fought and besieged Afshīn."

historians. The villages of Jankākath and Sūydak, which seem to have been in the same district, were the original home of the family of Abu's-Sāj Dīwdād, the founder of the dynasty of Sājids of Adharbayjān[1]. Near Mink and Marsmanda was obtained the material for the iron weapons which were manufactured in Farghāna and exported to all the provinces as far as Baghdād. In addition to this, there were in the Buttam mountains gold, silver, vitriol, and sal ammoniac workings; Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal[2] describe with a fair amount of detail the method of obtaining the latter, and their description fully coincides with the accounts of modern travellers[3].

To the north-east of Ushrūsana, on the right bank of the Syr-Darya, were the provinces of Īlāq and Shāsh[4], which formed geographically one indivisible whole[5]. By Īlāq was understood the valley of the river Angren (properly Āhangarān), by Shāsh the valley of the river Parak (Chirchik), which had two sources; one flowed from the Biskām mountains, the other from the district of Jidghil[6] (Pskem and Chotkal). Near the mouth of the Angren was the town of Banākath, | near the mouth of the 170
Chirchik the town of Najākath; the distance between them amounted to three farsakhs[7]. Banākath, according to Maqdisī's account[8], had no walls; the cathedral mosque was near the bazaar; the inhabitants were noted for their turbulence. As is well known, Banākath was destroyed by the Mongols and rebuilt under Tīmūr, who called the town Shāhrukhīya in honour of his son. The ruins of Shāhrukhīya are on the right bank of the Syr-Darya, at the mouth of the Gijigen valley, through which flowed the left channel of the Angren[9]; a little below it lie the ruins of old Banākath.

Two roads led from Ushrūsana to the Chirchik valley, one from Khāwas (or Khāwaṣ), the other from Dīzak. By the road from Khāwas the Syr-Darya was reached four farsakhs above Banākath[10]; on the way from Banākath to the Chirchik the towns of Kharashkath (one farsakh from Banākath, and the second

[1] S. Lane-Poole, *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. 126.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 327–8; ii, 382–3.
[3] Tomaschek, *Soghdiana*, S. 24.
[4] The local spelling was undoubtedly Chāch, as the district and chief town are often called by Persian writers. Arabic ش often represents the sound *ch*, cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 139.
[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 332–3. The name Īlāq is not found either in the Chinese sources or in the narratives of the Arab conquest; in pre-Muslim times the district must have been politically united with Chāch. Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 142.
[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, ii, 388.
[7] *Ibid.*, i, 345
[8] *Ibid.*, iii, 277.
[9] *Srednyaya Aziya*, article of E. T. Smirnov, Tashkent, 1896, p. 134. Cf. now also the description of the ruins by J. Castagné in *Protok. Turk. kruzh.*, xviii, 112 sq., with maps and views.
[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 156. In Maqdisī (*ibid.*, iii, 342) 2 drives.

largest town in Shāsh) and Khudaynkath ("Lady's Town," one farsakh farther on) are mentioned; the left bank of the Chirchik was reached at the town of Jīnānjkath[1] (four farsakhs from Banākath and two from the bank of the Syr-Darya). Jīnānjkath, like Banākath, had no walls[2]. The road from Khāwas here joined that from Dīzak. The distance from Dīzak to the mouth of the Chirchik[3] was traversed in three days (the intermediate stages in the steppe being Ḥusayn's well and Ḥumayd's well); farther on the Christian (probably Nestorian[4]) village of Wīnkard was passed. From Iṣṭakhrī's statement[5] that Jīnānjkath was on the road from Wīnkard to Binkath it might be concluded that Wīnkard also was on the left bank of the Chirchik, or more to the south, before crossing the Syr-Darya. The following remarks were made by the late N. S. Lykoshin in a private letter to me (dated 13/14 April, 1896): "With reference to the ancient Christian village on the left bank of the river Chirchik, near its
171 estuary, I have heard tales from our natives, | who call the ruins of this village Uljā-kend, and refer to literary evidence that Christians (tersā) lived there at one time or another." Since then, however, Vyatkin has shown that Uljākant or Unjākant is the same as Najākath[6]. It is more probable that Wīnkard, which Ibn Ḥawqal distinguishes from the river of Shāsh (*i.e.* the Syr-Darya) as one of the boundaries of the cultivated area of Shāsh, and mentions later on (p. 399) as a place to which travellers came after crossing the steppe (nothing is said about crossing the river), was situated to the south of the Syr-Darya, where the remains of ancient irrigation canals have been found; the strip of cultivated land south of the Syr-Darya and north of the steppe may have been incorporated in Shāsh[7].

Near Jīnānjkath the Chirchik was crossed to Shutūrkath or Ushtūrkath[8] ("Camel-town"), the third largest town in the province[9]. From Qudāma's statement[10] ("If the river is crossed, then the town of Shutūrkath is on the left") it might be concluded that it was situated below Jīnānjkath, which however is hardly probable. According to Iṣṭakhrī[11] it was three farsakhs from Khudaynkath to Shutūrkath. In all probability Shutūrkath was situated not far from the present Iski-Tashkent, perhaps on the

[1] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, I, 344-5; VI, 156.
[2] *Ibid*, III, 277.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 336.
[4] *Ibid*, II, 384.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 345.
[6] *Protok. Turk. kruzh*, V, 156 sq.
[7] The late Karavayev may have been right in identifying Wīnkard with Urumbai Mīrzā (cf. his book *Golodnaya Step*, and my review of it in *Zapiski*, XXIII, 414).
[8] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, VI, 20.
[9] *Ibid*, II, 389
[10] *Ibid.*, VI, 156. The word اليسار, however, is inserted in the texts only on the editor's conjecture (*ibid.*, VI, 204). The MS. has السل (?).
[11] *Ibid.*, I, 344.

site of those ruins which, in Evarnitsky's description[1], lie "opposite the village (qishlaq) of Kirshaul, to the east of Iski-Tashkent, and extend about eight versts along the bank of the river and about two or three versts westward to the steppe." According to Maqdisī[2] the town was fortified and there were fine covered bazaars (tīmāt) in it. The distance between Shutūrkath and Binkath, the capital of Shāsh, was traversed in one day[3]. On this road are mentioned the towns of Danfaghānkath (two farsakhs from Shutūrkath), Zālthīkath[4] (one farsakh farther on), and Banūnkath[5] (three farsakhs from Shutūrkath). From Banūnkath to Binkath was two farsakhs; Zālthīkath also was two farsakhs from Binkath, and must consequently be either identical with Banūnkath, or else situated close to it. Thus it is quite possible that Binkath was on the site of the present Tashkent.

The town of Binkath[6] was surrounded by two lines of walls, of which the outer line had seven gates (the spelling of their names is doubtful), and the interior line ten gates[7] (the more remarkable of their names being Gate of the Amīr, Gate of the Street of the Khāqān, and Gate of the Castle of the Dihqān). The shahristān | had three gates (Abu'l-'Abbās, Kish, and 172
Junayd), the citadel two, of which one gave on the shahristān, the other on the rabaḍ. The palace and prison were in the citadel, the cathedral mosque outside but close to it, the bazaars partly in the shahristān, but chiefly in the rabaḍ. The length and breadth of the town from side to side of the outer walls was approximately one farsakh. In the town and its neighbourhood there were many gardens and vineyards.

As regards the road from Khojend to Binkath (Tashkent), till latterly the mountain roads were of greater importance than the present road through the steppe. Maqdisī[8] reckons one day's journey from Binkath to "the silver mine," and as much from the mine to Khājistān, which was situated, as we have seen, on the road from Khojend to Akhsīkath. In any case, these stages were very long[9], as Ibn Khurdādhbih and Qudāma[10] reckon seven farsakhs from Binkath to the mine and eight from

[1] *Putevoditel' po Srednei Azii*, Tashkent, 1893, p. 149.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 276–7.
[3] *Ibid.*, III, 342.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, 344.
[5] *Ibid.*, VI, 20.
[6] *Ibid.*, II, 386–7; III, 276. In the historians the name of the ancient capital of Shāsh, Ṭārband, is often met with (cf. Beladsori, p. 421). It is not mentioned by the geographers.
[7] According to Maqdisī only eight.
[8] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, III, 342.
[9] Ya'qūbī (*ibid.*, VII, 294) reckons five days journey from Farghāna to Shāsh and four days' from Khojend to Shāsh.
[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VI, 20, 159.

the mine to Khājistān. In Qudāma we find a description of another road to the Angren valley; according to his description, from Khojend it ran along the river (Syr-Darya) to some ruins known as "the place of the observatory" (mawḍi' al-Marsad), thence two farsakhs to the castle of Mūhinān, situated "near the mouth of the river of the silver mine," *i.e.* the Angren or one of its southern arms. In the first case (the road from Khājistān) there is no doubt that the reference is to the road through the Kendir-davan pass. "The mine of Shāsh" is frequently mentioned on coins even of the 'Abbāsid period; the Persian name of this locality, as de Goeje has already noted[1], was Kūh-i sīm (literally "silver mountain"); a village of Kūh-i sīm is mentioned in Iṣṭakhrī[2], and was apparently situated south of the Angren, probably opposite the present village of Ablyk.

To determine the position of Tūnkath, the chief town of Ilāq, is a matter of great difficulty. The description of the road between Tūnkath and Binkath has come down to us in a muti-
173 lated condition[3], and the distance from Tūnkath to Khojend | or to the silver mine is not indicated in any source. We know only that Tūnkath was situated on the Angren; in view of this, de Goeje's interpretation, according to which the distance from Binkath to Tūnkath was eight farsakhs, may be accepted. Tūnkath[4] was half the size of Binkath, but consisted nevertheless of citadel, shahristān, and rabaḍ; the palace was in the citadel, the cathedral mosque and prison near it, the bazaars partly in the shahristān and partly in the rabaḍ.

On its northern side the cultivated strip of the Chirchik was bounded by a wall, stretching from the Sablik or Saylik[5] mountains to the bank of the Syr-Darya, and built for protection from the raids of the Turks, evidently during the period of Arab dominion, before the Sāmānid conquest of Isfījāb, *i.e.* before 840. Ibn Ḥawqal[6] ascribes the construction of the wall to 'Abdallāh b. Ḥumayd b. Thawr; the personage in question is possibly 'Abdallāh b. Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba, who governed Khurāsān for five months in 776 after the death of his father[7]. Beyond the wall began the Qalāṣ steppe; on going a distance of one farsakh into the steppe a fosse was reached, which also stretched from the mountains to the Syr-Darya. The remains of the wall have been preserved to the present day in the shape of a mound, which, like the mound at Bukhārā, is called by the natives

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 27 (text).
[2] *Ibid.*, i, 332, 345.
[3] *Ibid.*, i, 344; ii, 404.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 388–9; iii, 277.
[5] *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, June 1896, p. 27.
[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 388.
[7] Hamzah Ispahanensis, ed. Gottwaldt, text, p. 221, trans. p. 172. Gardīzī (MS. Bodl., f. 94; Camb. MS., f. 75 b) also says that 'Abdallāh governed the province after the death of his father till the end of A. H. 159.

Kempir-duval[1] ("Wall of the Old Woman"). As yet a survey has been made only of the western section of the mound, twenty-four miles in length, from the heights near the ariq of Bossu to the village of Jaldama; the natives used even to say that "the mound crosses to the left bank of the Syr-Darya, and stretches through the Hunger-Steppe to the town of Jīzak," but these tales have not been verified. Whether any remains of the eastern part of the wall have been preserved is unknown. The fosse mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal is undoubtedly identical with the "steep-sided and deep" ravine of Bossu ariq; behind the ravine "begins a hilly steppe, intersected by two channels of the Keles river." It is very probable that, in spite of the difference in spelling, the Arabic name of the Qalāṣ steppe is identical with the name of the river Keles. |

From the statements of the Muslim geographers it is evident 174
that the wall reached the bank of the Chirchik near the town of Jabghūkath[2] (properly "Town of the Jabghū;" jabghū or yabghū being a well-known Turkish title), two farsakhs above Binkath; in former times the military forces of the province were concentrated here. The situation of Jabghūkath probably corresponded to the former fortress of Niyazbek.

The number of towns in Shāsh and Īlāq, in contrast to Ushrūsana, was extremely large; Iṣṭakhrī[3] enumerates twenty-seven in Shāsh (Maqdisī[4] thirty-four), and fourteen in Īlāq (Maqdisī seventeen). We cannot always fix with exactness the spelling of the names of these towns, neither have we exact data with regard to their position[5]. To the north of the Chirchik and lying between it and the wall were, besides those towns already mentioned, the towns of Khātūnkath (*i.e.* "Lady's Town," two farsakhs from Binkath), Barkūsh (three farsakhs from Khātūnkath), and Khargānkat[6] (four farsakhs east of Khātūnkath). In the general list of towns Khargānkat is, perhaps in error, included in Īlāq. On the left bank of the Chirchik there was also the town of Kankiāq, at a distance of one farsakh from Khudaynkath. The description of the main road between Binkath and Tūnkath has come down to us in somewhat contradictory and mutilated

[1] *Srednyaya Aziya*, Tashkent, 1896, pp. 132–3 (article of E. T. Smirnov).

[2] According to Qudāma (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 157) it was two farsakhs from Binkath to "the military station on this side of the wall." In the Tumansky MS. (f. 24 b) there is mentioned "Jabghūkath, a pretty little town, where in ancient times there was the military camp of Chāch (Shāsh)." According to Iṣṭakhrī (345) it was two fars from Binkath to Jabghūkath, which was situated on the bank of the Chirchik.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 328–32.

[4] *Ibid.*, iii, 264–5.

[5] *Ibid.*, i, 344–5; ii, 404–5.

[6] Written خركانكت and خرجانكت.

redactions; the following itinerary appears to me to be the most probable:

	Binkath	
	Nūjkath[1]	1 farsakh
	Bālāyān[2]	2 farsakhs
	Nūkath . . .	1 farsakh |
175	Bānjkhāsh . . .	2 farsakhs
	Sakākath . .	1 farsakh
	Tūnkath	1 farsakh.

Of these towns Nūjkath only belonged to Shāsh, the remainder to Īlāq. To the east of the main road are placed the towns of Farankath or Faraskad (two farsakhs from Jabghūkath), Baghūnkath (one farsakh from Farankath), and Anūdhkath (two farsakhs from Baghūnkath); in the same locality, at a distance of one day's journey, are mentioned Kadāk, Ghadrānk, Kabarna, Ghazak (written also Ghazaq), Wardūk and Jabūzan; all the towns mentioned were included in Shāsh. To the west of the main road (north of the Angren), at the same distance, were Ashbīnghū, Kalashjik, Ardlānkath, Biskath, Sāmsīrak, Khumrak, and Ghannāj; of these Biskath (possibly the present Pskent or Biskent), Sāmsīrak and Khumrak were reckoned to Īlāq, the remainder to Shāsh; it is remarkable that even Banākath was reckoned to Shāsh and not to Īlāq. South of the Angren, in the area east of Tūnkath, were Gharjand, Khāsh, Dhakhkath or Adhakhkath[3], Tukkath or Nukkath[4], and Kūh-i sīm; of these Gharjand only was reckoned to Shāsh, the remainder to Īlāq; Maqdisī includes Gharjand as well in Īlāq. The towns named occupied an area two marches in length, and less than one march in breadth. To the west of Tūnkath, at a distance of five farsakhs, were placed the towns of Arbīlakh and Namūdhligh in Īlāq. Of the towns of Shāsh enumerated in Iṣṭakhrī the position of one only, Nakālik, is not indicated. Maqdisī quotes some further names, but their pronunciation is very dubious; it is very probable that sometimes one and the same name is given

[1] This should probably be read instead of نوغكث; the latter name does not appear in the general list of towns. According to the Tumansky MS. (f. 24 b) the boatmen (kishtibānān) engaged on the Parak (Chirchik) and Khashart (Yaksart, *i.e.* Syr-Darya) rivers came from Nūjkath. Nūjkath was probably situated on the site of the present Chirchik station.

[2] Cf the order in which the towns of Īlāq are enumerated by Iṣṭakhrī.

[3] Sam'ānī (*s. v.* الذخكنى and الروذبارى; cf. Yāqūt, ii, 717, 831) locates Dhakhkath "in the province of Shāsh, in the locality of Rūdhbār (*lit.* river)." In his enumeration of towns, Sam'ānī draws no distinction between Shāsh and Īlāq, and even reckons Tūnkath to Shāsh (*s. v* التونكتى; cf. Yāqūt, i, 900).

[4] De Goeje (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 332) is not justified in doubting the identity of these names.

twice in different forms. Of these names Bārskath (in Shāsh) and Shāwkath (in Īlāq) are quoted also in Sam'ānī's and Yāqūt's dictionaries; it is possible that the first | was on the site of the present village of Parkent[1]. The Zarānkath of Maqdisī (in Shāsh) perhaps corresponds to Zarkent; as regards the other names we have not decided to make any suggestions. Sam'ānī and Yāqūt[2] name also the village of Shākhākh, without indicating its position. 176

In the Sāmānid period the province of Isfījāb, *i.e.* the tract of cultivated land on the Aris and its tributaries, was also reckoned as part of Transoxania. The actual town of Isfījāb, according to native tradition, was on the site of the present village of Sayram[3]. The journey from Shāsh to Isfījāb is differently described; according to Iṣṭakhrī[4] the distance was traversed in four days, according to Ya'qūbī[5] in two. Maqdisī[6] also reckons only one day's journey from Binkath to Gharkard (or Ghuzkard). Qudāma[7] reckons five farsakhs from Jabghūkath to Gharkand, and four from Gharkard to Isfījāb; the latter distance agrees also with the distance (two drives) given by Maqdisī. Ibn Khurdādhbih[8] reckons eight miles from the silver mine to the Iron Gate, thence two farsakhs to Katāk or Kadāk, and a further six farsakhs to Gharkard. The insignificance of the distances given, especially of the first, seems completely incomprehensible. In any case, the Iron Gate of Ibn Khurdādhbih, even allowing for some mistake on his part, can hardly be identical with the Iron Gate of Ibn Ḥawqal[9], which was in the Qalās steppe on the northern boundary of Shāsh. According to Iṣṭakhrī[10] the rabāṭ of Anfuran served as a station in the Qalās steppe between Binkath and Gharkard. Between Gharkard and Isfījāb also there was steppe land. It is possible that Gharkard was on the site of Duvana; in any case it should be searched for in the locality watered by the Upper Keles and its tributaries. |

The town of Isfījāb[11] was a third of the size of Binkath; in the tenth century its citadel was already lying in ruins, and only the shahristān and rabaḍ remained. The length of the wall of the rabaḍ was one farsakh (in circumference). The shahristān had four gates: the Nūjkath, Farkhān, Shakrāna, and Bukhārā Gates; within it were situated the palace, prison, cathedral mosque, and bazaars, amongst which Maqdisī singles out for special mention the bazaar of the cotton-weavers. Isfījāb was to an even greater degree than Binkath a rendezvous for 177

[1] Cf. Bars-kul and Barkul (*Handbk. of Semiryechye*, 1898, vol. ii, p. 134).
[2] Yāqūt, iii, 265.
[3] The form Saryam suggested by the local literati is undoubtedly artificial.
[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 345-6. [5] *Ibid.*, vii, 295. [6] *Ibid.*, iii, 342.
[7] *Ibid.*, vi, 157. [8] *Ibid.*, vi, 20. [9] *Ibid.*, ii, 384.
[10] *Ibid.*, i, 336-7. [11] *Ibid.*, i, 333; ii, 389-90; iii, 272-3.

"Warriors for the Faith," for whom a large number of rabāṭs (kārawānsarāys) had been built, numbering as many as 1,700, according to Maqdisī. As everywhere, the rabāṭs were in part built by the inhabitants of the large towns for their fellow-citizens (we find mention of the rabāṭs of the Nakhshabīs, Bukharans, and Samarqandians), and in part with money given by certain nobles; such was the rabāṭ of Qarā-tagīn, who was ruler of Balkh under Naṣr b. Aḥmad; here was his tomb, and close by it the tomb of his son Manṣūr, who died in 340/951 [1]; here too was a bazaar, the revenues from which (7,000 dirhams a month) were dedicated to the purchase of bread and other food for the poor. The edifices of the town were built of clay.

As included in the province of Isfījāb was reckoned the whole locality to the east up to and including the valley of the Talas, and to the north-west up to Sabrān (Sawrān). Of the Talas valley and the roads between it and Isfījāb I have given a detailed description elsewhere [2]; as regards the north-west districts [3], to the west of Isfījāb lay the district of Kanjīda, the chief town of which, Subānīkath or Usbānīkath (in Maqdisī, Arsubānīkat), was two days' journey from the town of Isfījāb [4]. It was fortified, and had a cathedral mosque; the greater part of the buildings was in the rabaḍ. Below Kanjīda was the district of Bārāb or Fārāb, occupying an area on both banks of the Syr-Darya less than one day's journey in length and breadth. Iṣṭakhrī and
178 Ibn | Ḥawqal name Kadar as the chief town of the district, and locate it half a farsakh from the Syr-Darya According to Maqdisī the chief town had the same name as the district, and could muster as many as 70,000 troops (?); the cathedral mosque was in the shahristān [5], and the greater part of the bazaars in the rabaḍ; in the shahristān there were also some shops [6]. According to the same geographer Kadar was a new town; the construction of a minbar (*i.e.* a cathedral mosque) in it caused a civil war, evidently a struggle between its inhabitants and those of the chief town of the district. In view of such contradictory state-

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 157, 370.

[2] *Otchet, &c.*, pp. 9–10, 15–16 It may be added that the modern village of Mankent, to the north-east of Chimkent, is already mentioned by Yāqūt (iv, 671) under the name Mankath.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 346; ii, 390–91, 405; iii, 273–4.

[4] In the same district probably were situated the towns of Khūrlūgh and Jumushlāghū, mentioned in Maqdisī between Isfījāb and Subānīkath, without any more definite indication of position. It must, however, be remembered that Maqdisī does not always enumerate towns in geographical order, *e.g.* Wasīj is mentioned before Kadar, though it was situated below it. On Jumushlāghū see *Otchet, &c.*, p. 10.

[5] The word حصن should evidently be taken here in this sense, as the citadel and rabaḍ are mentioned separately.

[6] The word حوانيت, often translated "wineshops," means shops of any kind (cf. Ya'qūbī's description of Baghdād, *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 242. 9, 246. 7, 250. 20).

ments it is difficult to decide whether Kadar corresponded to the later Fārāb or to Utrār (Uṭrār)[1]. The name Utrār is perhaps met with already in Ṭabarī[2], who mentions among the enemies of Ma'mūn the prince of the town of Uṭrār-banda. Of the towns of Fārāb on the left bank of the Syr-Darya were Sutkand[3], where there were settlements of Ghuzz and Qarluq Turks who had embraced Islām, and Wasīj, a small fortified village with a cathedral mosque, where there lived "a powerful Amīr," two farsakhs below Kadar. Wasīj was the birthplace of the famous philosopher Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī; its fortress was still in existence in the twelfth century[4]. According to Mas'ūdī[5], the Syr-Darya at Fārāb sometimes flooded an area of over thirty farsakhs (which is, of course, an exaggeration); the villages, situated like forts on the tops of hillocks, were at such times able to communicate with each other only by boat.

From Kadar it was one march to Shāwghar[6], a large fortified town, with an extensive district and a cathedral mosque near the bazaar, and one other short march to Sawrān (or Ṣabrān). Sawrān, as the frontier town facing the Ghuzz | and Kīmāk 179
territories, was strongly fortified and surrounded by seven lines of walls; the cathedral mosque was in the inner town (shahristān). The Ghuzz came here for trading purposes, or in order to conclude peace treaties. Behind Sawrān Maqdisī places still another small fortified town, Turār, and in its district the village of Zarākh, in consequence of which the town was sometimes called Turār-Zarākh. Notwithstanding the resemblance of the names the position indicated will not allow of identifying it with Utrār. Maqdisī names some further points on the frontier of the Turkish territories; of these the large, rich, and fortified town of Shaghljan lay on the frontier of the Kīmāk territories; the small town of Balāj and the large town of Barūkat were occupied

[1] The distances indicated below make it necessary to locate Kadar somewhat to the north of Utrār.

[2] Ṭabarī, III, 815–16.

[3] This reading (ستكند, *lit.* "milk-town") has been adopted by us on the ground of the Tumansky MS. (Ibn Ḥawqal in de Goeje's edition has تسكند.) The ruins of Sutkand are still well known (a mile above Lake Qarakul) and have been described by N. Rudnev in *Turkest. Vyed*, 1900, No. 16. سوتكنت should also be read instead of سونكنت in Zafar-Nāmah, II, 646.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الوسجي.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VIII, 65; Maçoudi, *Le livre de l'avertissement*, trad. par B. Carra de Vaux, p 97.

[6] This must not be confused with the town of the same name situated on the road to Talas, near the present station of Kuyuk (*Otchet*, p. 9). Western Shāwghar is to be identified with Turkestan, as suggested by Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p 485. The town was then beside the main road (Maqdisī, p. 274); cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 147.

by Turkmens who had embraced Islām; in both one and the other the fortifications were already lying in ruins. In general the frontier guard in this locality was confided to emigrants from the steppe, who, if Ibn Ḥawqal is to be believed, fought zealously against their heathen fellow-tribesmen. "The rich pasture lands" between Fārāb, Kanjīda, and Shāsh (*i.e.* to the west and south-west of Isfijāb) were also occupied by nomad Turks who had embraced Islām to the number of about a thousand families.

Below Sawrān the Syr-Darya flowed through the steppe in the Ghuzz territories. Two days' journey from the estuary and one farsakh from the river was situated the town of Yanikant[1] ("The New Town," called by the Arabs al-Qaryat al-Ḥadītha, by the Persians Dih-i Naw[2]; in literature frequently[3], and sometimes also on coins, the name Shahrkant is met with), the winter residence of the king of the Ghuzz, now the ruins of Jankent to the south of the Syr-Darya, about three miles from the former Khivan fortress of Jān Qal'a, fifteen miles from Kazalinsk[4]. Not far from Yanikant were two other smaller towns, Jand and Khuwāra (or Juwāra), all three towns were inhabited by Muslims (probably traders from Khorezmia and Transoxania), although they were in the territories of unbelievers. From Yanikant to Khorezmia was reckoned ten days' journey, to Fārāb twenty days[5]; Gardīzī[6] describes as well the trade route from Yanikant
180 into the land of the Kīmāks, | to the banks of the Irtysh. In times of peace grain was exported to Yanikant from Transoxania down the Syr-Darya. According to V. Ḳallaur, the remains of Jand are the ruins of Khisht-Qal'a, in the district of Tumar-utkul, sixteen to twenty miles from Perowsk[7].

The inhabitants of the districts in the lower course of the river, thanks to the geographical situation of their country, long preserved their independence. The mouth of the river had already fallen into the hands of the Muslims in the tenth century, thanks to Seljuk[8]; in the first half of the eleventh century it was ruled by Shāh-Malik, the enemy of Seljuk's descendants[9], but his name shows him to have been a Muslim. In spite of this, the area

[1] On this and other towns see *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, ii, 393

[2] *Otchet*, pp 83, 106.

[3] *Texts*, pp. 79–80 (Kitāb at-tawassul); Schefer, *Chrest. pers.*, ii, 114 (Texts); Nasawi, ed. Houdas, p. 36, trans. p. 62; *Notices et Extraits*, xiii, 234.

[4] Lerch, *Arkheol. poyezdka*, St. P., 1870, p. 11.

[5] The suggestion made by J. Marquart (*Osttürk. Dialektstudien*, p. 202) that "farsakhs" should be read instead of "days" is quite erroneous. The distance is much greater, and not too small for twenty days.

[6] *Otchet*, pp. 106-7.

[7] Cf. *Protok. Turk. kruzh.*, v, 16 and 81, and my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 151. Some other identifications made by the same explorer are very doubtful (*ibid.*).

[8] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 322.

[9] Baihaki, ed. Morley, p. 856.

between Jand and Fārāb was, until the end of the twelfth century, considered to be a region of unbelievers. The centre of the dominion of the non-Muslim Qipchāqs, as we shall see in the third chapter, was the town of Sighnāq[1], which was still of great importance in the period of Mongol rule; it lay twenty-four farsakhs from Utrār, according to Lerch, on the site of the present ruins of Sunak-kurgan or Sunak-ata, six or seven miles north of the post station of Tumen-aryk[2]. Between Sighnāq and Jand there are mentioned also, in the account of Jūchī's campaign, the fortresses of Ūzgand, Bārchinlighkant[3], and Ashnās[4]. Ūzgand, on the authority of a sixteenth-century writer quoted by Lerch, was in the Qaratu mountains, but this interpretation of the text quoted by him is very doubtful[5]. Bārchinlighkant was probably nearer to Jand | than to Sighnāq, 181
as the Khwārazm-shāh Takash organized it some time before the definitive subjugation of the latter[6]. Of less important points the following are mentioned: Sāgh-dara, twenty farsakhs from Jand on the bank of the Syr, apparently below the town, as this point was reached on the way from Khorezmia[7]; Khayrābād, in the neighbourhood of Jand[8]; Rabāṭ-Ṭughānīn, one of the chief villages in the neighbourhood of Bārchinlighkant, and, identical with the last, in all probability, the village of Rabāṭāt[9] (literally "The Rabāṭs").

[1] The name is to be read thus, judging from the spelling in the MSS., besides which the first vowel is often inserted. This approaches phonetically the form Sunak much more closely than the form Saghanāq hitherto suggested, though it is by this name of Saganak that the ruins are known to the natives. The MSS. give also the reading Sughnaq The town is already mentioned under this name in the eleventh century, of Mahmūd Kāshgharī, I, 392. دیوان لغات الترك

[2] Lerch, *Arkheol. poyezdka*, pp. 11–12. *Protok. Turk. kruzh.*, Feb. 17, 1897, suppl., pp. 7–8.

[3] In Plano Carpini (Hakluyt Soc., Extra Ser., I, pp. 76, 110, and 152) Barchin, in Kirakos Parchin, on the Juchid coins بارجين (Lerch, *Arkheol. poyezdka*, pp. 10–11). Cf. the Chinese transcriptions Ba-eulh-chi-li-han, Ba-eulh-chen (Schefer, *Chrest. pers.*, II, 167); in Bretschneider (*Med Res.*, II, 95 and on the map) Ba-rh-chi-li-han. In the Muslim sources the abbreviated form بارجكند is also found (Texts, pp. 135, 151 (Jamāl Qarshī)). The name Bārchīn is perhaps preserved even to-day in Barshin-Darya, one of the channels of the Syr-Darya (*sh* as always in the Kirghiz dialect for *ch*), mentioned by Kallaur (*Prot. Turk. kruzh.*, v, 83; vi, 77 sq.); unfortunately his information about this channel, which he has not himself visited, is not quite clear.

[4] The mistaken identification of this Ūzgand with Ūzgand in Farghāna and of Ashnas (اشناس) with Shāsh (الشاش) has led even a modern historian of Islam, A. Muller (*Der Islam*, II, 209), into error. Ashnās must be identified with the ruins of Asanas, on the left bank of the Syr-Darya, seventeen miles from the river and twenty from the post station of Ber-kazan (Kallaur, in *Prot., &c.*, v, 14 sq.).

[5] Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 151.

[6] *Texts*, p. 74 (Kitāb at-tawassul)

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 41 (Inshā').

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 152 (Jamāl Qarshī).

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 74–5, 79–80 (Kitāb at-tawassul).

CHAPTER II

CENTRAL ASIA DOWN TO THE TWELFTH CENTURY

182 ELSEWHERE[1] I have endeavoured to give a general idea of the life of the inhabitants of Transoxania immediately before the Arab invasion. The principal feature of this life is to be found in the domination of the territorial aristocracy (the so-called Dihqāns), which was not balanced, as in Persia[2], by the alliance of throne and altar, *i.e.* by a strong monarchical power and the influence of the clergy. The local rulers were only the first noblemen; even the most powerful among them were, like their subjects, known as dihqāns. Mention is sometimes made in the Arabic sources of the personal guard of the rulers, the shākirs or chākirs[3] (literally "servants"); but from Narshakhī's[4] account of the court of the Queen of Bukhārā it is evident that this guard was only in the nature of a guard of honour, and was formed by the youthful members of the aristocracy, who fulfilled this obligation by turns at the court of their rulers, like the sons of European knights at the court of their kings and dukes.

Under such a political organization there could be no question of a state religion in the strict sense of the word; in spite of the fact that here, as in Persia, the religion of the ruling class was Zoroastrianism, the adherents of the dualistic sects persecuted in Persia found a safe refuge in Transoxania. The same liberty
183 appears to have been enjoyed by | Buddhists and Nestorians. The only indication of a struggle between Zoroastrianism and Buddhism is contained in Hiuen Tsiang's account of Samarqand, but the pilgrim's allusions to the success attending his own activities prove that the struggle was not acute[5]. In the warfare with the Arab invaders, the priesthood, so far as is known, played

[1] *Nyeskol'ko slov ob arizskoi kulturye v Srednei Azii* (in *Sredneaz Vyest.*, June 1896).

[2] Even in Persia the dihqāns held a position far above the other inhabitants of the villages. Ṭabarī says in his account of the mythological king Manūchahr: "He appointed a dihqān for each village; he made the inhabitants his servants and slaves, clothed them with the clothing of subjection, and ordered them to be obedient to him" (Ṭabarī, i, 434).

[3] *E.g.* Ṭabarī, ii, 1159.

[4] Nerchakhy, pp. 7, 8.

[5] *Zapiski, &c.*, viii, 5 (from *Histoire de la vie de Hiouen Thsang*, trad. par tan. Julien, p. 59 sq.).

no part whatever [1]. In the account of the capture of Paykand by Qutayba in 87/706 mention is made of a certain one-eyed man who incited the Turks against the Muslims, and was evidently a more dangerous enemy to the latter than the leaders of the military forces. When he was made prisoner and offered to ransom himself at the price of a million (dirhams) not even such a sum could tempt the Muslims, who preferred to rid themselves for ever of the ruses of an implacable enemy [2]. From the historian's account, however, we cannot discover if the influence of the one-eyed man on his people was of a religious character.

We have no data to enable us to solve the question whether, as in Persia [3], there existed distinctive ranks and classes among the aristocracy. In some passages Ṭabarī [4] applies to the Central Asian nobles the terms which are used to designate the highest grades of the Persian aristocracy; but at the same time, as we have seen, the word *dihqān* designated in the same manner the simple landowners and the ruling princes [5]. The moneyed aristocracy, *i.e.* the merchants enriched by the caravan trade with China and other countries, apparently occupied a special position. In the account of the emigration of the Soghdians, these traders are ranked in Ṭabarī [6] with the "princes" (mulūk). Narshakhī's account of the merchants of Bukhārā [7] proves that they possessed vast estates, lived in castles, and in their position had little to distinguish them from the dihqāns. Here, therefore, we have to deal with | independent rich people whose interests 184
were identical with those of the aristocracy, and not with numerous industrial guilds, as in the Muslim period. Of any antagonism between dihqāns and merchants we have no knowledge.

Unfortunately the historians supply us with no material for clearing up the organization of Paykand, the Bukharan "city of merchants," and its relations with the Bukhār-Khudāt and the dihqāns of Bukhārā; but the action of the offended father recounted by Narshakhī [8], and the enormous number of weapons found by the Arabs [9] in Paykand allow of the supposition that the same warlike spirit prevailed there as in the other districts of Transoxania. The Soghdian custom mentioned by Ṭabarī [10] is especially characteristic of the manners of the country. Each year at Samarqand a table was set with food and a pitcher of

[1] Only in the account of the conquest of Khorezmia are priests mentioned by the side of dihqāns (ahbār, perhaps scribes, in the biblical sense of learned men, Ṭabarī, ii, 1237).
[2] Ṭabarī, ii, 1188.
[3] Maçoudi, *Les Prairies d'or*, ii, 240.
[4] Ṭabarī, ii, 1237, 1243.
[5] Of the special Central Asian titles, that of the Bukharan aristocrats, jamūk, may be quoted (Nerchakhy, p. 5). The same title is met with among the Turks (Ṭabarī, ii, 1613).
[6] *Ibid*, ii, 1444.
[7] Cf. p. 108 above.
[8] Nerchakhy, p. 43.
[9] Ṭabarī, ii, 1189.
[10] *Ibid.*, ii, 1146.

wine for the bravest knight of Soghd. If any other touched the food he thereby challenged the claimant to combat, and whoever killed his antagonist was acknowledged the bravest hero in the land until the advent of the next aspirant.

The Arabs, therefore, were matched with numerous small principalities constantly at war with one another, and with the brave, warlike, but utterly unorganized class of knights. Under such conditions the outcome of the struggle could not remain in doubt. Compared with the local dissensions, civil wars among the Arabs themselves, and even the hostility between North and South Arab tribes, were of no importance; even during the period of internecine wars the domination of the Arabs in the province of Khurāsān was not shaken. The victory of the Arabs was partly secured by the assistance of the natives themselves. A famous law of 'Omar, according to which none but Believers had the right to bear arms, was not applied in Central Asia[1]. In their campaigns Qutayba and the other Arab conquerors availed themselves of the services of the inhabitants of some localities against others. The slowness of the conquest is explained partly by the fact that the Arabs themselves were satisfied for a long time with military booty and tribute, and had no intention of making a permanent conquest of the country, and
185 partly by the struggle with natural | obstacles. In spite of the brilliant military qualities of the Arabs, it was impossible that the natural conditions of their native land should not have its effect upon them; if campaigns conducted in the steppes held practically no difficulties for them, they became accustomed to mountain warfare only with great difficulty, and operated very unsuccessfully even in passes that presented no obstacles to contemporary armies[2].

Our information on the progress of the Arab conquests under the Umayyads has come down to us only in the shape of semi-legendary tales[3], which for a long time were transmitted orally and were written down only by later generations. This explains the inconsistency and chronological inaccuracy of many of the narratives; even as to the date when the Arabs first crossed the Amu Darya contradictory accounts have come down to us[4].

In spite of the doubtful character of some of the facts, the tales of the historians enable us to realize fairly clearly the spirit of the epoch, and leave no doubt that the conquerors were

[1] Cf. Ṭabarī, ii, 1693.

[2] Cf. the description of the struggle between the Arabs and the Turks in the mountains between Kish and Samarqand (Ṭabarī, ii, 1533-44).

[3] On the epic character of these tales, cf. Wellhausen, *Das Arabische Reich*, p. 257, and my more detailed article in *Zapiski, &c.*, xvii, 0140 sq.

[4] Beladsori, p. 408; Ṭabarī, ii, 156; Ja'qubi, *Historiae*, ii, 281; Lataifo'l-ma'arif, ed. Jong, p. 11.

guided only by the desire for booty and glory, and that religion was, in the main, of as little importance to them as to the defenders of the land. There were cases of personal friendship between Arab and native knights[1]. Ideals of chivalry were not without effect on the conquerors; Qutayba, wishing to inspire his warriors, called them the "dihqāns of the Arabs"[2]. The Arab hero Thābit b. Quṭba, one of the associates of Mūsā b. 'Abdallāh at Tirmidh, enjoyed such esteem among the natives that in their mutual dealings they swore by the "Life of Thābit"[3]. Like the local rulers, Thābit surrounded himself with shākirs (bodyguards), evidently from amongst the natives, as these shākirs are mentioned in opposition to the Arabs[4].

Without pausing on the first Arab invasions of Transoxania, undertaken solely for the sake of plunder, we shall endeavour to note the most important stages in the history of the Arab conquest. | After the fall of the Kushan empire (see p. 96) there 186
was not a single governor or viceroy of a foreign king in the land; nor, in spite of some of our information[5], is it probable that Sāsānid viceroys ever governed Transoxania. At first the Arab governors only made raids into Transoxania, and returned annually to their winter quarters in Khurāsān, the governor Salm b. Ziyād (681–3) being the first to winter across the river[6].

According to Ṭabarī[7] the local princes at this period assembled each year in one of the towns in the neighbourhood of Khorezmia[8], and promised each other to settle all their disputes by peaceful agreement, not to have recourse to military measures, and to carry on the struggle with the Arabs with their united forces. How far these promises were fulfilled may be seen from

[1] Ṭabarī, II, 1522. [2] *Ibid.*, II, 1247. [3] *Ibid.*, II, 1152. [4] *Ibid.*, II, 1155.

[5] To this group is related, besides the narratives of Ṭabarī and Abū Ḥanīfa (Noldeke, Ṭabarī, pp. 159, 167), Baladhurī's information (Baladsori, p. 195), according to which king Qubād (or Kawād) (A. D. 488–531) settled emigrants from Soghd in the Caucasus, where he founded the town of سغدبيل. It is very probable that this legend (which has been rejected also by Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, 108, n. 2) was, like many others, invented to explain a geographical name. Ibn Khurdādhbih also speaks of the rule of the Sāsānids in Mā-warā'annahr (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VI, 14; cf. Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Star. Merva*, p. 9). According to his statement, one of the four Marzbāns of Khurāsān ruled in Transoxania, but it is more probable that the division of Khurāsān into four Marzbānates corresponds to another division of the country, which we meet with again in the Arab period (*ibid.*, p 10), and in which Nīshāpūr takes the place of Transoxania. Cf. also *Ērānshahr*, p 70.

[6] Cf. the letter written in 718 by Ghūrak, the prince of Samarqand, to the Emperor of China, translated by E. Chavannes from the Chinese encyclopaedia, *Tsh'e fu yuen Koei*, which states that thirty-five years had passed since the beginning of the struggle with the Arabs (Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., 204 sq.). It is evident that the prince alludes to the action of Salm, and takes no account of former raids. Cf. also my article in *Zapiski*, &c., XVII, 0142.

[7] Ṭabarī, II, 394.

[8] The town is named, it seems, only in Ya'qūbī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VII, 299 كنداكين). In the later geographers we find no mention of it. Of course, it is not the same as the village in Soghd mentioned above (p. 125).

the fact that they had to be renewed annually, and also from the history of the conquests of Qutayba.

The civil war which broke out after the death of the Caliph Yazīd I (683) spread to Khurāsān also. The Viceroy Salm b. Ziyād, to whom at first all the Khurasanians swore fealty until the election of a new Caliph [1], was soon obliged to retire. Bloody struggles ensued between the representatives of the various Arab tribes, and finally the country fell to the chief of the Qaysites, 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim, who remained the absolute ruler of Khurāsān up to 72/691–2, and struck coins, even in gold, with his name [2]. In the year A.H. 72 he was killed by order of the Caliph 'Abd-al-Malik, to whom he had refused to submit. A
187 few years previously he had sent his son Mūsā into | Transoxania; Mūsā with a handful of men took possession of Tirmidh, after forcing the local ruler to evacuate the town, and remained there fifteen years [3] (689–704). During the governorship of Yazīd b. Muhallab (701–4) Mūsā was joinod by Thābit b. Quṭba al-Khuzā'ī, who enjoyed great popularity amongst the natives. Thābit attracted the local princes to his side, thanks to which Mūsā succeeded in expelling all Yazīd's tax collectors from Transoxania, all the tribute of the country being delivered to him [4]. In this way the native princes ceased to be the subjects of the legal Arab government, only to pay tribute to the rebel leader. Soon after this Mūsā dispersed a numerous army of Turks, Persians, and Ephthalites [5]. Having quarrelled with Thābit, and consequently with his native allies as well, Mūsā emerged victorious from this danger also. Thābit was killed, and the leader of the native princes, Tarkhūn, the Ikhshīdh of Soghd, was obliged to retreat after a bold sortie by Mūsā [6]. Finally, the general 'Othmān b. Mas'ūd on instructions from the governor Mufaḍḍal b. Muhallab, captured the town in 704 with the assistance of the Ikhshīdh of Soghd and the prince of Khuttal [7]. In this case, therefore, we find the native princes allied with the legal Arab administration.

In the following year 705 (according to other information [8] as early as 704) Qutayba b. Muslim, a distinguished adherent of the famous Ḥajjāj, came to Khurāsān as viceroy. Like his superior and director, Qutayba stopped at nothing; by employing craft and perfidy where boldness was of no avail, he was the first who

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 489.
[2] *Zapiski*, vi, 229 (coin from the collection of Gen. Komarov).
[3] Ṭabarī, ii, 1150. [4] *Ibid.*, ii, 1153.
[5] The mention of the latter (*ibid.*; cf. also Beladsori, p. 418) at this period is a unique statement, which it is difficult to explain.
[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 1155–60.
[7] Ṭabarī, ii, 1162. On the title or name السبل, see *ibid.*, ii, 1040–41 and cf. Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 302.
[8] *Ibid.*, ii, 1180.

firmly established Arab power in Transoxania. He made use of the dissensions between the natives themselves to a marked degree. In 705 the prince of Ṣaghāniyān himself called in Qutayba against his enemies, the princes of Shūman and Akharūn[1]; in Khorezmia | in 712 Qutayba marched to the protection 188
of the Khwārazmshāh against his younger brother Khurrazādh and the rebel dihqāns[2]. In the same year, during the campaign against Samarqand, Bokharans and Khorezmians assisted Qutayba with such zeal that Ghūrak, the Ikhshīdh of Soghd, reproached the Arab leader that he was achieving victory only by the aid of the "brothers and kinsmen" of his enemy[3]. During the campaign of 713 the inhabitants of Bukhārā, Kish, Nasaf, and Khorezmia were obliged by Qutayba's orders to furnish 20,000 men[4].

The resounding victories of Qutayba aroused the most far-reaching hopes among the Arab leaders. As Muḥammad b. Qāsim had at the same time (711) reached the mouth of the Indus and conquered Sind, Ḥajjāj promised the governorship of China to whichever of the two leaders first set foot in that country[5]. The Arabs had to be content with much more modest results, and moreover it was only in the southern part of the country that these results were at all permanent.

Qutayba built mosques at Bukhārā, Samarqand, and some other places[6], and compelled the inhabitants of Bukhārā to give up to the Arabs half the houses of the shahristān[7] (the same method[8] had been followed at Merv, under the first governors of Khurāsān). According to one authority[9] the people of Samarqand were obliged to evacuate their town completely, which was then occupied by the Arabs, while Qutayba recited verses from the Koran on the destruction of the tribes of 'Ād and Thamūd. In the north the armies of Qutayba reached Shāsh, and in the south-east are said to have reached Kāshghar, which at that time formed part of the Chinese empire[10]; in many

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.*, ii, 1237–39. [3] *Ibid.*, ii, 1244.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 1256. According to Balādhurī (ed. de Goeje, p. 423), Qutayba had under his command in Khurāsān, 40,000 Arabs from Baṣra, 7,000 from Kūfa, and 7,000 clients (mawālī). The same figures, in greater detail, in Ṭabarī, ii, 1290 sq.

[5] Ya'qūbī, *Hist.*, ii, 346. The same historian (*ibid.*, ii, 192) states that during the Caliphate of 'Othmān exactly the same announcement was made to 'Abdallāh b. 'Amir, governor of Baṣra, and Sa'īd b. 'Āṣ, governor of Kūfa, with regard to Khurāsān.

[6] Cf. pp. 108 and 119. [7] Nerchakhy, p. 51.

[8] Beladsori, p. 410; *Texts*, p. 1 (Gardizī).

[9] Ṭabarī, ii, 1250 In view of the disagreement among the sources of information, it is possible that this measure, notwithstanding the testimony of Ṭabarī, was taken only in 713, after the treason of the inhabitants and the second conquest of Soghd (see my article, "Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen," pp. 11–12).

[10] Ṭabarī, ii, 1276. H. A. R. Gibb (*Bulletin of the School of Or. Stud.*, ii, 467 sq) is probably right in asserting that Qutayba did not actually cross the Chinese frontier.

189 provinces, including even Farghāna (see below), | Arab governors were established. From the events which followed it is evident that these governors were only military leaders and collectors of taxes (moreover, these two duties were sometimes entrusted to different individuals), and that alongside them the native dynasties continued to exist, and, in all probability, retained the civil administration in their own hands.

Notwithstanding all his victories and the vast booty which he was the means of procuring for the Arabs, Qutayba did not enjoy the unconditional devotion of his army; when in 715 he sought to stir up a revolt against the new Caliph Sulaymān, he was deserted by all and killed. His immediate successors did not prove equal to their task. The provinces of the Syr-Darya basin were already lost to the Arabs in the years following the death of Qutayba. In 103/721–2 the Prince of Farghāna was able to offer to Soghdian emigrants a locality in the district of Isfara which bore the name of the "Pass of 'Iṣām b. 'Abdallāh al-Bāhilī." 'Iṣām b. 'Abdallāh had been established as governor here by Qutayba[1]; but it is evident that after the death of the latter the Arabs had been expelled or exterminated, and that the possession of the locality they had occupied reverted to the ruler of Farghāna. It may be that the legend quoted above (p. 160) of the destruction of an Arab division in the war with the Unbelievers has some connexion with this.

In the south-western part of Transoxania, where Bukhārā, Samarqand, and some other fortified towns remained subject to Arab garrisons, the latter were obliged to maintain a stubborn fight with the rebellious natives, which was complicated by the intervention of the Turks. As is well known, the Turkish Khāns had, as early as the sixth century, united under their rule the whole of Central Asia, and even hoped, in alliance with the Byzantines, to overthrow the Empire of the Sāsānids, had not the weakness of the former prevented the execution of this plan. The Empire of the Turks soon fell into two kingdoms, an Eastern and a Western; in the history of each, periods of power and glory alternated with periods of weakness, of which the Chinese took advantage to extend their empire and to subdue the nomads to themselves. The revival of the Eastern Turkish kingdom at the end of the eighth century all but resulted in the restoration of the unity of the Turkish Empire. As early as 689 a division of Eastern Turks, after defeating the forces of the Western |
190 Turks, invaded Soghdiana, and penetrated to the Iron Gate (*i.e.* the Buzgala Pass). This invasion was repeated in the year 701[2],

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 1440. In an earlier passage (ii, 1276) Ṭabarī locates this pass on the road from Farghāna to Kāshghar.

[2] *Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, pp. 14–16.

and finally, in 711, Me-ch'ue, Khān of the Eastern Turks, took the Khān of the Western Turks prisoner, and subdued his whole kingdom. At the end of 712 a Turkish division under the leadership of the nephews of Me-ch'ue occupied Soghdiana, whither they had been summoned by the inhabitants, who had risen against the Arabs after Qutayba's return to Merv. Samarqand alone remained in the hands of the Arabs, but in the spring of 713 Qutayba turned to advantage the difficult position of the Turks, and forced them to leave the country. The Turks were not even in a position to hinder the movement of the Arabs on Shāsh and Farghāna[1]. After the death of Me-ch'ue (716) the Western Turks again separated from the Eastern. Sulu, the chief of the Turgesh tribe, founded a powerful kingdom, which lasted according to the Arab sources till 737, according to the Chinese authorities till 738[2]. Possessing all the western part of Central Asia, Sulu could not resign Transoxania to the Arabs without a struggle; if the latter looked upon Soghd as the "garden of the Commander of the Faithful,"[3] the possession of this rich province was of great importance also to the Turks. Throughout his reign Sulu supported the rebellious dihqāns against the Arabs and caused the latter such injury that they gave him the name of Abū Muzāḥim[4] (literally, one who charges or butts, *i.e.* the elephant or bull).

The frequent revolts of the inhabitants are fully explained by the character of Arab rule in the period of the Umayyads. They, unlike the 'Abbāsids, did not as yet possess any broad imperial ideals, but were first and foremost the leaders of the Arab nation in the course of the "war for the Faith," concerned only to maintain their authority among the Arabs, and to collect taxes from the subject peoples and tribute from the vassal rulers. The attention of their lieutenants was necessarily directed to the same objects, and in a frontier district where the hope of rapid enrichment attracted the most restless elements[5], | the position 191
of the governor was especially difficult. After the murder of 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim the leading men of Khurāsān begged the Caliph 'Abdal-Malik to give them an Umayyad as governor, because "only a Qurayshite could establish order in Khurāsān after the disturbances."[6] For the most part, the governors were unequal to their task, and for this reason were very frequently changed. In view of this they endeavoured to extract as much

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 11–12. The connecting of the narrative of the inscriptions with that of Ya'qūbī is still, in my opinion, justified, in spite of Prof. Houtsma's objections (*Gott. Gel. Anz.*, 1899, no. 5, p. 386). The opposite view is maintained by H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arab Conquests in Central Asia*, p. 46.

[2] *Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, p. 27.

[3] Ṭabarī, ii, 1428.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 1593.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii, 178.

[6] Beladsori, p. 146.

profit as possible from their brief tenure of authority, and as far as possible to acquire real estate, which in some cases they and their descendants retained even after their deposition[1]. The subject population suffered chiefly of course from the licence of the Arabs and the rapacity of their viceroys. Sometimes the interests of the treasury and the authorities came into collision with religious interests, in the name of which the conquests had been undertaken. Here, as throughout the Arab empire, the greatest difficulties were presented by the question whether kharāj should be collected from the natives who had embraced Islām[2]. This question was solved differently at different times, according to the predominance of one or other tendency, but the natives could not, of course, remain indifferent to these fluctuations.

The most pious of the Umayyad Caliphs, 'Omar II (717–20), disallowed not only the levying of taxes from the converts to Islam, but also the subjection of the new converts to the ordinance of circumcision[3]. His governors were to occupy themselves above all with the spread of Islām and the foundation of inns (khāns)[4] and other buildings of general utility. 'Omar's first governor, Jarrāḥ b. 'Abdallāh, was still able to maintain Arab supremacy; his lieutenant, 'Abdallāh b. Ma'mar al-Yashkurī, operated successfully in the north-eastern part of Transoxania, and was already preparing an invasion of Chinese territories when he was surrounded by the Turks, and saved himself with difficulty by payment of a ransom[5].

192 Jarrāh's opinion that Khurāsān could be governed only | by means of "sword and whip"[6] was not acceptable to the pious Caliph, who appointed 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān b. Nu'aym al-Ghāmidī in his place. During his governorship a revolt of the Soghdians[7] broke out with the support of the Turks, and continued even under the following governor, Sa'īd b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz, who came to Khurāsān in 102/720–1, in the reign of the Caliph Yazīd II. Sa'īd endeavoured to win over the dihqāns of Khurāsān to his side by leniency, thus provoking the ill will of the Arabs, and earning the nickname of Khudhayna[8] (literally, "the lady").

[1] Beladsori, p. 406; *Texts*, p. 2; Gardīzī, f. 84; Cambr. MS. 167 b: دبه اسد آباد از روستای نسشابور اسد بن عبد الله بنا کرد وتا روزکار عبد الله بن طاهر فرزندان او داشتند.

[2] It is well known that at that time no clear distinction was made between kharāj (in later times "land-tax") and jizya (in later times "poll-tax"). Cf. principally J. Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, passim, and *Der Islam*, ii, 361 sq.; *Encyc. of Islam*, *s.v.* Djizya and Egypt. Even the author of the *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm* (p. 59) identifies kharāj with jizya.

[3] Tabarī, ii, 1354. [4] *Ibid.*, ii, 1364. [5] Beladsori, p. 426.

[6] Tabarī, ii, 1355. [7] *Ibid.*, ii, 418.

[8] *Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, pp. 22–3.

Nor were his operations against the enemy distinguished by resolute action. In 103/721–2 he was replaced by Sa'īd b. 'Amr al-Ḥarashī, under whom the rebellious Soghdians, especially the dihqāns and rich merchants, resolved to abandon their native country (Ghūrak, the prince of Soghd, took no part in this movement). The prince of Farghāna promised to assign them a locality in the district of Isfara, but treacherously betrayed them to the Arabs. Besieged by the latter in Khojend, the fugitives were compelled to surrender, and engaged to pay the outstanding arrears of kharāj. After the surrender of the town the Arabs found a pretext for violating the agreement, and the Soghdians were treacherously massacred. By the same perfidy the Arabs possessed themselves of all the fortified points in the valleys of the Zarafshān and Kashka-Darya, and completely restored their authority in this locality[1]. In 106/724 a bloody encounter took place near Barūqān between the North Arab and South Arab tribes. In spite of this the governor Muslim b. Sa'īd made an expedition into Transoxania in the same year, and reached Farghāna, but was defeated by the Turks on the return journey, and returned with heavy losses[2]. The next governor, Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qushayrī[3], restored Balkh in 725, and endeavoured to reduce to submission the inhabitants of the mountain provinces situated to the west and north-east of the town, but without great success[4]. |

Asad's successor, Ashras b. 'Abdallāh as-Sulamī (727–9), 193
attended personally, according to Ṭabarī[5], to all affairs both great and small; he was the first to found rabāṭs (more correctly ribāṭs), *i.e.* stations for cavalry sections whose duty it was to defend the frontier from enemy attacks[6] (resembling to some extent the Russian Cossack organization). But he was the originator of a movement against the Arab domination which embraced all Transoxania, and caused the Arabs vast losses[7]. In 728 Ashras formed the project of converting all the inhabitants of Transoxania to Islām; two missionaries, an Arab and a Persian, were dispatched to Samarqand, and Ashras promised them that tribute should not be levied on the converts. The

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 1439, 1449; Beladsori, p. 427

[2] *Ibid.*, ii, 1472–81. On the importance of this disaster cf. Gibb, *Arab Conquests in Central Asia*, p 66.

[3] Such is the reading in Nerchakhy and in the History of Balkh; العسرى in the printed editions of Ṭabarī and Balādhurī, although in both works with reference to other individuals the spelling العشرى is met with (*e g.* Ṭabarī, ii, 1997; Beladsori, p. 427.

[4] Ṭabarī, ii, 1490–94.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii, 1504.

[6] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الرباطى.

[7] Ṭabarī, ii, 1507 sq.; Marquart, *Die Chronologie der altturkischen Inschriften*, pp. 33–6; W. Barthold, *Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, pp. 23–6.

profit as possible from their brief tenure of authority, and as far as possible to acquire real estate, which in some cases they and their descendants retained even after their deposition[1]. The subject population suffered chiefly of course from the licence of the Arabs and the rapacity of their viceroys. Sometimes the interests of the treasury and the authorities came into collision with religious interests, in the name of which the conquests had been undertaken. Here, as throughout the Arab empire, the greatest difficulties were presented by the question whether kharāj should be collected from the natives who had embraced Islām[2]. This question was solved differently at different times, according to the predominance of one or other tendency, but the natives could not, of course, remain indifferent to these fluctuations.

The most pious of the Umayyad Caliphs, 'Omar II (717–20), disallowed not only the levying of taxes from the converts to Islam, but also the subjection of the new converts to the ordinance of circumcision[3]. His governors were to occupy themselves above all with the spread of Islām and the foundation of inns (khāns)[4] and other buildings of general utility. 'Omar's first governor, Jarrāḥ b. 'Abdallāh, was still able to maintain Arab supremacy; his lieutenant, 'Abdallāh b. Ma'mar al-Yashkurī, operated successfully in the north-eastern part of Transoxania, and was already preparing an invasion of Chinese territories when he was surrounded by the Turks, and saved himself with difficulty by payment of a ransom[5].

192 Jarrāh's opinion that Khurāsān could be governed only | by means of "sword and whip"[6] was not acceptable to the pious Caliph, who appointed 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān b. Nu'aym al-Ghāmidī in his place. During his governorship a revolt of the Soghdians[7] broke out with the support of the Turks, and continued even under the following governor, Sa'īd b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz, who came to Khurāsān in 102/720–1, in the reign of the Caliph Yazīd II. Sa'īd endeavoured to win over the dihqāns of Khurāsān to his side by leniency, thus provoking the ill will of the Arabs, and earning the nickname of Khudhayna[8] (literally, "the lady").

[1] Beladsori, p. 406; *Texts*, p. 2; Gardīzī, f. 84; Cambr. MS. 167 b: دبه اسد آباد از روستای نیشابور اسد بن عبد الله بنا کرد وتا روزکار عبد الله بن طاهر فرزندان او داشتند.

[2] It is well known that at that time no clear distinction was made between kharāj (in later times "land-tax") and jizya (in later times "poll-tax"). Cf. principally J. Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, passim, and *Der Islam*, ii, 361 sq; *Encyc. of Islam*, *s. v.* Djizya and Egypt. Even the author of the *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm* (p. 59) identifies kharāj with jizya.

[3] Ṭabarī, ii, 1354. [4] *Ibid.*, ii, 1364. [5] Beladsori, p. 426.

[6] Ṭabarī, ii, 1355. [7] *Ibid.*, ii, 418.

[8] *Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, pp. 22–3.

Nor were his operations against the enemy distinguished by resolute action. In 103/721–2 he was replaced by Sa'īd b. 'Amr al-Ḥarashī, under whom the rebellious Soghdians, especially the dihqāns and rich merchants, resolved to abandon their native country (Ghūrak, the prince of Soghd, took no part in this movement). The prince of Farghāna promised to assign them a locality in the district of Isfara, but treacherously betrayed them to the Arabs. Besieged by the latter in Khojend, the fugitives were compelled to surrender, and engaged to pay the outstanding arrears of kharāj. After the surrender of the town the Arabs found a pretext for violating the agreement, and the Soghdians were treacherously massacred. By the same perfidy the Arabs possessed themselves of all the fortified points in the valleys of the Zarafshān and Kashka-Darya, and completely restored their authority in this locality[1]. In 106/724 a bloody encounter took place near Barūqān between the North Arab and South Arab tribes. In spite of this the governor Muslim b. Sa'īd made an expedition into Transoxania in the same year, and reached Farghāna, but was defeated by the Turks on the return journey, and returned with heavy losses[2]. The next governor, Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qushayrī[3], restored Balkh in 725, and endeavoured to reduce to submission the inhabitants of the mountain provinces situated to the west and north-east of the town, but without great success[4]. |

Asad's successor, Ashras b. 'Abdallāh as-Sulamī (727–9), 193
attended personally, according to Ṭabarī[5], to all affairs both great and small; he was the first to found rabāṭs (more correctly ribāṭs), *i.e.* stations for cavalry sections whose duty it was to defend the frontier from enemy attacks[6] (resembling to some extent the Russian Cossack organization). But he was the originator of a movement against the Arab domination which embraced all Transoxania, and caused the Arabs vast losses[7]. In 728 Ashras formed the project of converting all the inhabitants of Transoxania to Islām; two missionaries, an Arab and a Persian, were dispatched to Samarqand, and Ashras promised them that tribute should not be levied on the converts. The

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 1439, 1449; Beladsori, p. 427

[2] *Ibid.*, ii, 1472–81. On the importance of this disaster cf. Gibb, *Arab Conquests in Central Asia*, p 66.

[3] Such is the reading in Nerchakhy and in the History of Balkh; القسرى in the printed editions of Ṭabarī and Balādhurī, although in both works with reference to other individuals the spelling العشبرى is met with (*e g.* Ṭabarī, ii, 1997; Beladsori, p. 427.

[4] Ṭabarī, ii, 1490–94.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii, 1504.

[6] Sam'ānī, *s v.* الرباطى.

[7] Ṭabarī, ii, 1507 sq.; Marquart, *Die Chronologie der altturkischen Inschriften*, pp. 33–6; W. Barthold, *Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, pp. 23–6.

success of the mission exceeded all expectations, and roused ill will alike amongst the treasury officials and the dihqāns. The latter were interested in the preservation of the aristocracy, and were therefore unable to contemplate calmly the spread of the new religion which had not yet lost its democratic character. Ashras himself was convinced that "in the kharāj lay the strength of the Muslims," and ordered freedom from taxation only for those of the newly converted who had undergone circumcision, who fulfilled the ordinances of Islam, and could read a sūra of the Koran. The reply was made to him that the natives had genuinely embraced Islam and had begun to build mosques, so that "all the people had become Arabs" and that no tax could be levied on any. This was followed by the decision, "Tax all those who were formerly liable." A general revolt resulted; the Arab missionary, who could not approve the treachery of the governor, made common cause with the rebels, and was arrested; the whole of Soghd rose against the Arabs, and sought help from the Turks. In the year 728 only Samarqand and Dabusīya remained in the hands of the Arabs; in 729 they re-established their authority in Bukhārā; and in 730, according to other accounts in 731, they had to maintain a severe struggle with the forces of the Turkish Khāqān, who was joined also by the native ruler of the country, Ghūrak, the Ikhshīdh of Soghd, although he had remained in alliance with the Arabs as late as
194 the year 728. The governor, Junayd b. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān, | saved his army with much difficulty, and repulsed the Turks, but the latter remained masters of the province with the exception of the towns of Samarqand and Bukhārā. The occupation by the Turks of the valley of the Zarafshān was probably the cause of the famine which occurred in Khurāsān in 115/733: from the words of Junayd himself we may conclude that the famine was attributed to the return to power of the infidels in those provinces from which Merv had up till then received its supplies[1].

Under such circumstances the movement directed against the Umayyad administration had every chance of success amongst the Arabs themselves. Ṭabarī[2] refers the beginning of the Shi'ite movement in Khurāsān as far back as the reign of 'Omar II, but it was only in 734 that Ḥārith b. Surayj raised the black standard in the name of "the book of God and the example (Sunna) set by his Prophet,"[3] and promised "to observe the contract made with the adherents of the protected religions (ahl adh-dhimma) not to levy tribute on the Muslims, and not to oppress anyone."[4] Such a programme must have attracted to his side both the Muslims, especially the new con-

[1] Tabarī, ii, 1563. [2] *Ibid.*, ii, 1358. [3] *Ibid.*, ii, 1567, 1570.
[4] *Texts*, pp. 1–2 (Gardīzī).

verts, and the non-Muslims. At first the movement had no anti-dynastic character. Ḥārith even accepted the proposal of the governor of Khurāsān, ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbdallāh al-Hilālī, that they should in concert dispatch envoys to the Caliph Hishām requiring him to fulfil the ordinances of the Prophet, and in the event of his agreement, be satisfied with this[1]. The Caliph's answer to this was the dismissal of ʿĀṣim, and Asad b. ʿAbdallāh was again appointed governor (735–8). Immediately after his arrival Asad ordered the execution of the ʿAbbāsid emissaries[2], and renewed the war with Ḥārith. Military operations were carried on chiefly near Tirmidh and in Khuttal; therefore Asad again lived mainly at Balkh, and removed his capital[3] thither in 736. The unbelievers took advantage of the disturbances amongst the Arabs to seize Samarqand; in 735 or 736 Asad marched to Waraghsar, in order to deflect the water from Samarqand by means of a dam, and himself took part in the work, which, | however, can hardly have been successful[4]. 195

In 737 Asad was obliged to carry on a severe struggle in Ṭukhāristān (in the wider sense) against the Turkish Khāqān and his allies, amongst whom were Ḥārith and the ruler of Khuttal. The prince of Ṣaghāniyān (Ṣaghān-Khudāt), perhaps from animosity towards his neighbour, remained in alliance with the Arabs[5]. At first the war went very badly for the latter, and for the first time for a long period a Turkish army crossed to the left bank of the Amu Darya[6]. Afterwards, however, success changed to the side of the Arabs; the Turks were obliged to retreat to Ushrūsana, where they made preparations for a new campaign and a siege of Samarqand[7] (probably reoccupied by the Arabs during the retreat of the Turks). Soon afterwards the Khāqān was killed by the Turgesh prince Kūrṣul, and as a result of this the Western Turkish empire broke up. Ḥārith was forced to withdraw to the Turks; Khuttal, which was then under the rule of an emigrant from Bāmyān, was conquered by the Arabs, with the exception of one small fortress[8]. Notwithstanding all his military operations, Asad still found time for more peaceful occupations. Ṭabarī[9] quotes the remark of a dihqān from Herāt, who called Asad an excellent "landlord" (katkhudā), erecting khāns in the Steppes; "whether a pilgrim travel eastwards, or whether he travel westwards, he finds nothing deserving of blame."

[1] Ṭabarī, ii, 1577.

[2] Gardīzī, f. 84; Camb. MS. f. 67 b: اسد کروهی مردمانرا کد داعیان آل عباس بودند بکرفت وبکشت

[3] See above, p. 77, n. 6.

[4] Ṭabarī, ii, 1585–6.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii, 1596.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 1604.

[7] *Ibid.*, ii, 1613.

[8] *Ibid.*, ii, 1632.

[9] *Ibid.*, ii, 1636–37.

Asad's activities were continued with yet greater success by his successor Naṣr b. Sayyār (738–48), who had taken part in the campaigns of Qutayba, and in 705 had received a village[1] as a gift from his immediate chief. At the time of his nomination to the governorship Naṣr had already attained a great age, and was considered the shaykh (senior) of the Khurāsān Muḍarites[2] (North Arabs).

The victories of Naṣr must have reminded the Arabs of the time of Qutayba. By taking advantage of the disintegration of the Western Turkish monarchy he re-established Arab dominion in the basin of the Syr-Darya, and in 739 concluded treaties |
196 with the rulers of Ushrūsana[3], Shāsh, and Farghāna. The prince Kūrṣūl, the murderer of the Khāqān, who had raised himself to power in the country of the Turks, was taken prisoner on the banks of the Syr-Darya and executed. By this means all danger from the side of the nomads was removed, and it is possible that Arab governors were sent to Shāsh and Farghāna[4]. At first Naṣr was equally successful in his struggle against internal difficulties. In order to settle the question of kharāj, Naṣr endeavoured to transfer taxation from the Muslims to the non-Muslims who had been illegally exempt from taxation; according to Ṭabarī[5], for 30,000 Muslims illegally taxed there were 80,000 non-Muslims exempt from taxes, so that these could be easily transferred from the first to the second. Those Soghdians who had taken refuge with the Turks, and who at the time of the murder of the Khāqān had dreamed of a return to their native land, came to terms in 741 with Naṣr, who accepted all their conditions. It was decided that those amongst them who had formerly embraced Islām and afterwards reverted to the faith of their fathers should not be subjected to persecution; that those who returned should be exempted both from private debts incurred before their emigration and from arrears of government taxation; and, finally, that they should be required to return the prisoners they had captured from the Muslims only by the decree of a qāḍī and on condition of the deposition of the legal number of witnesses. For the conclusion of such an agreement, which was unwillingly ratified by the Caliph, Naṣr was subjected to great recriminations: he maintained, however, that if his adversaries had experienced the valour of the Soghdians they too would not have refused their terms[6].

[1] Ṭabarī, II, 1180. [2] *Ibid.*, II, 1661.

[3] According to Abū-'Ubayda, quoted in Balādhurī (Beladsori, p. 429), Naṣr was not successful in Ushrūsana; but according to Ṭabarī (II, 1694) the dihqān of Ushrūsana paid tribute to Naṣr, and the inhabitants of Ushrūsana also took part in the campaign against the Turks (*ibid.*, II, 1690).

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 1694–95, 1767. [5] *Ibid.*, II, 1689.

[6] *Ibid.*, II, 1717–18.

According to Ṭabarī[1], Khurāsān under Naṣr attained a degree of prosperity hitherto unknown. Nevertheless the restoration of order in the province proved to be impossible, and he did not succeed in achieving even a reconciliation between the two hostile parties amongst the Arabs. As a Muḍarite Naṣr had often had conflicts with the former viceroy Asad, the leader of the Yamanite | party[2]; for the first four years of his governor- 197
ship he appointed only Muḍarites as commanders, but later, from a desire to reconcile the parties, he began to nominate Yamanites as well. He did not, however, succeed by this in forestalling an armed revolt of the Yamanite party which occurred in 744, headed by Juday' b. 'Alī Karmānī, who had ruled Khurāsān for a short period after the death of Asad[3]. But this armed enemy appeared less dangerous to the governor than Ḥārith since his withdrawal to the Turks. In 744 Naṣr obtained from the Caliph a full amnesty for Ḥārith and his adherents, and persuaded him to return to Khurāsān[4]. In the spring of 745 Ḥārith arrived at Merv, and immediately appeared as arbitrator between Naṣr and Karmānī, declaring that he cared only for the triumph of justice; but this did not prevent his collecting some thousands of his adherents round him and once again raising the black standard[5]. Circumstances obliged Ḥārith to turn first on Karmānī, in the war with whom he was killed in the spring of 746[6]. Thus the governor was delivered from his chief enemy amidst the Arabs. There can be no doubt that he would have succeeded in triumphing over the other rebels as well, had not a worthy antagonist appeared in the person of Abū Muslim, the chief author of the transfer of power from the Umayyads to the 'Abbāsids.

As is well known, the Shi'ite movement was at first carried on only in the name of the ordinances of the Prophet, and for the benefit of his family, the name of no definite claimant being pronounced. The natural heirs of the Prophet were considered to be the 'Alids, one of whom, Yaḥyā b. Zayd, appeared in Khurāsān, but was killed in 743. His dead body was crucified on the gates of Gūzgān (*i.e.* Yahūdīya or Anbār, see p. 79), and hung there until the victory of Abū Muslim[7]. The latter (the name adopted by him and struck on coins was really 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān b. Muslim) came from Ispahān: he was one of the most active emissaries of the 'Abbāsids, who had gradually taken the place of the 'Alids, and in 747 he arrived in Khurāsān with the commission of the 'Abbāsid Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad. By means

[1] *Ibid*, II, 1664–65.
[2] *Ibid*, II, 1493–94, 1498, 1584–85.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, 1664, 1847.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 1867–68.
[5] *Ibid.*, II, 1889, 1919
[6] *Ibid.*, II, 1932–33.
[7] *Ibid.*, II, 1770–74; *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VII, 302.

198 of a compromise between Islām and the beliefs of | the natives[1] (especially in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls) Abū Muslim attracted the dihqāns and the rural population to his side. In the course of one day he was joined by the inhabitants of sixty villages[2]. In vain Naṣr demonstrated to the Yamanites that the true aim of the movement was the massacre of the Arabs, and that in view of this danger all Arabs must unite against the common foe[3]; Abū Muslim was successful in attracting to his side all the elements hostile to the Umayyads, including a section of the Khārijites of Sijistān[4], and of the Yamanites under the leadership of Karmānī. A division sent by Naṣr under the command of the son of Ḥārith prepared an ambush for the Yamanites; Karmānī was killed[5], but his sons 'Alī and 'Othmān remained allies of Abū Muslim. In the beginning of 748 Naṣr was forced to evacuate Khurāsān, and died in Persia in the autumn of the same year. By the end of 749 the transfer of power from the Umayyads to the 'Abbāsids in Western Asia as well was already an accomplished fact.

Thus Abū Muslim gained the victory over the Umayyad governor only through a union of the most heterogeneous elements; it was natural therefore that, when victory over the common enemy had been attained, new efforts were required to maintain discipline amongst this mass, and to remove dangerous rivals. The chief supporters of Abū Muslim were Abū-Dāwud Khālid b. Ibrāhīm and Ziyād b. Ṣālih al Khuzā'ī. First of all the leaders of the Yamanites were removed; 'Othmān was killed in Khuttal by Abū Dāwud and on the same day Abū Muslim killed 'Alī[6]. The results of the accession of the 'Abbasids could satisfy neither their Arab nor their Persian adherents. After his victories over the Umayyad administration Abū Muslim had to engage in a struggle not only against the Arabs but also against the Persian national movements. At Nīshāpūr from amidst the fire-worshippers appeared the religious reformer Bih-Āfarīd (in 'Awfī, Māh-Āfarīd), who desired to restore the pure
199 Zoroastrian teaching | and had sharply attacked the official Parsi priesthood. The Magians complained to Abū Muslim that a man had appeared who was undermining both their faith and his. Abū Muslim rendered them assistance in suppressing the movement[7]. More dangerous was the revolt started in

[1] *Zapiski*, iii, 155–6 Compare Ṭabarī, iii, 129; Abu-l-Fath Muḥammad Asch-Schahrastani's *Religionsparteien und Philosophenschulen*, ubers. von Dr. Th. Haarbrucker, Erster Theil, Halle 1850, p 173.

[2] Tabarī, ii, 1952. [3] Abū Ḥanīfa ad-Dīnawarī, ed. Guirgass, p. 360.

[4] *Schahrastani*, i, 149. [5] Ṭabarī, ii, 1975. [6] *Ibid.*, ii, 1999–2000.

[7] *Texts*, p. 93–4 ('Awfī); *Schahrastani*, i, 283–4; Alberuni, *Chronologie*, ed. Sachau, p. 210–11; Alberuni, *Chronology*, trans. by Sachau, p. 193–4; *Fihrist*, p. 344; *Encyc. of Islam*, *s. v.* Bih 'Āfrīd.

Bukhārā by the Arabs in 133/750–51. The leader of the movement, Sharīk b. Shaykh al-Mahrī declared "Not for this have we followed the house of the Prophet, for the shedding of blood and the committing of iniquity." Thus early, therefore, appeared that disappointment with the 'Abbāsids, which afterwards found such eloquent expression in the letter ascribed to Abū Muslim[1]. Sharīk undertook the revolt in the interests of the 'Alids. More than 30,000 adherents gathered round him; the representatives of the Arab government in Bukhārā and Khorezmia took his part, and, judging from Narshakhī's account, he had behind him also the urban population of Bukhārā. Against him Abū Muslim sent Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ, who was supported by the Bukhār Khudāt Qutayba and the inhabitants of the 700 castles (see p. 108).

The revolt was suppressed with great cruelty; the town was set on fire and burned for three days, and the prisoners were hung on the town gates. After this Ziyād went to Samarqand, where he put the remaining rebels to death[2]. The Bukhār-Khudāt Qutayba, in spite of the service he had rendered on this occasion, was subsequently put to death by order of Abū Muslim, for having fallen away from Islām[3].

Simultaneously with her internal troubles Transoxania was exposed to grave danger from external enemies. After the fall of the Western Turkish empire no new powerful nomad state had as yet arisen in the steppes of Turkestan. The Chinese therefore endeavoured to make use of the fall of the Turks to assert their authority in Transoxania, the rulers of which had long since dispatched embassies to China and received titular honours from the Chinese Government. In 748 the Chinese took Sūyāb and destroyed it[4]. | In the following year the ruler 200
of Shāsh was executed by them "for the non-fulfilment of his duties as vassal." According to the Arabic account[5] the Chinese were summoned against this ruler by the Ikhshīdh of Farghāna; on the other hand, the son of the murdered man appealed for help to the Arabs.

Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ, who had just quelled the insurrection of Sharīk, defeated the Chinese army, which was commanded by Kao-hsien-chih, in July 751. According to the narrative of the Arabic historian, probably somewhat exaggerated, as many as

[1] Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, trad. par V. Chauvin, Leyde-Paris, 1879, pp. 240–41.
[2] Ṭabarī, iii, 74; Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, ii, 425; Nerchakhy, pp. 60–63.
[3] Nerchakhy, p. 8.
[4] Iakinth, *Sobranie svyedyenii*, iii, 244–45; F. Hirth, *Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk (Die altturkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, Zweite Folge), p. 71; Chavannes, *Documents*, &c., p. 143.
[5] Ibn al-Athīr, v, 344.

50,000 Chinese were killed and about 20,000 taken prisoner, but in the Chinese records the whole army of Kao-hsien-chih is given as 30,000 men[1]. The earlier Arab historians, occupied with the narrative of events then taking place in Western Asia, do not mention this battle[2] (see p. 3); but it is undoubtedly of great importance in the history of Turkestan as it determined the question which of the two civilizations, the Chinese or the Muslim, should predominate in the land. In other localities also the Chinese supported the native rulers in their struggle with the Arabs, but did not decide on open warfare with the latter. In the Chinese annals mention is made of important successes gained by the Chinese in the extreme South East of Transoxania, on the borders of India[3]; but this information is not confirmed from Arabic sources. Abū-Dāwud Khālid b. Ibrahīm, whom Abū Muslim appointed governor of Balkh, operated with success in Khuttal and Kish; the ruler of Khuttal fled to China, the dihqān of Kish was killed, and his brother[4] succeeded him on the throne. In 752 the ruler of Ushrūsana begged for help against the Arabs from the Chinese, but met with a refusal[5].

Thus Abū Muslim emerged victorious over external as well as internal foes, but his vast popularity amongst the natives of Khurāsān, to whom he was not only the representative of administrative power, but also a religious teacher, provoked the apprehension of the 'Abbāsids, and Abū Muslim had to make war on those who were indebted to him for the throne. In
201 135/752–3 | Sibā' b. an-Nu'mān and Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ, whom Abū Muslim had appointed governors of Transoxania, caused a revolt on secret orders from the Caliph Saffāḥ, but it was not successful. Sibā' b. an-Nu'mān was executed at Āmul; Ziyād was abandoned by his armies and fled to the dihqān of Bārkath (see p. 94) who ordered him to be killed, and sent his head to Abū Muslim[6]. During the war Abū Dāwud rendered assistance to Abū Muslim, but the intrigues of the 'Abbāsids subsequently influenced him also; Abū Muslim himself was lured to the Caliph's palace and treacherously murdered (755).

After this the partisans of Abū Muslim naturally became

[1] Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, p. 143 (note).

[2] We find an allusion to it in Tha'ālibī (Laṭâifo'l-ma'ârif, ed Jong, p. 126), according to whom the Chinese who were taken prisoner by Ziyād b. Ṣālih taught the inhabitants of Samarqand the method of manufacturing paper. Tha'ālibī quotes the "Book of Roads and States," meaning probably that of Jayhānī (see pp. 12–13). An earlier allusion to Ziyād's expedition in Ibn Tayfūr (ed. Keller, p 8) is quoted by Gibb, *Arab Conquests*, p. 96. Cf. Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, 297 sq.

[3] Iakinth, iii, 254; Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, 151.

[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 74, 79–80.

[5] Iakinth, iii, 242–3; Chavannes, *Documents, &c.*, p. 140.

[6] Ṭabarī, iii, 81–2.

enemies of the 'Abbāsids. Immediately after his death a Persian rising broke out in Khurāsān, which was suppressed in two months[1], but his party continued to exist. The instigators of a whole series of Shi'ite movements in Persia and in Transoxania somehow or other connected them with the name of Abū Muslim[2]. The distinctive sign of the party (of course only at the time of open agitation) was white clothes and standards; thus the party acting in the name of him, to whom formerly the black flag had been the pledge of triumph, received the name *sapīd-jāmagān* ("the wearers of white raiment," in Arabic *al-mubayyiḍa*).

The nature of the policy of the 'Abbāsids is well known. The first representatives of the dynasty were the same worldly rulers as the Umayyads and openly supported Greek Science and, chiefly under Ma'mūn, the rationalistic creed of the Mu'tazilites. They were distinguished from the Umayyads chiefly by their political aims. The latter were first and foremost representatives of the Arab nation; the 'Abbāsids sought to create a state in which both those provinces with a Persian and those with an Arab population should enjoy equal rights. The well-balanced administrative system of the Sāsānids, which was regarded by the Arabs as the highest example of wise statecraft[3], served as their model. | Their wazīrs (this office also in its bureaucratic 202
sense[4] was created by the 'Abbāsids) who, from the time of the Caliph Manṣūr, had belonged to the famous Persian family of the Barmakids (see p. 77), considered themselves the direct successors of Buzurjmihr and other semi-mythological statesmen of the Sāsānid epoch[5].

The task of the provincial governors, especially that of the Governor of Khurāsān, to which Transoxania was, as before, subordinate, was also determined by these principles. As under the Sāsānids, the son of the head of the state was on two

[1] *Ibid.*, iii, 119–20.

[2] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 199, 204; trad., pp. 291, 298.

[3] The famous polyhistorian Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/869) says in his treatise on the "Superior Qualities of the Turks" (مناقب الاتراك: I make use of a copy kindly communicated to me by Baron V. R. Rosen) that the Sāsānid Persians excelled all nations in the art of governing states, as the Chinese did in handicrafts, the Greeks in science, and the Turks in the art of war (اهل الصين فى الصناعات واليونانيون فى الحكم وآل ساسان فى الملك والاتراك فى الحروب). This treatise was published in 1903 by van Vloten (*Tria opuscula auctore al-Djahiz*) under the title رسالة فى فضائل الاتراك, and has been translated into English by Harley Walker (*J. R. A. S.*, 1915, pp. 631–97: the passage quoted is on p. 682).

[4] On the use of the word *wazīr* before and after the 'Abbāsid period see my paper (in *Festschrift Goldziher*, 1911) "Die persische Šu'ūbīja und die moderne Wissenschaft" (*Zeitsch. fur Assyriologie*, xxvi, 245–66), esp. p. 258.

[5] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 150–51, trad. pp. 223–24.

occasions appointed chief of the province, which is explained by the importance of the governorship of Khurāsān, where the struggle with both internal and external enemies presented peculiar difficulties. The problem before the governors lay in the strengthening of the political structure according to the spirit of the Sāsānid traditions, in the union of all partisans of order and tranquillity, in the pacification of the restless elements, and in making war on rebellious vassals and their allies of the Steppes. The complete subjugation of the country to Muslim rule, and the establishment of entire immunity from danger both internal and external, was attained only when, instead of constantly changing governors at the head of the province, hereditary rulers were appointed from among the native aristocrats, well acquainted with local conditions and enjoying the confidence of the population. It follows as a matter of course that these governors acted more in their own interests than in those of the Caliphs, and that their dependence on the latter rapidly became purely nominal.

The 'Abbāsid viceroys who governed Khurāsān till the rise of the Ṭāhirid dynasty were obliged to suppress a whole series of revolts, on the part of the Arabs as well as of the Persians. After the pacification of Sharīk's rising, we still find a great many revolts of Arab Shi'ites in Bukhārā. The second successor of Abū Muslim, 'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, in 140/757–8 ordered the execution of the Arab ruler of Bukhārā Mujāshi' b.
203 Ḥurayth | al-Anṣārī on account of his sympathy with the 'Alids[1].

Under the Caliph Mahdī (775–85) there occurred at Bukhārā about 160/777 the revolt of the Kharijite Yūsuf al-Barm, a client of the tribe of Thaqīf. The standard of revolt was raised in the name of the ordinances of Islām[2], and military operations, judging from Gardīzī's account[3], took place mainly in the North Western part of Afghanistan, as Yūsuf seized Marwarrūd, Ṭālqān and Gūzgān. Subsequently, during the reign of Ma'mūn, yet another revolt had to be quelled, that of Yūsuf's grandson, Manṣūr b. 'Abdallāh[4]. We find a whole series of Kharijite disturbances in Sijistān and Bādghīs, and Sijistān remained a hotbed of sedition even under the Ṭāhirids and the Sāmānids. In Bādghīs about the year 150/767 there occurred also a Persian religious movement, the leader of which, the prophet Ashnas, sought to carry on the work of Bih-Āfarīd, who had been executed, as we have seen, by Abū Muslim[5].

As regards the "people in white raiment," *i.e.* the party of

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 128.
[2] Ja'qubi, *Historiae*, ii, 478–9; *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 303–4.
[3] Oxford MS., f. 94; Camb. MS., f. 75 b.
[4] Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, ii, 546.
[5] Gardīzī, f. 92; Camb. MS., f. 74 a.

Abū Muslim, their activities never really ceased (the sect still existed in the twelfth century) although comparatively rarely manifested in open revolt. After the murder of Abū Muslim, a revolt was stirred up in Transoxania by his follower Isḥāq, an illiterate man who was called "the Turk" from the circumstance that he had formerly gone to the Turks as envoy on a mission from Abū Muslim. | Isḥāq also called himself the successor of Zoroaster, who, he announced, was alive and would shortly manifest himself for the establishment of his religion[1]. The rising was quelled but Abū Muslim's first successor in the governorship of Khurāsān, Abū Dāwud, fell in 757 by the hand of assassins belonging to this sect[2]. Abū Dāwud's successor 'Abd al-Jabbār, becoming dissatisfied with the government of the Caliph, allied himself in 759 with the rebels, at whose head was Barāz, and raised the white standard[3], but was defeated and captured in flight near Marwarrūd by his Arab | subjects, 204
who delivered him to the government[4]. A much graver danger was presented by the revolt of Hāshim b. Ḥakīm[5], a native of the neighbourhood of Merv, who had previously served under Abū Muslim and later under 'Abd al-Jabbār. His revolt had already broken out, according to Gardīzī and Narshakhī, during the governorship of Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba, *i.e.* before the beginning of 776. Hāshim declared to his followers that the Deity was incarnate in him, as before him in Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muḥammad, and Abū Muslim; he wore a green cloth over his face continually, and asserted that mere mortals were unable to bear the light emanating from his face. Hence the Arabs gave him the nickname Al-Muqanna' ("the veiled one")[6]. It is difficult to say how much reliance must be placed on the statements that the veil was also intended to hide the physical deformities of their prophet from his followers. His greatest successes were gained in the neighbourhood of Kish and Nasaf, where the village of Sūbakh was the first to take his side; besides this the "people in white raiment" asserted themselves in Bukhārā, where the Bukhār-Khudāt Buniyāt[7] himself supported them, and in Soghd. The head-quarters of the Bukharan adherents of Muqanna' were for a long time in the village of Narshakh. Muqanna' applied also to the Turks for help. The final refuge of the religious

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 345.

[2] According to Gardīzī (f. 90; Camb. MS., f. 73 a); according to Ṭabarī (iii, 128) he was killed by "men from the army."

[3] Gardīzī, f. 91; Camb MS., f. 73 a: علم سپیدکرد. Cf. also *Z.D.M.G.*, lii, 216–17.

[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 135. According to Gardīzī these men belonged to the tribe of Azd.

[5] Narshakhī gives the fullest details about him (Nerchakhy, pp. 63–74).

[6] He is the "veiled prophet" of Thomas Moore's novel. Cf. now the Arabic accounts translated by E. G. Browne, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, i, 318 sq.

[7] Nerchakhy, p. 9.

leader was a mountain fortress in the neighbourhood of Kish. The rising was put down under the viceroy Musayyab b. Zuhayr[1] (780–3), and the Bukhār-Khudāt Buniyāt, who had sympathized with the rioters, was subsequently killed at Farakhsha by the Caliph's horsemen. The sect however continued to exist in the neighbourhood of Kish and Nasaf, and in some villages of Bukhārā; the latter are named in the translation of Narshakhi[2], | but these names are not mentioned in other sources unless Zarmān (see above, p. 96) or Razmāz (p. 129) is to be read instead of Zarmāz. The castle of 'Omar is called in Sam'ānī[3] the castle of
205 'Omayr: its position is | unknown. Maqdisī[4] also speaks of the existence in the villages of Transoxania of the religion of the "people in white raiment, whose rites resemble those of the Zindīqs" (Dualists). According to the Tumansky MS., the largest number of "people in white raiment" were to be found among the rural population of Īlāq[5].

Less clear are the motives of the rising stirred up in the year 806 by Rāfi' b. Layth, the grandson of Naṣr b. Sayyār, and the reasons of the success which attended this rebel at the outset. Naṣr's family had evidently become reconciled to 'Abbāsid rule; Layth, the father of Rāfi' (Ṭabarī[6] calls him a client of the Caliph Mahdī), and his cousin Ḥasan b. Tamīm took part in the war against Muqanna'[7]. Ṭabarī[8] explains Rāfi''s revolt on purely personal grounds, namely, on account of the punishment to which he was subjected by order of the Caliph for adultery. By what means Rāfi' succeeded in attracting the natives to his side, in killing the governor of Samarqand, and in seizing Samarqand is unknown. The inhabitants of Nasaf themselves begged help from Rafi' against the government, and he sent them "the ruler of Shāsh with his Turks[9]," who must consequently have been allied with the rebels. In addition to this, Ya'qūbī[10] mentions as partisans of Rāfi' the inhabitants of Farghāna, Khojend, Ushrūsana, Ṣaghāniyān, Bukhārā, Khorezmia, and Khuttal. Even the Toquz-Oghuz, the Qarluqs, and the Tibetans sent Rāfi' reinforcements[11]. The rising was put down only in 810;

[1] According to Narshakhī (p. 70), Musayyab arrived in Jumādā I; according to Ḥamza Iṣfahānī (Text, p. 222, trans., p. 172–3, where by mistake Zuhayr b. Musayyab) in Jumādā II, 163 A H. According to Gardīzī (f. 95; Camb. MS, f. 76 b.) Musayyab arrived in Khurāsān in Jumādā I, 166, and remained only eight months.

[2] Nerchakhy, p 73. The castle of Khushtuwān is possibly identical with Kākhush-tuwān rabāṭ, the name of which was given to the village, and the rustāq (cf above, p. 116, and Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الكاخشتوانى).

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* المبيضى.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 323.

[5] W. Barthold, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, p. 22.

[6] Ṭabarī, iii, 484.

[7] Gardīzī, f. 93; Camb. MS., f. 75 a.

[8] Ṭabarī, iii, 707–8.

[9] *Ibid.*, iii, 712.

[10] Ja'qubi, *Hist*, ii, 528.

[11] *Ibid.*

abandoned by the Turks[1] in 809, Rāfi' surrendered to Ma'mūn, "when he heard the report of his just rule,"[2] and received full forgiveness.

Thus the Turks intervened in the disorders occurring in Transoxania, the rebels themselves sometimes appealing to them for help; but the Arabs had not to deal with such considerable Turkish forces as in the Umayyad period. | After the fall of the 206
Turgesh empire and the defeat of the Chinese two kingdoms were formed on the frontier of Transoxania. Semiryechye and the eastern part of the Syr-Darya province were seized by the Qarluqs, who in 766 had occupied Suyāb, the former Turgesh capital. On the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya arose the kingdom of the Oghuz, who were evidently, like the Toquz-Oghuz in Eastern Turkestan, a section of the Western Turks who were dispersed after the death of Sulu[3]. The Toquz-Oghuz, who, as we have seen, took part in the disturbances in Transoxania at the beginning of the ninth century, must evidently be identified with the Syr-Darya Oghuz (Ghuzz), and not with the Eastern Turkestan Toquz-Oghuz[4]. These nomads apparently did not undertake campaigns of conquest in Transoxania, but limited themselves to making sudden raids and rendering assistance to the native rulers and Arab rebels To protect the country from their raids walls were built in Rāsht, in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā, and in Shāsh[5]; from this it is evident that in spite of the victory of Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ the Arabs had given up the provinces situated to the north of the Chirchik valley. On the whole we have but little information on the campaigns against the turbulent local rulers and the Turkish Khāns. Under Manṣūr (754–775) Layth, "the client of the Commander of the Faithful" (probably the son of Naṣr b. Sayyār, see p. 200), was sent as envoy to Farghāna. The prince of Farghāna at that time lived in Kāshghar, but was compelled by the Arabs to sue for peace and to pay a heavy tribute. As his ambassador to them he dispatched the high noble Bātījūr (or Bāṭchūr), who, on being summoned by the Arabs to accept Islām, peremptorily refused, and remained in confinement until the accession of the Caliph Mahdī (775). To all entreaties he made answer, "I will not betray the king whose envoy I am[6]." During the reign of Mahdī (775–85), about the time of the revolt of Yūsuf-al-Barm (see above p. 198), a campaign into Farghāna was undertaken by Aḥmad b. Asad. Here the capital of the king of Farghāna is

[1] Tabarī, iii, 775. [2] *Ibid.*, iii, 777.
[3] Marquart, *Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften*, p. 24–5; W. Barthold, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, p. 28.
[4] Cf. now my article "Ghuzz" in *Encyc. of Islām.*
[5] See above, pp. 71, 112, 172–3.
[6] Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, ii, 465–66.

called Kāsān[1], from which it may be deduced that the king had recovered his country. Shortly after this Mahdī sent ambassadors to demand tokens of submission from a large number of
207 rulers, the majority of whom complied. | Amongst these are mentioned the Ikhshīdh of Soghd, the Afshīn of Ushrūsana, the king of Farghāna, the jabghū of the Qarluqs, the Khāqān of the Toquz-Oghuz, "Ṭarkhān, king of the Turks" (perhaps the ruler of Shāsh), the king of Tibet and even the Chinese emperor[2]. Under Hārūn ar-Rashīd (786–809) the governor Ghiṭrīf b. 'Aṭā (792–3) sent 'Amr b. Jamīl to Farghāna in order to drive out the army of the Jabghū of the Qarluqs[3]; and the governor Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al Barmakī (794–5) operated successfully in Transoxania, receiving the submission of the king of Ushrūsana, who formerly "had never appeared before nor shown submission to anyone[4]." During his residence in Khurāsan (809–18) Ma'mūn found it necessary to send an army to Soghd, Ushrūsana, and Farghāna, and at the same time summoned the rulers to make submission by means of embassies[5]. Ibn al-Athīr gives an account of an expedition by the Arabs in 194/810 against the town of Qulān (now Tarti in the district of Aulié-Ata), in which the Ṣūfī Shaqīq b. Ibrāhīm Balkhī was killed[6]. Before the beginning of his struggle with the Caliph Amīn (811) Ma'mūn complained to his wazīr, Faḍl b. Sahl, that he was obliged to begin hostilities at the most unfavourable moment; the jabghū (of the Qarluqs) had refused obedience; the same insubordination had been shown by "Khāqān, the ruler of Tibet"; the king of Kābul was preparing to invade the districts of Khurāsān which bordered on his own dominions; the prince of Utrār[7] was refusing to pay the tribute he had formerly paid. Faḍl advised him to write letters to the Jabghū and Khāqān granting them the provinces over which they ruled already, and promising them help in their struggle against the (other) kings; to send gifts to the king of Kābul and offer to make peace with him, to which he would willingly agree; and to remit to the prince of Utrār, as a sign of favour, one year's

[1] Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, ii, 478. Cf. also my article "Farghāna" in *Encyc of Islām*

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 479.

[3] Gardīzī, f. 96; Camb. MS., f. 77 b: بن جمیل را بفرستاد (Cod. عمر) عمرو از فرغانه بیرون کرد (Cod. جنوبه را) تا جبغویه را. On 'Amr b. Jamīl see *Texts*, p. 2 (Gardīzī).

[4] *Ibid.*, f. 97; Camb. MS., f. 78 a: وجنان خبر که ملك سرشنه بود ببش او باز آمد که پیش هیچ کس نیامده بود وهیچ کس را فرمان نبرده بود

[5] Beladsori, p. 430.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 164. Qulān is mentioned in my *Otchet, &c.*, pp. 21 and 31. Cf. also F. Grenard in *J. A.*, 9, xv, 27.

[7] In the printed text اترابنده; the MS. has ابرازبنده.

tribute[1]. These and similar measures probably succeeded in attaining at any rate external peace for the country.

As regards internal administration, judging from the accounts of the historians, the men who did most for the welfare of the country were Abū'l- | 'Abbās Faḍl b. Sulaymān at-Ṭūsī[2] 208
(783–7)[3] and Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī[4] (794–5). Other governors for the most part cared only for their personal enrichment; some of them, like 'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān[5] and Musayyab b. Zuhayr[6], immediately after their appointment arbitrarily increased the taxation. The arbitrary acts of the governors were not always promptly punished by the central government; 'Alī b. 'Īsā b. Māhān, one of the most avaricious governors, managed to remain in office for more than ten years[7] (from 796), as he divided his spoils with the Caliph Hārūn[8]. The population of the subject provinces was as formerly summoned to perform military service. Faḍl b. Yahyā formed a strong Persian corps in Khurāsān: according to Ṭabarī[9] as many as 500,000 men were levied (which is evidently an exaggeration), of whom 20,000 were sent to Baghdād, and the remainder stayed in Khurāsān. These received the name of the "'Abbāsid Corps," evidently because they were intended to serve as the prop of the dynasty.

In the account of the war fought by 'Alī b. 'Īsā against the rebel Ḥamza there is mention of a division of "Soghdians and men of Nakhshab[10]," and the army of Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn in the 'Irāq campaign (of 811) included 700 Khorezmians[11].

We must lay stress on yet one other measure of the 'Abbāsid

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 815–16. [2] *Texts*, p. 2

[3] Gardīzī (f. 95; Camb. MS., f. 77 a) gives the date of the arrival of Faḍl's envoy in Merv as Muḥarram 167 (August 783), and of Faḍl himself as Rabī' I (October) of the same year. In Ḥamza of Ispahān the same months are given, but of the year 166 (Text, p. 222, trans., p. 173: there is a mistake in the translation). Ṭabarī (iii, 517) and Narshakhī (p. 32) put the appointment of Faḍl in 166, but do not mention the time of his arrival.

[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 631. In the short period of his administration Faḍl cannot have done all that is ascribed to him; cf. my article "Barmakids" in *Encyc. of Islām*.

[5] Gardīzī, f. 91; Camb. MS, f. 73 a: خراج مرو وبلخ وبسیار از شهرهای خراسان زیادت کرد. 'Abd-al-Jabbār was also accused of having killed the leaders of the Khorezmians (Ṭabarī, iii, 134).

[6] Gardīzī, f. 95; Camb. MS., f. 76 b: بر وظیفهٔ خراج زیادت کرد ورعایا از وی کله کردند تا مهدی اورا معزول کرد

[7] According to Ṭabarī (iii, 713) and Gardīzī (f. 98; Camb. MS, f. 79 b) he was dismissed in 191 (806–7); according to Ḥamza of Ispahān (Text, p. 225, trans., p. 175) in Rabī' ii, 193 (March, 808).

[8] Ṭabarī, iii, 703–4. [9] *Ibid.*, iii, 631.

[10] Gardīzī, f. 98; Camb. MS., f. 79 a سغدیان ونخشبیان صبرکردند تا حمزه ستوه شد پس حمله آوردند ویارانش را بکشتند وبر روی حمزه جراحت کردند

[11] Ṭabarī, iii, 800.

governors which was undoubtedly of great importance in the economic life of the country, namely, the introduction of debased
209 coinage.

According to Narshakhī[1], the Bukhār-Khudāt Kānā, who ruled for thirty years, was the first to coin silver money (dirhams) in Bukhārā. This coinage was introduced by him in the reign of the Caliph Abū Bakr (632–4). The dirhams were made of pure silver, and the Bukhār-Khudāt was represented on them wearing a crown. Towards the end of the eighth century these coins had already disappeared from circulation, and were replaced by the Khorezmian coinage. The Bukharans were dissatisfied at this and applied to the governor, Ghiṭrīf b. 'Aṭā, begging him to coin silver money for them of the same appearance as the dirhams of the Bukhār-Khudāts, but such as would serve exclusively for local needs, and could not be exported from the province. As silver was dear at the time, Ghiṭrīf, by agreement with the representatives of the town, began to coin money formed of an alloy of six metals—gold, silver, lead, tin, iron, and copper. The coins were struck with the former design, but with the name of Ghitrīf, and for this reason received the name of ghiṭrīfī. The inhabitants of Bukhārā at first refused to accept these black dirhams; an obligatory exchange was therefore introduced by which six ghiṭrīfī dirhams equalled one dirham of pure silver, and ghiṭīfī were taken according to this rate in payment of tribute. The taxation of Bukhārā and its neighbourbood up to that time amounted to somewhat less[2] than 200,000 dirhams; it was now fixed at 1,168,567[3] ghiṭrīfī dirhams. Shortly after this rate of exchange was introduced, the ghiṭīfī rose, until it equalled the white dirham in value, but the taxation figures were not reduced. The Bukharans therefore were now obliged to pay six times as much as formerly. Subsequently the value of the ghiṭīfī rose even higher; in 220/835 100[4] white dirhams were worth only eighty-five ghiṭrīfī dirhams, in 522/1128 only 70. |

210 Narshakhī's account admits of some doubts. Debased coinage began to be minted in Bukhārā, as formerly in Khorezmia, in order that this money should not circulate beyond the confine

[1] Nerchakhy, pp. 34–6.

[2] Prof. N. I. Veselovsky (*Zhurn. Min. Narodn. Prosv.*, Dec. 1897, pp. 467–8 considers that Narshakhī's expression would be more accurately translated thus (s in Lerch): "In former times the kharāj of Bukhārā consisted of 200,000 dirham which was not much." We have no grounds, however, for thus violating the Persian text; the figures quoted by us further on show that the taxation was in fact somewhat less than 200,000 white dirhams or 1,200,000 ghiṭrīfī dirhams.

[3] In the text the words وصد are omitted here (cf. Nerchakhy, p. 31). In Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 340) a somewhat different figure is quoted (1,166,897, below 1,166,877; in Ibn Khurdādbih (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 27) 1,189,200).

[4] The word صد is omitted in the text.

of the province. Maqdisī[1] says of the Khorezmians: "They estimated the value of the dirham at four dāniqs[2], in order that the merchants should not deprive them of the dirhams; and up to the present day silver is brought to us (the author evidently speaks here in the name of the Khorezmians) and is not taken away from us." The change from pure silver to an alloy of six metals was made, therefore, not in consequence of the dearness of silver, but with a view to that restricted circulation of the new money of which Narshakhī also speaks, and so the Bukharans had no grounds for refusing to accept ghiṭrīfīs. No explanation is given either of the rapid rise in the rate of exchange of the debased coinage. It is most likely that the cause was the depreciation of the old worn white dirhams; therefore, if the figures relating to taxation were defined in ghiṭrīfī dirhams it was impossible to request the government that these figures should be reduced after the rise in value of the ghiṭrīfī, i.e. after the depreciation of the value of the white dirhams. Maqdisī[3] also says that the black dirhams which circulated only in Transoxania were preferred there to the white. Unfortunately we have no information as to the rate of exchange of the ghiṭrīfī for the Kūfī dirham and fals (copper money). Ibn Ḥawqal[4] speaks of the exchange of the ghiṭrīfī for fals, and Narshakhī[5] of the exchange for silver in his account of the events of 260/874, but in neither the one nor the other is there any mention of rates of exchange.

The ghiṭrīfī dirhams were neither the only nor yet the first coins of this kind. The historians and geographers distinguish, besides the Khorezmian dirhams, three types of alloy dirhams in which taxes were paid in Transoxania, namely, the muḥammadī, musayyabī, and ghitrīfī dirhams. The first were introduced, according to Gardīzī[6], | under Muḥammad b. Dahda, 211
who, however, is not mentioned amongst the governors of Khurāsān, and was probably one of the Arab officials in Transoxania subordinate to the governor of Khurāsān. The musayyabī dirhams were coined under Musayyab b. Zuhayr (780–3). According to Ibn Khurdādhbih[7] (whose information refers to 211 and 212, *i.e.* 826–8) taxes were paid as follows:—in Khorezmia, in Khorezmian dirhams; in the Turkish towns incor-

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 286 (De Goeje, *Das alte Bett des Oxus*, p. 100).

[2] Elsewhere 4½ (*Bibl. Geog Arab.*, III, 340, *Das alte Bett*, p. 109); the ordinary dirham weighed 6 dāniqs.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 340. [4] *Ibid.*, II, 363 [5] Nerchakhy, p. 76.

[6] Gardīzī, f. 95; Camb. MS., f. 76 b: بدو باز خوانند (Cod. مسمی) ودرم مسیمی چنانکه غطریفی بغطریف بن عطا الکندی ومحمدی بمحمد بن دهده واین درمها را روی وارزیز آمیخته باشد.

[7] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VI, 27–8.

porated in the territories of Nūḥ b. Asad, in Khorezmian and musayyabī dirhams; in Shāsh, Īlāq, and Khojend, in musayyabi dirhams; in Ushrūsana, partly in musayyabī, but mainly in muḥammadī dirhams; in Farghāna, Soghd, Kish, and Nasaf, in muḥammadī dirhams; in Bukhārā, in ghiṭrīfīs. From this it is evident that each of the three alloy coinages was distributed over a definite geographical area. As regards the external appearance of these dirhams, judging from the accounts of the geographers, there does not seem to have been any substantial difference between the three kinds. On all of them there were figures which sharply distinguished them from the usual type of Muslim coinage [1], and also, according to Ibn Hawqal, unintelligible characters. The origin of this coinage was soon forgotten [2]. As early as the tenth century, as is evident from Maqdisī's [3] account, there existed a legend, which is related also by Sam'ānī [4], that three brothers, Muḥammad, Musayyab, and Ghiṭrīf, seized Transoxania and began to coin dirhams there in their own names.

We cannot enter here into a survey of the numismatic question to which of the three kinds must be referred the different types of alloy dirhams found up to the present in Central Asia, and coined after the pattern of the local silver dirhams of pre-Muslim origin [5]. Numismatists distinguish two main categories of pre-Muslim Central Asiatic coins, the Khorezmian and the Soghdian. In the former we have on the obverse a bust of the king (face
212 without beard), on the reverse an altar with consecrated | fire; one coin is engraved with a camel moving to the right. As regards the inscription (on the obverse), A. K. Markov suggests the reading Mazda hodat ("ruler-autocrat"), Prof. O. Donner Malka Sadak ("Just King," like *βασιλεὺς δίκαιος* on the Arsacid coins). The Soghdian coins on the other hand present several types, but on all of them we find the portrait of the Sāsānid king Varahrān (Bahrām) V (420–38), whose coinage evidently served as a model for the Soghdians [6]. The legends also present some variants; on coins of the most widely-distributed type we find eleven signs, which according to Lerch's [7] interpretation are to

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 314. [2] *Ibid.*, ii, 363. [3] *Ibid.*, iii, 340.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s.v.* الزيوندى. Maqdisī does not say anything about the period of the governorship of the three brothers; according to Sam'ānī they ruled in Transoxania immediately after Sa'īd b. 'Othmān.

[5] This is discussed in detail (along with an account of the literature on the subject) in Prof. O. Donner's article "Sur l'origine de l'alphabet turc du Nord de l'Asie" (*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, xiv, 1, pp. 33–8).

[6] According to E. Thomas's opinion (*Numism. Chron.*, iii, 1, 118) the Varahrān V type of coin was borrowed by the Soghdians at second hand through the coinage of the rebel Varahrān (Bahrām) Chūbīn (about 578).

[7] See his article in *Travaux de la 3e session du Congrès international des Orientalistes*, ii, 419–29, and now his more detailed, but unfinished, paper in *Trudy Vost. Otd. Arkh. Obshch.*, part xviii.

be read *bukhar khuddat.* Together with silver dirhams of a very high standard (97%) there are also coins of the basest alloy, sometimes with Arabic legends, e.g. with the name of the Caliph al-Mahdī (who was contemporary with Musayyab). Coins on which the names of Muḥammad, Musayyab, and Ghiṭrīf could be plainly deciphered have not so far been found; on some coins only after the religious formula the name Muhammad is repeated, which may refer to Muḥammad b. Dahda[1]. In my view the words of Narshakhī and Sam'ānī (in spite of Prof. N. Veselovsky's[2] opinion) do not allow of any doubt that the names of the three viceroys were engraved on coins, perhaps not in Arabic, but in Aramaic characters (as on the Arabic-Pehlevi coins). Like all coins of base alloy these dirhams suffered greatly with time; not only the Aramaic, but also the Arabic inscriptions can only be deciphered with great difficulty. Even the reading bukhar khuddat suggested by Lerch, which seemed to be quite certain, is disputed by E. Drouin, and Prof. O. Donner recognizes the validity of his objections. Some perplexity is also occasioned by the fact that while the ghiṭrīfī dirhams circulated in Bukhārā only, the so-called dirhams of the Bukhār Khudāts were also found in Samarqand, Khojend | and Khiva[3]. 213
Thus the numismatic data have so far shown only the fact that in Soghd in the fifth or sixth century dirhams began to be coined in imitation of the Sāsānid coinage; if Narshakhī's chronological information with regard to the introduction of coined money in Bukhārā is true, then the Bukhār-Khudāts probably borrowed the type from their Soghdian neighbours, and not directly from the Sāsānids (otherwise they would have taken as their model the dirhams of Khusrū II, as the Arabs did shortly afterwards). It is extremely curious that as late as the end of the eighth century, when dirhams and fals of the Kūfī type had long been coined in Transoxania, the request of the population for debased currency should have been satisfied by means of dirhams of the old type with heathen figures.

The Caliph Ma'mūn, having with the help of the Persians defeated his brother Amīn, naturally constituted himself the protector of the people to whom he owed the throne, and confided to Persians the administration of the eastern provinces more consistently than did his predecessors. These rulers laid the foundations of the Ṭāhirid and the Sāmānid dynasties. The

[1] W. de Tiesenhausen, *Notice sur une collection de monnaies orientales de M. le Comte S. Stronganoff*, St-P., 1880, p. 11. E. Thomas in *Numism. Chron.*, iii, 1, 128; here محمديه should perhaps be read instead of محمدلا. It is well known that the name of the Caliph Mahdī was Muhammad and the coins may possibly have received their designation from him.

[2] See above, p. 204, note 2.

[3] *Travaux, &c.*, p. 423.

ancestor[1] of the Ṭāhirids, Razīq, was a client of Abū Muḥammad Ṭalḥa b. 'Abdallāh al-Khuzā'ī[2], viceroy of Sijistān under Salm b. Ziyād (see above, p. 183); Ḥāfiz-Abrū[3] mistakenly confuses this Ṭalḥa with the famous figure of the early days of Islām. Muṣ'ab, the son of Razīq, governed the town of Būshang in the province of Herāt, and at the time of the 'Abbāsid propaganda was secretary to one of the adherents of Abū Muslim. He is again mentioned as governor of Būshang in the account of the revolt of Yūsuf al-Barm, who captured this town from him[4]. After the rising had been put down Būshang was evidently restored to Muṣ'ab, who was succeeded as governor of the town by his son Ḥusayn (d. 199/814–5), and by his grandson Ṭāhir.
214 Somewhat | before this Ṭāhir had taken part in the war against Rāfi' b. Layth[5]. In 811, when the campaign against Amīn was undertaken, Ṭāhir was appointed commander of Ma'mūn's military forces, and the wazīr Faḍl b. Sahl personally attached to his spear-head his appointed standard[6]. After Ma'mūn's accession (813) Ṭāhir was appointed governor of Al-Jazīra (Mesopotamia), military commander of Baghdād and financial administrator of the Sawād[7] ('Irāq). Ṭāhir's friend Aḥmad b. Abū Khālid roused Ma'mūn's suspicions against the then governor of Khurāsān, Ghassān b. 'Abbād, and in 821 Ṭāhir was sent to Khurāsan as governor[8]. In November 822 Ṭāhir died suddenly soon after omitting Ma'mūn's name in the reading of the Khuṭba, thus signifying his independence of the throne of Baghdād. Naturally suspicions were aroused that he had been poisoned by order of the Caliph; nevertheless Ma'mūn confirmed his son Ṭalha in the governorship of Khurāsān (822–8). | Ṭalḥa's successor, Abu'l-'Abbās 'Abdallāh, who reached Khurāsān in 830, was already to all intents and purposes an entirely independent ruler; even the Caliph Mu'taṣim (833–42), who hated him[9], could only encourage secret plans of murder[10], but never decided on taking measures openly against him. Other members of the Ṭāhirid family at

[1] Ibn Khallikān gives a detailed account of the origin of the dynasty (no. 350, trans. Slane, I, 649 sq.); according to Mas'ūdī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VIII, 348) the Ṭāhirids were descended from the Knight Rustam.

[2] This individual is mentioned also in Ṭabarī (II, 393).

[3] *Texts*, p. 158. The same author gives the name of Muṣ'ab's father as Farrukh.

[4] Gardīzī, f. 94; Camb. MS., f. 75 b: يوسف ثقفى حرورى ببروں آمدہ بود اندر روزگار حميد وحكم طالقانى وبو معاذ فريابى يا وى بودند وبوشنك از مصعب بن رزيق بستدہ بودند

[5] Ṭabarī, III, 777.

[6] *Texts*, p. 2 (also Ibn Khallikān).

[7] Ṭabarī, III, 1039.

[8] *Ibid*, III, 1042.

[9] On the causes of this hatred see *Texts*, p. 3 (Gardīzī).

[10] According to Gardīzī (f. 102; Camb. MS., f. 82 b) the Caliph sent a slave girl as a present to 'Abdallāh, and gave her a poisoned turban (دستارچه) for him, but on her arrival at Nīshāpūr she fell in love with the Ṭāhirid and revealed the secret to him.

the same period filled important posts in the West; amongst other offices they held the command of the military forces of Baghdād, which could not fail to contribute towards the ascendancy of the dynasty. On the whole, however, the heads of the family considered themselves safe only within their own state. When 'Abdallāh informed his secretary that he intended to undertake the pilgrimage to Mecca (Ḥajj) the faithful servant answered: "O Amīr! Thou art too sensible to undertake such a senseless business[1]." 'Abdallāh entirely agreed with his official, and remarked that he had only wished to test him. |

The Sāmānids were called to power even earlier than the 215
Ṭāhirids, but only in the capacity of rulers of Transoxania, subordinate to the governor of Khurāsān. The ancestor of the dynasty, Sāmān-Khudāt, founder and ruler of the village of Sāmān in the Balkh province[2], was considered a descendant of the Sāsānid leader Bahrām-Chūbīn, who had fled to the Turks in 591. Sāmān-Khudāt enjoyed the protection of the governor Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qushayrī (d. 738), embraced Islām, and called his son Asad in honour of his patron. Of the life of Asad we know nothing; his sons Nūḥ, Aḥmad, Yaḥyā, and Ilyās, after taking part in the suppression of the revolt of Rāfi' b. Layth[3], served under the Caliph Ma'mūn, and were able to conciliate his goodwill. At the Caliph's desire the governor of Khurāsān, Ghassān b. 'Abbād (819–21) appointed Nūḥ governor of Samarqand, Aḥmad governor of Farghāna, Yaḥyā governor of Shāsh, and Ilyās governor of Herāt[4]. The Sāmānids were not able to maintain their rule in Herāt. Ilyas, who died there in 242/856–7[5], apparently left no successor: in the accounts which have come down to us relative to the rise of the Ṣaffārids in Sijistān and the province of Herāt, there is no mention of the Sāmānids. In Transoxania the Sāmānids constituted themselves

[1] Gardīzī, f. 103; Camb. MS., f. 83 a: تا امیر تو حازمنر ارانی که کاری کنی که از حزم دور بود

[2] Thus the majority of the historians. Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog Arab*, III, 338; Yāqūt, III, 13) locates Sāmān in the neighbourhood of Samarqand.

[3] Nerchakhy, p. 74

[4] Thus in Mīrkhwānd (*Histoire des Samanides*, ed. Defrémery, pp. 2, 113). According to Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī (in Nerchakhy, p. 100) Ilyās received Shāsh and Yahyā Herāt, but in Browne's ed. (p. 379) Ilyās received Herāt and Yahyā Shāsh (instead of Shāsh the MSS. have اشناس and اشفاس; Ashnās also in the trans., p. 73). Mīrkhwānd's account is confirmed by the passage from Sam'ānī quoted below. We know from Kindī's *Governors and Judges of Egypt* (ed. Guest, p. 184) that Ilyās b. Asad Sāmānī was appointed governor of Alexandria in 212/827, but we are not told how long he remained in the West; cf. also عجب نامه (Volume, &c., presented to E. G. Browne), p. 169. Narshakhī's narrative (p. 75) at this point abounds in considerable errors, both historical and chronological. In Gardīzī (f. 101; Camb. MS., f. 81 a) only the appointment of Nūḥ is mentioned.

[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السامانی. The death dates of the other Sāmānids are also given there.

hereditary rulers, and Aḥmad b. Asad, who survived his brothers, was able to transmit the power to his sons. In 211 and 212 (826–7), if we may judge by Ibn Khurdādhbih's account of the taxation of Transoxania[1], Nūḥ b. Asad, the eldest of the brothers, was apparently still considered the ruler only of a part of Soghd
216 with the town of | Samarqand, of Farghāna, and of some "Turkish towns." After the death of Nūḥ (227/842) his brother Aḥmad, on whom the seniority devolved, remained in Farghāna, and sent his son Naṣr[2] to Samarqand.

We know very little of the internal history of Transoxania under the first Sāmānids. Gardīzī[3] mentions an earthquake in Farghāna in 224/839, and the author of the *Qandīya*[4] speaks of the slaughtering of some thousands of people in the district of Shāwdār in 245/859, without giving any particulars of the causes of the revolt. On the death of Yaḥyā in 855, Shāsh evidently reverted to Aḥmad also, as we subsequently find Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb b. Aḥmad[5] there in the capacity of ruler. After the death of Aḥmad (864), Naṣr, the new head of the family, remained ruler of Samarqand, and Aḥmad's other son Abu'l-Ash'ath[6] began to rule in Farghāna. Bukhārā came under Sāmānid rule only in the year 874[7], after which Naṣr b. Aḥmad received in 875 a diploma from the Caliph Mu'tamid granting him the administration of the whole of Transoxania[8].

To this period must be referred the final subjugation of Transoxania to Muslim rule, a task in the performance of which both the Ṭāhirids and the Sāmānids still enjoyed the support of the government at Baghdād. We have seen that during the early years of Mā'mūn's rule a general revolt against Ārab domination broke out in Transoxania. After the departure of Ma'mūn disorders broke out afresh and calm was only restored under Ghassān b. 'Abbād (819–21). Perhaps the famine which occurred in Khurāsān (as in fact throughout Persia) in 201/816–7 was partly caused by the cessation of the grain convoys from Transoxania, as was the case in the famine of 733 (see above, p. 190). After the death of Ṭāhir and the appointment of Ṭalḥa, Aḥmad b Abū Khālid was sent with an army to Transoxania. The chief object of the campaign was the subjugation of Ushrūsana,

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 27–8. In order to obtain the total of the taxes in Transoxania as given by him, those of the "province of Nūḥ" must be added to those of Soghd, Buttam, Kish, Nasaf, Usrūshana, Shāsh, the silver mines (in Ilāq) and Khojend. Above, however, Soghd is reckoned in the 'province of Nūḥ"; probably in the first case Soghd should be taken as meaning the possessions of the Ishshīdh (with the chief town Ishtīkhan), and in the second case the region of the town of Samarqand.

[2] Mirkhond, *Histoire des Samanides*, pp 2, 114.

[3] *Texts*, p. 3.

[4] *Texts*, p. 49; trans. by Vyatkin, *Handbook of Samarkand prov.*, viii, p. 242.

[5] Nerchakhy, p. 81.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[8] Ṭabarī, iii, 1889.

whose prince Kāwus (son of the king who had submitted to Faḍl b. Yaḥyā) consented to pay tribute to Ma'mūn, but after the Caliph's arrival in Baghdād broke the agreement. Shortly after this, dissensions broke out in Ushrūsana amongst the members of the royal family; Ḥaydar, the son of Kāwus, killed a famous noble, who was at the head of his brother Faḍl's party and had given the latter his daughter in marriage. After the murder Ḥaydar fled, first to the local representative of the Arab government, | and subsequently to Baghdād. On the other hand 217
in 205/820–1 Faḍl summoned the Toquz-Oghuz into the country. In 207/822 Aḥmad b. Abū Khālid entered Ushrūsana with an army, guided by Ḥaydar along a shorter road which was unknown to the Arabs, in consequence of which Kāwus was taken unawares and forced to surrender. Faḍl escaped with the Turks to the steppes, where he treacherously abandoned them and joined the Arabs; the Turks perished from thirst in the steppes. Kāwus went to Baghdād, embraced Islām, and was established as ruler of the province. He was succeeded by Ḥaydar[1], who subsequently became the first noble at the Caliph's court, and achieved great renown under the name of Afshīn (the title of the princes of Ushrūsana). Afshīn was executed in 841; but his dynasty continued to rule in Ushrūsana till 280/893 In the Hermitage in Petrograd there are coins of the last afshīn of Ushrūsana, Sayr b 'Abdallāh, struck in 279, and also one of the Sāmānid Ismā'īl struck in Ushrūsana in 280[2].

The appointment of Ahmad b. Abū Khālid, one of the chief authors of the rise of the Ṭāhirids, was undoubtedly very welcome to Ṭalha, who made liberal gifts both to the Arab leader himself and to his secretary. According to Mīrkhwānd's[3] account Aḥmad b. Abū Khālid proved himself also the protector of the Sāmānids and restored the power of Ahmad b. Asad in Farghāna, out of which he drove the "enemies of the Faith." The final subjugation of Farghāna, namely of Kāsān and Ūrast, is attributed by Balādhurī[4] to Nūḥ b. Asad, but he refers this event to the period of the Caliph Muntaṣir (861–2), when Nūḥ was long since dead. | Another exploit of Nūḥ's may be admitted as more credible, the subjugation, namely of Isfījāb, in 840[5]. Nūḥ ordered a wall to be built in Isfījāb "round the vineyards and cultivated fields of the inhabitants[6]," *i.e.* he put up a structure of this sort as a protection against the Turkish invasions, such as had formerly been built in Shāsh. The province of Isfījāb, however,

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 1044, 1065–66; Beladsori, pp. 430–31.
[2] A. Markov, *Inventarnyi katalog musul'manskikh monet Imp. Ermitazha*, St. P., 1896, pp. 112, 114.
[3] *Histoire des Samanides*, pp. 2, 114.
[4] Beladsori, p. 420. In one MS the Caliph is called Manṣūr.
[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السامانى. [6] Beladsori, p. 422.

218 was still | governed by a separate Turkish dynasty[1] in the tenth century and enjoyed important privileges, extending even to exemption from taxation[2]. As a token of his allegiance, the ruler of Isfījāb sent annually to the Sāmānid Government four dāniqs (less than fivepence) and a broom[3] in lieu of taxes.

The Caliph Ma'mūn[4] charged his governors with the prosecution of the war with the rebels, and at the same time ordered his envoys to invite important natives to take service under the Caliph. To these, on their arrival in Baghdād, he made liberal gifts. The same practice was followed to an even greater extent under Mu'taṣim, in whose reign the Turkish guards, amongst whom were incorporated also emigrants from Soghd, Farghāna, Ushrūsana, and Shāsh, formed one of the mainstays of the throne[5]. This circumstance contributed to the definitive assertion of Muslim rule in the country. 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir, probably with the help of the Sāmānids, sent his son Ṭāhir on a campaign into the Ghuzz country and conquered places where none had penetrated before him. By the time of Mu'taṣim the inhabitants of Transoxania may be considered good Muslims and themselves began to do battle "for the faith" with their Turkish neighbours. The fact that under the Ṭāhirids the Caliphs still took some part in the affairs of the country is probably to be explained by the presence of important natives of Transoxania at the court of Baghdād. The Caliph Mu'taṣim, albeit unwillingly, devoted two million dirhams towards the digging of a large irrigation canal in the Shāsh province: according to 'Awfī it still existed in the thirteenth century[6]. We have seen (above, pp. 95, 99) that down to the last years of the reign of Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir certain lands in Transoxania were considered the private property of the Caliph.

Owing to their aristocratic origin and position as the official representatives of Arab dominion, the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids could not embody and express the national and democratic tendencies, like Abū Muslim and other "Dā'ī", *i.e.* Shi'ite
219 teachers. The period of the rule of both | dynasties is most accurately characterized as one of enlightened absolutism. In their endeavour to establish stable government and to restore peace in the land, the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids appeared as the protectors of the lower against the oppression of the higher classes; they promoted education but undertook no drastic

[1] On some representatives of the dynasty see above, p. 176.
[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 333. [3] *Ibid.*, III, 340; IV, 343.
[4] On Ma'mūn and Mu'taṣim see Beladsori, p. 431.
[5] Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, p. 247. Mu'taṣim was surrounded by a Turkish guard even during the reign of Ma'mūn: in 214/829 he came to Egypt with 4,000 of his Turks (Kindī, p. 188).
[6] Ṭabarī, III, 1326; *Texts*, pp. 83–4.

social reforms and carried on a relentless struggle with the restless elements among the masses. These features appear already with sufficient distinctness in the reign of the first organizer of Khurāsān, 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir, who, as Ya'qūbī expresses it, ruled Khurāsān as none had ever ruled it before[1]. 'Abdallāh interested himself mainly in the cause of the agriculturists[2]. Amongst the inhabitants there were frequent quarrels regarding the use of water for artificial irrigations; as the Muslim lawbooks contained no instructions on this matter 'Abdallāh summoned the faqīhs of Khurāsān and instructed them to work out, in collaboration with some faqīhs from 'Irāq, the legal principles regarding the use of water. The "Book of Canals" (Kitāb al-Qunīy) composed by them served as a guide in similar matters even two centuries later, in the time of Gardīzī. In the order in which 'Abdallāh instructed his officials to protect the interests of the peasants[3], considerations of a moral character are brought forward on behalf of this class: "God feeds us by their hands, welcomes us through their mouths and forbids their ill treatment." His feeling for the lower classes led 'Abdallāh to the idea of general education, propounded by him in the most definite terms: "Knowledge must be accessible to the worthy and unworthy; knowledge will look after itself and not remain with the unworthy." And indeed at this period even the children of the poorest peasants went to the towns to be taught; such was the lot of the two Khaighūnī brothers, natives of the village of Kharghūn (see p. 125), who were sent to Samarqand by their father in 233/847-8; in the course of three years they mastered the sciences while their mother supported them by her work at wool weaving[4]. Living in the age of rationalist supremacy, it is doubtful if 'Abdallāh understood by "knowledge" only the islamic theology, | which at this time was firmly established in 220
Khurāsān and Transoxania, especially at Bukhārā[5]. 'Abdallāh himself, like his father, enjoyed some fame as a poet; his nephew Manṣūr b. Ṭalḥa, ruler of Merv, Āmul and Khorezmia, wrote philosophical treatises; 'Abdallāh called him the "Wisdom of the Ṭāhirids" and was extremely proud of him[6].

As regards the popular movements with which the Ṭāhirids had to deal, the chief amongst them were the Kharijite movement in Sijistān and the Shi'ite in Ṭabaristān, both of which continued under the Sāmānids. The influence of the discordant elements was manifested only under the grandson of 'Abdallāh,

[1] Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, II, 586.
[2] Further see *Texts*, p. 3.
[3] In the text مزركان is printed by mistake for مرزكران.
[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* المرغوني.
[5] Nerchakhy, p. 54.
[6] *Fihrist*, p. 117.

Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir; his father Ṭāhir b. 'Abdallāh (844–62) was the worthy successor of 'Abdallāh and the historians speak of his rule and of his personal character with the same esteem as those of his father[1]. On the other hand Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir succeeded his father while yet of tender years[2], and is represented by them as a weak ruler, given up to pleasures[3]. At that period the ruler of Ṭabaristān was Muḥammad's uncle, Sulaymān b. 'Abdallāh; in addition a section of country on the border, between the two Ad-Caspian provinces of Ṭabaristān and Daylam, the property of the Caliph, was granted to Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh, who from 851 to 867 was governor of Baghdād. As his representative in this country Muḥammad sent the Christian Jābir b. Hārūn, who seized also the "dead lands" adjoining Muhammad's section, *i.e.* the pastures used by the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages and not constituting private property. Such a violation of the rights of the population resulted in a general revolt at the head of which were the 'Alids[4]. In 864 the 'Alid Ḥasan b. Zayd made himself ruler of the province and governed it with slight interruptions to the year 884. Thus, in this case the Shi'ite movement was aroused by the violation of the interests of the peasants. The same democratic character
221 was probably borne by the rising which occurred | in 301/913–4 against the Sāmānids under Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Uṭrūsh, who was also considered a descendant of 'Alī. Ḥasan propagated Islām with success in Daylam[5]; he gained over the population to his side and maintained his popularity to the end of his life. Impartial historians[6] praise his just rule. Al-Bīrūnī[7], on the other hand, permeated by the ancient Persian traditions, charges Ḥasan with the destruction of the family organization established by the mythological Farīdūn. "Farīdūn commanded men to rule their houses, their families and descendants, and gave them the name of Katkhudā, which means 'Master of this house.' An-Nāzir al-Uṭrūsh abolished this custom and the period returned when robbers were as much katkhudās as the (real) people." It is evident from this that Ḥasan did away with the rights of owners of family estates.

In Khuārāsān and in Transoxania of course there could be no question of such drastic measures for the benefit of the lower classes; to those who were dissatisfied with their condition there remained one alternative, that of joining the "Warriors for the Faith," and setting out for some locality where war with the infidel and the heretic was being carried on. The guild of warriors for the

[1] *Texts*, p 3 (Gardīzī); *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 307.
[2] Ja'qubi, *Hist.*, ii, 605.
[3] Gardīzī, f. 104.
[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 1523–26.
[5] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 61.
[6] *Ibid.*, viii, 64; Ṭabarī, iii, 2292.
[7] *Chronologie*, ed. Sachau, p. 224. *Chronology*, translated by Sachau, p. 210.

Faith (alongside the terms *Ghāzī* and *Fatā* is often found that of *al-Muṭawwi'a*, correctly *al-Mutaṭawwi'a*) possessed, like all Eastern guilds, a corporate organization. The leaders of similar volunteer troops not infrequently attained considerable fame and enjoyed official recognition[1]; as they were not tied to their native country, the volunteers, especially those from Transoxania, offered their services wherever a holy war was in progress and wherever booty might be expected[2]. Rulers, of course, could not always avail themselves of these services without some danger to themselves. In all probability it is the volunteers[3] that are referred to in the characteristic tirade by Maqdisī[4] against the inhabitants of Binkath, as constituting at once "a support and a source of anxiety" to the | Sāmānid ad- 222
ministration. It is not without reason that Gardīzī[5] replaces the terms quoted above by the word 'ayyār ("scoundrel"). As is everywhere the case, the restless elements gathered special strength in the large towns. The population of Samarqand gave trouble even to the Sāmānids[6]: under Timūr the Samarqand ghāzīs heroically held the town, which was not fortified at that period, against foreign invasion, but were immediately afterwards subjected to persecution at the hands of the Government[7]. According to the observations of travellers Samarqand had still the same reputation under the present Bukharan dynasty[8].

In Khurāsān as early as the year 821 we see a revolt stirred up by one of the volunteers[9]. At the close of the same century there arose from the ranks of this guild the powerful Ṣaffārid dynasty, which put an end to the rule of the Ṭāhirids and attained supremacy in Persia. Not content with this, the Ṣaffārids sought to extend their power over Transoxania, which caused the ruin of their dynasty. The founder of the dynasty[10],

[1] Baihaki, ed. Morley, p. 23 (سالار غازیان)

[2] *Ibid*, p. 347.

[3] On the military forces in Shāsh and Farghāna see *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 291.

[4] *Ibid*, iii, 276.

[5] *Texts*, p 4 (referring to Ya'qūb b Layth), 13 (ادن علمدار), called in the Arabic text of 'Utbī, (As. Mus. MS, No. 510, f. 65: 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 341) رئیس الفتیان سمرقند in the Persian translation, Nerchakhy, p. 225, سپه سالار سمرقند.

[6] See above, p. 87.

[7] Petis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur Bec*, i, 91–6, *Ẓafar-namah*, i, 109–12. For a more detailed account of these events see my paper in *Zapiski, &c.*, xvii, pp. 01–014.

[8] J. Wolff, *Narrative of a mission to Bokhara*, fifth edition, Edinburgh & London, 1848, pp. 202–3.

[9] Ṭabarī, iii, 1044.

[10] On the origin of the dynasty see *Texts*, pp. 3–4; *Bibl. Geog Arab*, i, 245–47; Ibn Khallikān, No. 838 (trans. de Slane. iv, 301 sq.). A brilliantly-written sketch of the history of the Ṣaffārid dynasty is due to Prof. Noldeke (*Orientalische Skizzen*, Berlin, 1892, pp. 187–207; *Sketches from Eastern History*, trans. J. S. Black, pp. 176–206) Comp now also my paper, "Zur Geschichte der Saffariden" (*Orient. Studien = Festschrift Noldeke*, i, pp. 171–91).

Ya'qūb b. Layth b. Mu'addal, and his three brothers, 'Amr, Ṭāhir, and 'Alī, belonged to the town of Qarnīn in Sijistān, situated at a distance of one march from the capital of the province, Zaranj, on the left hand going towards Bust. Ya'qūb went to the town (probably Zaranj), where he hired himself out to a copper-smith, receiving fifteen dirhams a month for his work; his brother 'Amr was, by one account, a mule driver, by another, a carpenter. The brothers quickly distinguished themselves amongst their companions. By their generosity they gained adherents, and together with their uncle Kathīr b. Raqqāq
223 formed a robber gang, with whom they joined | a division of "Warriors for the Faith" under the leadership of Dirham b Naṣr b. Ṣālih[1], which was engaged with the Kharijites of Sijistān, though, as I have shown elsewhere[2], Ya'qūb had himself been a kharijite at the beginning of his career. In their skirmishes with the Kharijites near the town of Bust one of the brothers, Ṭāhir, was killed. The volunteers rapidly made themselves such unwelcome allies of the government that Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn[3], who governed Sijistān in the name of the Ṭāhirids, was obliged to give place to them and leave the province. After this Dirham made himself the actual ruler of Sijistān, and appointed Ya'qūb governor of Bust, but the latter by his exploits soon eclipsed his leader in the eyes of the army. Dirham found it prudent to acquiesce in the general opinion, and made Ya'qūb commander-in-chief and himself one of his lieutenants In one of the sources used by Ibn Khallikān the exact date of this event is quoted, Sunday 6th Muḥarram 247 (March 22nd, 861). Thus Ya'qūb, in spite of the testimony of Ya'qūbī[4], had already come to the fore in the reign of Ṭāhir b. 'Abdallāh.

Ya'qūb was concerned above all for the maintenance of his power in Sijistān; he killed the native prince, who bore the title of Rutbīl[5], and subjugated the Kharijites[6]. After this he

[1] Dirham b. Naṣr is mentioned in Ṭabarī (iii, 1892) as an individual in the service of Ya'qūb. In Gardīzī's text the words درهم بن have probably fallen out before نصر. The appearance of Dirham b. Ḥusayn in Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khallikān is probably to be explained by a confusion between this person and Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn Khwāndamīr (حبيب السير, ii, 127) calls Dirham the grandson of Rāfi' b Layth (see p. 200)

[2] *Fest. Nold.*, article quoted above. On Ya'qūb's relations with Sālih b. Naṣr (or b. an-Nadr) and Dirham (probably a brother of the latter) cf. *ibid.*, p. 178 sq.

[3] Called Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr b Rāfi' in Ibn Mu'īn (MS Pub. Lib., f. 399 a) according to the same author Ya'qūb's father Layth was in Ibrāhīm's service.

[4] Ja'qūbī, *Hist*, ii, 605.

[5] Or Zunbīl. The latter reading is maintained by Marquart (*Ērānshahr*, p. 248) as "the most probable," but, as it seems, without good reason. Cf. Noldeke in *ZDMG.*, lvi, 432.

[6] Evidently Ya'qūb did not so much destroy the heretics as lure them over to his party. In Niẓām al-Mulk (*Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 194, trad, p 283, where the translation is not entirely correct), at any rate, it is said of one rebel that "he was the comrade of Ya'qūb b. Layth, and among the Kharijites is designated as his

extended his | rule to the Kābul valley, then to Sind and 224
Makrān, and finally in 867[1] conquered Herāt and Būshang, the birthplace of the Ṭāhirids, which was governed at the time by Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir[2]. In 869 Ya'qūb seized Kirmān; the Caliph Mu'tazz (866–9) granted this province simultaneously to two persons, Ya'qūb and Alī b. Ḥusayn, the ruler of Fārs, in order to stir up war between them and thus rid himself of one of them[3]. The victor in the struggle proved to be Ya'qūb, who deprived his opponent not only of Kirmān, but also of Fārs. In 871 Ya'qūb received from the Caliph Mu'tamid (870-92), under whom affairs of state were directed by his brother Abū Aḥmad Muwaffaq, fresh favours, being appointed viceroy of Balkh and Ṭukhāristān[4]. According to Gardīzī[5], Ya'qūb had already seized these provinces in 870, and at the same time took possession of Ghazna, Gardīz, and Kābul. Finally, in 873 Ya'qūb decided to march against Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir himself, a pretext for war being afforded by the fact that Muḥammad had given shelter to one of Ya'qūb's enemies. Muḥammad was taken prisoner, and on August 1, 873[6] Ya'qūb entered the capital of the Ṭāhirids. Gardīzī gives an interesting account of the parleys between Muḥammad's ambassadors and Ya'qūb. Muḥammad ordered the following to be transmitted to his antagonist: "If thou hast come by order of the Commander of the Faithful, then show thy diploma, that I may deliver the Viceroyalty to thee; if not, then return."[7] Ya'qūb in answer took his sword from beneath his praying mat, and said: "Here is my diploma and my standard."[8]

This time the Baghdād government could not condone Ya'qūb's action; the influence of the Ṭāhirids in the capital compelled the

successor" Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī (*Journ. As*, 4, xi, 419-20; ed. Browne, p 375) accuses the Ṣaffārids, like the Būyids, of adherence to the Shi'ite teaching. Niẓām al-Mulk also evidently considered Ya'qūb a Shi'ite, as he puts into his mouth these words addressed to the Caliph: "I shall not be appeased until I have sent thy head to Mahdīya," *i. e.* to the Fāṭimids (*Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 14, trad., p. 20). These words can certainly not have been used, as at that time there existed neither Fāṭimid dynasty nor town of Mahdīya (on the foundation of the latter see Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 70), but for all that the statement already quoted makes it probable that Ya'qūb, like Abū Muslim, attracted to his party all the restless elements amongst the lower classes.

[1] According to Gardīzī (f. 105; Camb. MS, f 85 a), only in 871, after the conquest of Balkh. According to Ṭabarī (iii, 1500), Ya'qūb undertook the march to Herāt in 862. Cf. *Festschrift Noldeke*, p 189.

[2] Named in Gardīzī.

[3] Ṭabarī, iii, 1698.

[4] *Ibid.*, iii, 1841.

[5] *Texts*, p. 4.

[6] The date given in Gardīzī (f. 106, Camb. MS, f. 85 b) is 2nd Shawwāl 259; in Noldeke (*op. cit.*, S. 195, trans., p. 184) Sunday, Aug. 2, cf. also Ṭabarī, iii, 1881.

[7] F. 106; Camb. MS., *l. c.*: اکر بفرمان امیر المومنین آمدی عهد ومنشور عرضه کن تا ولایت دتو سپارم واکر نه باز کرد.

[8] F. 106; Camb. MS., *l. c.*: یعقوب شمشیر از زیر مصلی بیرون آورد وکفت عهد ولوای من اینست.

225 Caliph to take the side of Muḥammad. In 874 | the pilgrims from the eastern provinces were assembled in the house of the Ṭāhirid 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh, where the Caliph's edict against Ya'qūb was read to them[1]. The menacing activities of Ya'qūb soon obliged the government to make concessions; at his demand Muwaffaq summoned the merchants and read to them a new decree by which Ya'qūb was appointed viceroy of Khurāsān, Ṭabaristān, Jurjān, Rayy, and Fārs, and military commander of Baghdād[2]. But not even this could induce Ya'qūb to relinquish his march on Baghdād. His defeat near Dayr al-'Āqūl (April 8th, 876) saved the 'Abbāsid dynasty, but revived the disorders in Khurāsān. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir, liberated by the Caliph's army, was again appointed viceroy of the eastern provinces, but remained for the most part at Baghdād, while operations in the towns of Khurāsān were carried on in his name by his brother Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir, who had already in 874 reached Marwarrūd with an army of succour from the prince of Khorezmia and some other persons. Ya'qūb died on Tuesday, June 9th, 879[3], having succeeded in establishing his power only in Southern Persia.

Such was the reign of the "copper-smith" (ṣaffār—hence the name of the dynasty), whom one of his enemies, the ruler of Ṭabaristān, Ḥasan b. Zayd, called the "anvil," on account of his iron character. Without devising juridical sophistries for the justification of his deeds, Ya'qūb based his rights on the sword alone[4]: he was therefore obliged to aim solely at the creation of an army devoted to him and the acquisition of the financial means indispensable for carrying on his wars. The latter frequently forced him to have recourse to confiscation of the property of wealthy individuals. After his death, in spite of the military failures of his latter years, four million dīnārs and fifty million dirhams were found in his treasury. According to the
226 author of the "Ta'rīkhi Khayrāt,"[5] Ya'qūb had | 5,000 camels and 10,000 donkeys: his soldiers, with the exception of the nobles and leaders, received horses and their fodder from the treasury. In his private life Ya'qūb always remained a soldier of simple tastes, wearing cotton garments, sitting on the bare

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 1887. [2] *Ibid.*, iii, 1892.

[3] Thus according to Ibn Khallikān: in Noldeke (*op cit*, p. 204), Wednesday, June 5; but that day was a Friday.

[4] Besides the words already quoted from Gardīzī, see *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 14, trad., p. 20.

[5] MS Brit. Mus. Or. 4898, f. 133 a (cf. above, p. 56). I became acquainted with this and several other MSS., *e.g.* the "History of Bayhaq" (see p. 31, n. 6) only after the publication of my texts and 160 pages of my investigation. On the former and its author Mūsawī cf. now my article in the *Bulletin de l'Acad des Sciences*, 1915, pp. 1365 sqq. Mūsawī's information on Ya'qūb was taken from Mas'ūdī (*Prairies d'or*, viii, 46 sq., on the camels and donkeys, p. 55).

ground, and sleeping with his head on his shield. Only on ceremonial occasions, especially at the reception of ambassadors, was he surrounded by guards, chosen from among the finest soldiers, and divided into two sections of 1,000 men each: the soldiers of the first division held gold maces, those of the second silver ones. Ya'qūb decided all matters personally, and shared the work of administration with no one.

'Amr, the brother and successor of Ya'qūb (879–900), was already obliged to resort to other methods of warfare, to make large concessions, and to reckon more with circumstances. Proclaimed as his brother's successor by his soldiers, 'Amr hastened to express his submission to the Caliph, and was appointed Viceroy of Khurāsān, Fārs, Iṣpahān, Sijistān, Kirmān, and Sind[1], in consequence of which the priesthood and volunteers were able to accept him as the lawful ruler of these provinces against his opponents[2]. 'Amr went even further, and endeavoured to make peace with the Ṭāhirids. In his capacity as military governor of Baghdād he appointed 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir as his representative in that town, and sent him a gold sceptre[3] as a token of his appointment. Nevertheless it proved impossible to maintain peace with the Ṭāhirids, one of whom, Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir, seized Merv[4] in 877 (his predecessor here was "the brother of the Khwārazmshāh"). In April 885 Muhammad b. Ṭāhir was again declared viceroy of Khurāsān, and was represented by Rāfi' b Haithama, who had already conquered Nīshāpūr[5] in 882. The Caliph cursed 'Amr in the presence of the Khurāsān pilgrims, and ordered the imprecation to be repeated in the mosques[6]. In 889 'Amr was again in favour, and re-appointed 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh as his representative in Baghdād. The name of 'Amr | was inscribed on the 227
standards, spears, and shields; but at the beginning of 890 he was once more deposed, and the standards, spears, and shields with his name thrown away[7]. Only in 892, with the accession to the throne of the Caliph Mu'taḍid, was 'Amr finally acknowledged as the lawful ruler of Khurāsān. The standard dispatched from Baghdād was exhibited in the court of 'Amr's dwelling house at Nīshāpūr for three days as a visible proof of the favour of the Caliph[8].

'Amr's authority, like that of Ya'qūb, was in fact founded on the sword, and therefore for him also it was an object of the first importance to acquire the financial means indispensable for prosecuting his wars, but this aim was now achieved, in addition to what could be gained by pillage and confiscations, by a regular

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 1932
[2] *Texts*, p. 4 (Gardīzī).
[3] Ṭabarī, iii, 1936.
[4] *Ibid.*, iii, 1915.
[5] *Ibid*, iii, 2039.
[6] *Ibid.*, iii, 2106.
[7] *Ibid.*, iii, 2115–17.
[8] *Ibid*, iii, 2133.

system of administrative economy. The amount of 'Amr's revenues is unknown; we can only form some surmise from the information which has come down to us on the sums collected in taxes under the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids. According to Ṭabarī[1], in the year of the death of 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir the taxes from all provinces under his rule totalled forty-eight million dirhams. According to Ibn Khurdādhbih[2], the tribute which 'Abdallāh paid to the Caliph consisted of 44,846,000 dirhams, thirteen thoroughbred horses, 2,000 sheep, 2,000 Ghuzz slaves, valued at 600,000 dirhams, 1,187 pieces of stuff, and 1,300 pieces of iron. This information relates to the years 211 and 212 (826 and 827); in the year 221/836, if Qudāma is to be trusted[3], 'Abdallāh bound himself to pay in all thirty-eight millions, in which sum was included the value of the slaves to be sent, of the sheep, and pieces of cotton stuffs Evidently all the remainder of the revenues was now enjoyed by the Ṭāhirids. Ya'qūbī[4] puts the tribute of Khurāsān at forty millions in addition to the fifth part of the booty (from the "wars for the Faith"), the whole of which was enjoyed by the Ṭāhirids. Besides this the Ṭāhirids received thirteen millions from 'Irāq, independently of gifts. As regards
228 the taxes in Khurāsān, Ibn Ḥawqal[5] and Maqdisī[6] | give us approximately the same figures for the Sāmānid period. The revenues of 'Amr, whose dominions did not include Transoxania, were probably considerably less, but, in contrast to the Ṭāhirid period, they were entirely at his disposal. There is no information as to whether he sent any money to Baghdād beyond occasional presents. According to Ibn Mu'īn[7], 'Amr was the first of the Muslim kings to order the inclusion of his name in the Khuṭba, which till then had been read only in the name of the Caliph. Even if this statement be incorrect[8], in any case 'Amr was to an even greater degree than the Ṭāhirids an independent ruler. According to Ibn Khallikān, it was long since Khurāsān had seen such a wise and skilful ruler as 'Amr. As regards his financial policy, Gardīzī[9] gives the following account, which is probably taken from Sallāmī. 'Amr had three treasuries; the

[1] Ṭabarī, III, 1338–39. Cf also Mas'ūdī's account (*Prairies d'or*, VIII, 125 sq) of the presents sent by 'Amr to the Caliph in 283/896. Amongst these was a copper idol captured by 'Amr from the mountaineers on the Indian frontier

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, VI, 28. [3] *Ibid.*, VI, 185

[4] *Ibid*, VII, 308. [5] *Ibid*, II, 341. [6] *Ibid*, III, 340

[7] MS. Pub Lib., f. 400 a. پیش از ان در خطبه جز خلیفه را دعا نمی کردند ونیاد نام پادشاه در خطبه او نهاد.

[8] Compare the account of Narshakhī (p. 77) of the Khuṭba in honour of Ya'qūb, and later in honour of Naṣr b Aḥmad at Bukhārā. But these accounts may be not quite trustworthy. 'Amr seems to have been the first of the rulers of the Eastern provinces who put his name and the name of his father on silver coins. The connexion between the sikka (coinage) and Khuṭba in Muhammadan states is well known

[9] *Texts*, p. 4.

first included the revenues from the land and other taxes, which were utilized for the upkeep of the army; the second, revenues from the personal property of the ruler, which went towards the upkeep of the court; the third, the revenues from occasional taxes[1] and confiscations of the property of soldiers who took service with the enemy; from these moneys rewards were made to faithful servants, nobles, and envoys. In the matter of confiscations, 'Amr, according to Gardīzī, carried them out "at an appropriate time," and always under a plausible pretext[2].

The army was the object of his special care and received its pay every three months with solemn ceremonial. Ibn Khallikān and Gardīzī[3] have preserved for us an account of such | a parade, 229
borrowed from Sallāmī. The distribution of pay to the Army was administered by a special official, the 'Āriḍ. He took his seat in the place appointed for the ceremony, and on hearing the sound of two large drums the whole army assembled there. In front of the 'Āriḍ lay sacks with money; the 'Āriḍ's assistant had before him a list of the soldiers and read over the names. The first called was 'Amr himself; the 'Āriḍ made a close inspection of his horse and equipment, then expressed his approval and gave him 300 dirhams. 'Amr placed the money in the leg of his boot and said—"God be praised, that He hath permitted me to serve faithfully the Commander of the Faithful, and hath made me worthy of his favours." After this 'Amr took his seat on an eminence and watched the horsemen and infantry in turns present themselves before the 'Āriḍ, undergo the same close scrutiny, and receive their money. Ibn Khallikān rightly points out the resemblance between this custom of 'Amr's and the picture of the review of the armies in Sāsānid Persia, under Khusrū Anūshīrvān[4]. It is doubtful whether this resemblance was accidental.

Of the system of civil administration under 'Amr we know nothing; Gardīzī says only that he had spies everywhere, and that he was aware of everything that went on in his territories[5]. According to the author of the "Ta'rīkhi Khayrāt[6]," 'Amr

[1] The meaning of the term احداث, which von Kremer could not explain (*Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, I, 200), is evident from the text. It is possible also that this word may mean the revenues from newly cultivated fields Cf. the term المستحدثة (*Zapiski*, IV, 135). The same term was also used in quite a different meaning ("young men," as a particular military division, perhaps in the same sense as ghāzıyān or muṭawwi'a, cf. above).

[2] Immediately after this Gardīzī tells how 'Amr accused one of his chief champions Muhammad b. Bā-hār of all sorts of crimes, but immediately withdrew his accusations when Muhammad, grasping his sovereign's purpose, agreed to surrender his property to the Treasury.

[3] *Texts*, pp. 4–5.

[4] Tabarī, I, 963–5; Abū Ḥanīfa ad-Dīnawarī, ed Guirgass, pp. 74–5.

[5] *Texts*, p. 5.

[6] f. 136 b.

bought young slaves, trained them in his own service and then gave them to his nobles; these slaves reported to him all the actions of their masters. Nor were they deterred by fear of the latter, as in 'Amr's reign not one noble dared beat a slave without the permission of the sovereign.

Not content with his position as ruler of Persia, 'Amr considered that the rights of the Ṭāhirids in Transoxania should pass to him as well. This pretension was the cause of his ruin. At that period the power of the Sāmānid dynasty was solidly established in Transoxania: at that period too the man who stood at the head of the province was no whit behind 'Amr in ability, and had been able to establish the same political structure in his dominions, on a firmer juridical basis moreover than had been achieved by the former "muleteer." |

230 Isma'īl b. Aḥmad was born in Farghāna in 849; he had begun his career at Bukhārā where he was sent in 874 by his brother Naṣr. After the fall of the Ṭāhirids[1] Bukhārā suffered the same fate as the other towns of Khurāsān and had no firmly established administration. At the beginning of 874 Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir aṭ-Ṭā'ī, who is probably identical with the well-known member of the Ṭāhirid dynasty, arrived in the town from Khorezmia. The inhabitants showed some resistance but after a five days' battle he seized the town: his Khorezmians committed all kinds of excesses in Bukhārā and a considerable portion of the town was burnt. Ḥusayn promised the inhabitants a full amnesty, but later, when they took him at his word and dispersed, he broke his promise and a fresh revolt broke out. Ḥusayn was shut up in his castle and had to flee by night, unable to take with him even the money collected from the inhabitants. This money was distributed amongst those who had taken part in the rising and many Bukharan families owed their wealth to this night's work. After the departure of Ḥusayn the riots were renewed; the adherents of peace and order assembled round the faqīh Abū 'Abdallāh, son of the famous Abū Ḥafṣ, and on his advice appealed for help to Naṣr b. Aḥmad, who sent them his brother Isma'īl. Isma'īl advanced to Karmīnīya, where he was met by Abū 'Abdallāh himself, which, according to the historian, greatly reassured him on the score of the future; "He understood that whatever Abū 'Abdallāh did the inhabitants of the town were not in a position to undo." Probably through the mediation of Abū 'Abdallāh, Isma'īl made peace with the Amīr Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Khawārijī who had seized Bukhārā about this time: judging from his surname, he was one of the Khārijite leaders, possibly one of Ya'qūb's adherents. It was agreed that Isma'īl should be Amīr of Bukhārā with Ḥusayn as his assistant,

[1] The following details are from Narshakhī (pp. 76 sqq.).

and the whole army swore agreement to this. On the first Friday in the month of Ramaḍān (June 25, 874) the Khuṭba was read at Bukhārā in the name of Naṣr b. Aḥmad, instead of Ya'qūb b. Layth. A few days later[1] Isma'īl made his entry into Bukhārā and immediately broke his word, ordered Ḥusayn to be imprisoned, and made himself sole ruler of the town. |

Isma'īl's position was, nevertheless, very difficult: he had to 231
struggle against the distrust of his brother Naṣr, and the intrigues of Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir, as well as against robber bands, formed by ruined peasants, and against the unsubdued Bukharan nobles. Isma'īl proved able to surmount all these difficulties. In his struggle with the robbers, who, to the number of some 4,000 men, were pillaging the district between Barkad and Ramitan, Isma'īl had the co-operation of the landowners and aristocracy, whose own interests, of course, demanded above all the restoration of order. When this object had been attained, Isma'īl removed the most influential members of the local aristocracy, headed by the Bukhār-Khudāt Abū Muhammad and the rich merchant Abū Ḥātim Yasārī, who were dispatched to Samarqand as envoys, Isma'īl meanwhile secretly requesting Naṣr to imprison them. Having taken advantage of their absence to consolidate his power, he begged his brother to release them, and on their return to Bukhārā loaded them with favours and endeavoured to fulfil all their desires. Evidently his idea was thus to consolidate his power and at the same time to stir up the aristocrats, not against himself but against Naṣr. In the subsequent conflict between the brothers, however, the | population was not always on the side of Isma'īl. In the commercial town of Paykand, Naṣr was given a brilliant reception; and in other districts the inhabitants refused to supply provisions to the army of Isma'īl, who in their eyes was a rebel against the lawful government. The conflict ended in the autumn of 888[2] with the capture of Naṣr. Here again Isma'īl maintained his habitual wise moderation; there was an interview between the brothers, in which Isma'īl spoke, not as a conquerer to his prisoner, but as a subject to his sovereign. This magnanimity must have touched Naṣr and certainly contributed towards the fame of Isma'īl himself. Naṣr returned to Samarqand and remained the nominal head of the dynasty until his death, which occurred on Aug. 21, 892[3]. | He had previously appointed Isma'īl as his 232

[1] According to Narshakhī (p. 78) on Monday, 12 Ramaḍān; but this day was a Thursday.

[2] According to Narshakhī (p. 83) the engagement was on Tuesday, 15 Jumādā II, 275, but this day was a Friday.

[3] According to Narshakhī (p. 84) Jumādā I, to Sam'ānī (*s. v.* السامانی) Jumādā II (the day of the month in both sources is the same); as the day, according to Sam'ānī, was a Monday, the first date is probably the more trustworthy.

successor, and the latter was acknowledged throughout the land. In the spring of 893 he received his investiture from the Caliph. In the same year Isma'īl carried out a successful expedition to Talas and converted the chief church of the town into a mosque[1]. In this year also the native dynasty in Ushrūsana was deposed and this province united to the immediate dependencies of the Sāmānids[2].

In the following years 'Amr consolidated his rule in Persia; the Caliph was compelled to carry out all his wishes, and in Feb 898, at his request, he summoned to his palace the Khurāsān pilgrims in order to read to them the decree deposing Isma'īl and appointing 'Amr as Viceroy of Transoxania[3]. Immediately after this an envoy was sent to 'Amr at Nīshāpūr with gifts and the diploma for Transoxania. It was not without irony that 'Amr accepted the gifts extorted from the Commander of the Faithful. The envoy laid before him the robes sent by the Caliph; 'Amr put them on one after the other, accompanying the donning of each robe by an expression of gratitude. Finally the envoy placed before him the diploma of investiture. 'Amr said "What am I to do with this? The province cannot be wrested from the hands of Isma'īl except with the aid of a hundred thousand naked swords." The envoy made answer: "Thou didst desire it, thou wilt know best (what to do)." 'Amr took the decree, kissed it, touched his forehead with it and then placed it before him. After this the envoy retired and 'Amr ordered 7,000 dirhams to be given to him and his companions[4].

The progress of the war between Isma'īl and 'Amr is differently described. According to Ṭabarī[5], Isma'īl at first begged 'Amr to desist from his project and to leave him ruler of Transoxania, but 'Amr decisively refused all his proposals; only later when, in the neighbourhood of Balkh, the army of Isma'īl surrounded that of 'Amr were the roles reversed and 'Amr's proposals for peace were rejected by Isma'īl. According to Narshakhī, 'Amr, on receiving the decree from the Caliph, demanded the submis-
233 sion of Aḥmad b. Farīghūn, ruler of Gūzgān, | of Abū Dāwud, ruler of Balkh[6], and of Isma'īl; the latter, infuriated because 'Amr had placed him on an equality with such insignificant

[1] Compare my *Otchet o poyezdkye v Srednyuyu Aziyu*, p 15 (from Narshakhī and Ṭabarī), cf. also Mas'ūdī, *Prairies d'or*, VIII, 144 sq, where it is said that the name of the king was طنكس (other readings, p. 420), that the number of prisoners taken with his wife, the Khātūn, was 15,000, and the number of the killed 10,000 According to the opinion of Mas'ūdī, these Turks belonged to the tribe of the Qarluqs (Arab. Kharlukh).

[2] See above, p. 211.

[3] Ṭabarī, III, 2183.

[4] Ibn Khallikān; see also *Texts*, p. 5.

[5] Tabarī, III, 2194.

[6] Coins with the name of the ruler have been preserved; his full name was Abū Dāwud Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. Cf. *Inventarn. katalog musul'm. monet Imp. Erm.*, p. 171.

potentates, declared war, and 'Amr after this vainly made proposals for peace, agreeing to leave Transoxania to him. However that may have been, Isma'īl succeeded in forestalling his enemy and military operations both in 899 and in 900 took place not in Transoxania but in the localities to the South of the Amu-Darya. In the autumn of 899[1] 'Amr's chief commander, Muḥammad b. Bashar[2], was defeated and killed; the prisoners were all liberated without ransom by Isma'īl, who on this occasion also endeavoured to overcome his enemies by magnanimity. 'Amr in consequence of his cupidity did not enjoy the goodwill of the nobles and soldiers: a number of them transferred their allegiance even before the decisive battle, and some went over to Isma'īl's camp during the battle itself, which was fought near Balkh in the spring of 900[3]. 'Amr was taken prisoner and after some time sent to Baghdād. The news of his defeat was received there with great joy: in spite of the fact that Isma'īl's action was in direct opposition to the solemnly expressed will of the Caliph, the latter now hastened to convey his full approval to the victor[4]. It is quite possible that the Baghdād Government, when carrying out the desire of 'Amr, at the same time encouraged Isma'īl by secret messengers to oppose him[5]. To the end of his life Isma'īl remained the Caliph's faithful subject and gradually subjugated to his own rule all the Northern provinces of Persia[6]. His successors were obliged to evacuate the Caspian provinces and the Western part of Persia | in favour of the Shi'ite dynasties of the 'Alids, 234
Ziyārids, and Būyids[7], who were apparently supported by the masses to a greater extent than were the Sāmānids, and who endeavoured to satisfy Persian national aspirations[8].

The sympathy of the historians from whom we derive our information on the struggle between the Sāmānids and the Ṣaffārids is unquestionably on the side of the first. The Sāmānids by their origin, in contrast to the military despots who rose from

[1] The battle according to Ibn Khallikān occurred on Monday, 17th Shawwāl, 286, but this day was a Friday. In Noldeke (*op. cit.*, p. 213), Monday, 29 Oct., 898, which is probably a mistake for 899.

[2] In Narshakhī (p. 86) Muhammad b. Layth.

[3] The battle took place according to Sallāmī on a Tuesday in the middle of Rabī' I, 287, *i. e.* the 18th of March; according to another source, Ibn Khallikān, on Wednesday, 17 Rabī' II, but this day (April 21) was a Monday; according to 'Utbī (Manīnī I, 343) a Tuesday in the middle of Rabī' II, 287, which began on Saturday, April 5, 900. Narshakhī (p. 88) gives an impossible date (Wednesday, 10th Jumādā I, 288). According to Ṭabarī (III, 2194) news of the battle was received at Baghdād on Wednesday, 25th Jumādā I, 287, *i. e.* May 28, 900.

[4] Ṭabarī, III, 2195. [5] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p 14, trad., p 22.

[6] Cf my article, "Isma'īl b. Ahmad" in *Encycl of Islām*.

[7] Cf. Lane-Poole, *Mohammadan Dynasties*, pp. 127, 136–43.

[8] The founder of the Ziyārid dynasty, Mardāwīj, dreamed of the restoration of the throne of the Sāsānids (Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 226, from Ibn Miskawayh, cf. Gibb Mem. Series, VII, 5, p. 489); on the Būyid coins we not infrequently find the ancient Persian title of Shāhānshāh, *i. e* Shāh of Shāhs.

the ranks of the people, were the natural continuators of the work begun by the Ṭāhirids, and the natural protectors of law and order, in the maintenance of which the higher classes of society were chiefly interested. From the expressions of Ṭabarī[1] it is evident that "the wealthy and the dihqāns," whatever may have been their relations with Ismaʿīl, proved faithful adherents to him in his struggle with ʿAmr. The complex state organization introduced or restored by Ismaʿīl was in any case better adapted to the interests of the aristocracy than general equality under the power of the military despot, as under the Ṣaffārids. The lack of detailed information on the structure of the state under the Ṭāhirids does not allow us to decide how far the creation of this organization was really the work of Ismaʿīl and the other organizer of the Sāmānid state, the wazīr Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Jayhānī[2]. In any case it is only for the Sāmānid period that we possess accurate information, thanks to which we are able to form a sufficiently clear idea of the organization of government in Khurāsān and Transoxania and of the economic life of the population.

At the head of the state stood, of course, the autocratic ruler answerable only to God[3]. If in the eyes of the Baghdād Govern-
235 ment the Sāmānids were only amīrs (governors) | "clients (*mawālī*) of the Commander of the Faithful," or even only ʿāmils[4] (tax collectors), within their own territories they were undoubtedly independent rulers. In the conflicts for the throne, both sides sometimes appealed to the Caliph for investiture[5]; there were instances when the Caliph, himself dependent on the Būyids, who were hostile to the Sāmānids, invested some rebel[6]; but there is no proof whatever that the diploma sent by the Caliph augmented in any degree the number of the pretender's adherents, or in general played any part at all in the dispute, which was decided by force of arms. Later on, when the disposal of the throne of Baghdād fell into the hands of the Būyids, there were occasions when the Caliph nominated by them was not acknowledged in Khurāsān[7], but the authority of the Sāmānid government was in no way shaken thereby. The Persian historians sometimes call the Sāmānids "Commanders of the Faithful"[8] *i.e.* they give them the same title as the Caliphs. According to the Persian ideal the autocrat must above all be a good "landlord"[9] (katkhudā) of his kingdom and care for its outward welfare; for the cutting of canals and underground conduits, the construction of

[1] Ṭabarī, iii, 2194.
[2] *Texts*, p. 6 (Gardīzī).
[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 9, trad., p. 11.
[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 2279.
[5] *Ibid.*, iii, 2290.
[6] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 380–81.
[7] *Trudy Vostochnavo Otdyela Arkh. Obshch.*, i, 188 sqq., 234; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 381; ix, 103.
[8] *Texts*, p. 90 (ʿAwfī).
[9] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 110, trad., p. 163.

bridges over large rivers, the welfare of the villages and encouragement of agriculture, the erection of fortresses and the founding of new towns, the beautifying of the cities by high and noble edifices, the building of rabāṭs on the high roads, and so forth[1]. In the main, of course, the role of the monarch was concerned with the choice of the men to whom the separate branches of the administration might be entrusted. Throughout the whole system of the Eastern Muslim political organization there runs like a red thread the division of all the organs of administration into two main categories, the dargāh (palace) and dīwān (chancery). Prior to the Sāmānid period we have no information regarding the existence in the Eastern Muslim states, as at the 'Abbāsid court, of a personal guard of the sovereign composed of slaves purchased for the purpose and mainly | Turkish. We find a guard of this sort already established at 236
the court of Isma'īl and his successors, although the "men of the dargāh" at this period did not attain to such importance as in later times. The chief military duties were entrusted not only to captains of the guard but also to members of local distinguished families. Dihqāns[2] as well as Turks entered the army, while in general at this time the majority of the inhabitants of Transoxania still bore arms[3].

Nizām al-Mulk[4] describes the career of a Turkish slave at the Sāmānid court as follows. During the first year the slave (ghulām) served on foot in the capacity of a groom, and not even in secret, under pain of punishment, did he dare mount a horse; at this period he wore garments of Zandānī cloth (which derived its name from the Bukharan village of Zandān, see p. 113). After a year the ḥājib, in agreement with the commander of the tent (withāq), gave him a Turkish horse with plain harness. In the third year he received a special belt (qarāchūr); in the fifth a better saddle, a snaffle ornamented with stars, richer clothing, and a club; in the sixth year parade dress; in the seventh, the rank of Withāq-bāshī, *i. e.* commander of the tent, which he shared with three other men. The insignia of office of the withāqbāshī were a black felt hat embroidered in silver and Ganjī clothing (Ganja is the present Elizabetpol). He gradually rose to the following grades, Khaylbāshī (section commander) and Ḥājib. At the head of the whole court establishment was the chief ḥājib (Ḥājib-i-buzurg) or "Ḥājib of ḥājibs" (Ḥājib al-ḥujjāb), one of the first dignitaries in the kingdom.

The second office of importance at the dargāh was that of

[1] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 6, trad., pp. 6–7. [2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 292; II, 343.
[3] *Zapiski, &c.*, II, 275 (from Hilāl aṣ-Ṣābi': cf. now *Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, III, 374; trans, VI, 400).
[4] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 95, trad., pp. 139–40.

"Captain of the Watch"[1] (ṣāḥib-ḥaras or amīr-ḥaras). The office of the ṣāḥib-ḥaras, like other court offices, was established by Mu'āwiya, the first of the Muslim rulers to surround himself with imperial pomp[2]. The original office of the ṣāḥib-ḥaras had
237 undoubtedly much in common with that of the | "Captain of the guard" (ṣāḥib-ash-shuraṭ)[3], who was at the same time the military commander of the town. In his account of one Umayyad governor, Ṭabarī[4] uses the words ḥaras and shuraṭ in the same sense; but at the Caliph's court these two functions were discharged by different persons[5]. Evidently the office of "Captain of the Guard" was ranked higher in importance: in Baghdād, as we have seen, it was held by the most prominent members of the Ṭāhirid and Ṣaffārid dynasties; in Samarqand Isma'īl himself, nominally at least, held this office at the court of his brother Naṣr[6]. The ṣāḥib-ḥaras, under the 'Abbāsids at any rate, was first and foremost the official responsible for carrying out the judgements of the Caliph. Nizām-al-Mulk[7] puts the following words into the mouth of the Caliph Ma'mūn: "I have two captains of the watch; the business of both, from morning till night, is to cut off heads, hands, and feet, to beat with rods and to throw into prison." The external attributes of this office corresponded to its designation; under the Umayyads the ṣāḥib-shuraṭ bore a spear before the governor[8]. Nizām-al-Mulk requires 50 lictors (chūbdār) to be constantly at the palace at the disposal of the ṣāḥib-ḥaras; 20 with gold sticks, 20 with silver, and 10 with large ones of wood.

Besides these important offices, there was a whole series of smaller ones[9] (door-keepers, table-dressers, cup-bearers, &c.). The chief military offices in the kingdom, especially the governorships, were filled sometimes by members of ruling families (Qarā-tagīn of Isfījāb and his son Manṣūr[10], Abū 'Alī of Ṣaghāniyān), sometimes by Turkish slaves as a reward for meritorious service (Sīmjūrids, Alptagīn, Tāsh, Fāiq); the latter could not obtain such an appointment until after the age of 35[11]. For a "ḥājib of ḥājibs" it was considered degrading to revert to the
238 office | of simple governor[12]. The chief military command in

[1] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 121, trad., p. 178.
[2] Ṭabarī, II, 205; Ja'qubī, *Hist.*, II, 276.
[3] The word *shurat*, sing. *shurta*, is the Greek χόρτις (verbally from I. Krachkowsky).
[4] Ṭabarī, II, 1028–29. [5] *Ibid.*, II, 205; III, 1549–50.
[6] Nerchakhy, p. 78. Under the later Sāmānids, however, we see the ṣāḥib-shuraṭ in the role of executor of the ruler's judgements (*Journ. Asiat.*, 5, III, 303; يتيمة الدهر, iv. 45).
[7] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 122, trad., p. 179. [8] Ṭabarī, II, 862.
[9] Some of them are enumerated in *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 111, 114; trad., pp. 164, 167.
[10] See above, p 176. [11] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 95, trad., p. 140.
[12] *Texts*, p. 11 (Gardīzī).

the State was that of the Governor of Khurāsān, who bore the title of sipah-sālār[1] (commander of the army) and administered from Nīshāpūr all the territories of the Sāmānids to the south of the Amu-Darya. In the Sāmānid period, as subsequently under the Mongols[2], it was considered the proper thing for the ruler to consult the military commanders[3] on the appointment of the chief civil dignitary—the wazīr.

The domestic affairs of the court were managed by the wakīl[4]. The importance of this office under the Sāmānids is evident from the fact that its holder is mentioned by Gardīzī along with the amīr and the wazīr[5].

The bureaucratic system was equally fully developed in the time of the Sāmānids. We find in Narshakhī[6] mention of ten government offices at Bukhārā, situated in the vicinity of the Rīgistān: (1) Dīwān of the Wazīr; (2) Dīwān of the Treasurer (Mustawfī); (3) Dīwān of the "Mainstay of the State" ('amīd al-mulk); (4) Dīwān of the Captain of the guard (ṣāḥib-shuraṭ); (5) Dīwān of the Postmaster[7] (ṣāḥib-barīd); (6) Dīwān of the Mushrifs; (7) Dīwān of the private domains (of the ruler); (8) Dīwān of the Muḥtasib; (9) Dīwān of the Awqāf; (10) Dīwān of the Qāḍī.

The Wazīr or "chief Khwājah"[8] (Khwājah-i buzurg) stood at the head of all the "gentlemen of the pen," *i.e.* of the whole bureaucratic system; his insignia of office even under the Saljūqs was an inkstand[9]. Nizām al-Mulk considered it desirable that the office of wazīr, like the royal dignity, should be hereditary from father to son[10]. Already in the Sāmānid period we find something similar to such dynasties of wazīrs (Jayhānī, Bal'amī, 'Utbī), although there is scarcely | an example (at least under 239
the Sāmānids) of the son being the direct successor of the father in this office: after the fall of a wazīr the power usually came into the hands of his opponents and only returned to his descendants many years later.

The term *mustawfī* (Treasurer) is probably identical with the

[1] In the Arabic trans., ṣāḥib al-jaysh (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 337).
[2] D'Ohsson, iv, 666.
[3] *Texts*, p. 91 ('Awfī).
[4] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 81–2, trad., 121.
[5] Gardīzī, MS. Bodleian Lib., f. 127; Camb. MS., f. 102 a: نامهای بخارا سوی سرهنگان البتکین رسد از امیر واز وزیر واز وکیل.
[6] Nerchakhy, p. 24.
[7] Cf Muhammad Narshakhī, *History of Bukhārā*, Russian trans. by N. Lykoshin, p 36 (the Persian text in Schefer's ed. is corrupt).
[8] The Persian term خواجهٔ بزرك is even employed in the Arabic treatise of Bundārī (Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 55). On the word خواجه and its Khurāsānī origin cf. Mas'ūdī, ix, 24: the explanation given by Mas'ūdī shows that the word was as yet in his time little known in the West.
[9] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 138.
[10] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 151, trad., p. 223.

terms Khāzin[1] and Khazīnah-dār[2]. Under the treasurer, apparently, were the "accountants"[3] (Ḥāsib, plural Ḥussāb). The Government office of which this official was the head probably corresponds to the "Dīwān al-Kharāj" of the 'Abbāsids[4]. The system of dividing the finances of the state between three treasuries, which existed under 'Amr, was not carried over into the Sāmānid Kingdom[5]. Nizām al-Mulk[6] sees the highest ideal in two treasuries, one of which should contain the funds for ordinary expenses and the other should be considered as the inviolable funds, only to be used in case of extreme necessity and even then only as a loan.

The dīwān of the "Mainstay of the State" is probably identical with the "dīwān of official documents" (dīwān ar-rasā'il or dīwān-i inshā); the latter is mentioned very frequently by the historians, in some cases already in the Sāmānid[7] period. In Bayhaqī[8] the head of the "dīwān of documents" bears the title of "Khwājah-i 'amīd" and was one of the highest officials in the state.

We have already spoken of the office of the "Captain of the Guard": his dīwān probably corresponded to the "dīwān of the Turkish army" of the 'Abbāsids[9]. Amongst the civil officials at the head of this department was in all probability the 'āriḍ, who in this case was subordinate to the ṣāḥib-shurṭ: to him fell the duty of issuing pay to the army and of seeing that it was
240 maintained in good condition[10]. | Under the Sāmānids, as under 'Amr, the issue of pay to the army and the officials was made on four dates[11] (every three months).

As is well known, postal services in the East existed only for the purposes of government[12]; the duty of the postal officials

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الخازن.

[2] *Texts*, p. 10.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الحاسب.

[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 1550.

[5] Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 300, 340) only gives the name of "the treasuries" of Nīshāpūr to the three richest cities in its neighbourhood, namely, Ṭūs, Nasā, and Abīward; cf. also *ibid.*, iv, 225.

[6] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 205, trad., p. 300.

[7] *Journ. Asiat.*, 5, i, 213–16; 5, iii, 319, 321, 327 (text of Tha'ālibī in يتيمة الدهر, iv, 29–32, 69, 70, 75); Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الميكالى.

[8] Baihaki, pp. 163, 167.

[9] Ṭabarī, iii, 1550.

[10] *Texts*, p. 5 (Gardīzī); Sam'ānī, *s. v.* العارض; cf. above, p. 221.

[11] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii, 341–2. The total sum distributed to the army was 20 million dirhams; for this reason perhaps these issues were called بيستكانى (see Vuller's dictionary) in Arabic العشرينيّة, Mafātīh al-'olūm, p. 65.

[12] Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte*, i, 192 sq. For the word "barīd" the Mafātīh al-'olūm (p. 63) gives a Persian etymology, but it is more probably the Latin *veredus* (cf. *Encycl. of Islam*, *s. v.* Barīd). The bearer of the dispatches was called al-furāniq (Pers. *parwānah*, servant), the box with the dispatches and their inventory Askudār (Pers. *az kū dārī*, Whence have you?); *Mafātīh*, p. 64 The term Askudār occurs very often in Baihaki, *e. g.* pp 392 and 394. Secret dispatches were written in cipher (معما, *ibid.*).

(alongside the term ṣāḥib-barīd occur also those of ṣāḥib-khabar and munhī) was to see to the rapid transmission of important information from the capital to the provinces and to report all the actions of the local authorities. In principle, the postal officials constituted a special department and were independent of the provincial governors. In the Sāmānid period the authority of the central Government was still so strong that it was possible to send to the capital veracious and independently written reports, even of the actions of the most powerful of the provincial authorities, the Governor of Khurāsān[1]: but already in the Ghaznevid period officials sometimes had to dispatch by post reports drawn up according to the wishes of the governor, and for the transmission of veracious accounts of the actions of the latter were compelled to employ disguised couriers[2].

The term "ishrāf" literally means "observation from an eminence." The duty of the Mushrif (observer), according to Nizām al-Mulk[3], was "to be aware of all that went on in the dargāh and report on it when he deemed necessary;" he should have his representative in each town and locality. From the fact that in Bayhaqī[4] mushrifs are mentioned together with treasurers, and draw up a report of the court property, it may be inferred that their control had mainly to do with the sums allotted for the maintenance of the Court.

The dīwān of the private domains of the ruler bore under the 'Abbāsids the title of "dīwān of domains"[5] (dīwān aḍ-ḍiyā'). Under the Sāmānids it is very probable that it was under the charge of the wakīl.

The duty of the Muḥtasib consisted in the maintenance of order in the streets and bazaars, and in the calling to account of those | who openly[6] violated the sacred law, who attempted 241
to cheat customers or failed to pay the established taxes[7]. According to Nizām al-Mulk[8] the kings "always entrusted this office to someone about the court, either a eunuch or some old Turk, who evinced partiality towards none, and who was feared by high and low." In the Sāmānid period, however, we find even men of learning[9] occupying this post; probably the jurisdiction of the muḥtasib over wrongdoers was not at that time so drastic in character.

The separate department which existed under the Sāmānids

[1] *Texts*, p. 12 (Gardīzī), 92 ('Awfī).
[2] Baihaki, pp. 395, 398.
[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 56, trad., pp. 86–87.
[4] Baihaki, p. 181.
[5] Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, 1. 199.
[6] With what happened inside the houses the muḥtasib had nothing to do; cf. the verses in Sa'dī's *Gulistān*, ed. Platts, p. 46.
[7] Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, 1, 423 sq.
[8] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p 41, trad., p. 62.
[9] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* المحتسب.

for the administration of the Awqāf was apparently abolished in later times: in the decrees of the twelfth century the administration of the Awqāf is included in the duties of the Qāḍī [1].

At the head of the judicial department stood the "Qāḍī of Qāḍīs." The Persians compare this office to that of "mūbadh of mūbadhs" (*i.e.* high priests) of the Sāsānid period [2]. Besides this, legal matters, especially complaints of oppression on the part of officials, were not infrequently examined by the ruler himself [3], or by a member of the royal family [4] specially deputed for that purpose.

In the provinces we find the same offices and departments as in the capital, the provincial wazīrs being called ḥākims [5] or katkhudās (landlords; the latter term is frequently met with in Baihaki). Under the Sāmānids and Ghaznevids provincial officials also were frequently appointed by the sovereign himself [6] and petitions relating to retirement were similarly presented even by petty officials to the ruler [7]. Subsequently, with the growing
242 power of the bureaucracy | the heads of the several departments appointed their substitutes in the provincial towns themselves [8].

The priesthood enjoyed great honour [9] in the Sāmānid dominions. We have seen that even the founder of the power of the dynasty established his rule in Bukhārā with the assistance of the head of the local priesthood. The learned were exempted from the obligation of kissing the ground before the rulers. The most learned and worthy man was selected from among the faqīhs of the Ḥanafite school at Bukhārā and important matters were settled on his advice, his requests were fulfilled, and offices were filled according to his instructions [10]. From Sam'ānī [11] we know that the personage corresponding to the later muftī or shaykh al-Islām at this time bore the Persian title of Ustādh (teacher) and that the office of ustādh existed even in the days of Isma'īl. Teachers in Transoxania were generally known by the Persian title of dānishmand or dialectically dānshūmand [12].

[1] *Texts*, p. 75.

[2] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 39, trad., p 57. The judicial functions of the chief mūbadh (Mo-hu-tan = mogpetan-mogpet) are also mentioned in Chinese sources (Yakinth, *Sobranie svyedyenii*, iii, 168; B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago, 1919, p. 531).

[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p 17, trad., p. 26.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السامانی (on Isma'īl's brother, Abū Ya'qūb Isḥāq, كان على مظالم بخارا).

[5] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الاسانبكثی.

[6] Baihaki, pp 165, 166.

[7] *Ibid*, pp. 753, 754.

[8] *Texts*, pp. 42, 43, 75

[9] Compare the accounts in Sam'ānī of the hermit at whose grave one of the Sāmānids offered up prayers, and the Shaykh whose coffin was carried by the Wazīr Abū 'Alī Bal'amī (Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البابكسی and المزنی).

[10] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 339.

[11] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الاستاذ.

[12] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 43; *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 88. Probably Ch'ang-Ch'un.

Amongst the purely ecclesiastical offices was that of the Khaṭīb (preacher). As is well known, sermons in the mosques were originally delivered by the Caliph himself or by his representative. In the Sāmānid period this custom had already lapsed in the East, as the rulers and their governors were Persian or Turkish by birth and hardly likely to be masters of the Arabic tongue: but in those cases where the governor could speak good Arabic, he united as heretofore in his person the duties of Walī (governor) and khaṭīb[1].

The system of bureaucratic administration cannot have been uniformly introduced throughout the whole extent of the kingdom, as some provinces were still under the rule of their local dynasties, in some cases very ancient ones. Besides the dynasty of the Abū Dāwudids at Balkh, which gave but little sign of its existence, we find separate dynasties in Sijistān (Ṣaffārids), in Gūzgān (Farighūnids), | in Ghazna (native rulers, afterwards 243
deposed by Alptagīn and other members of the guards), in Bust (like Ghazna, under Turkish leaders), in Gharjistān (on the upper Murghāb), in Khorezmia, in Isfījāb, and in the mountainous regions of the Eastern part of the present Bokhārā Khanate (Ṣaghāniyān, Khuttal, and Rāsht). All these rulers (the Amīrs of Ṣaghāniyān and Rāsht and the ruler of Isfījāb are not mentioned here, probably by an oversight), according to Maqdisī[2], sent presents only, not tribute, to the capital. In one locality, Īlāq, the chief local dihqān, who lived in Tūnkath, had by this time lost all political power[3], but (probably in consequence of his extensive territorial property) continued to influence the people, as Maqdisī[4] calls him a "powerful dihqān." The greatest political power was wielded by the rulers of Khorezmia, Isfījāb, and Ṣaghāniyān.

The origin of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs[5] goes right back into mythological times. The Arab conquerors, though they left the title of Shāh to the local rulers, practically transferred the power to their own governor. We have no information on the further relations between the Khwārazm-shāhs and the Arab amīrs, nor on the progress of the struggle between them which led to the division of Khorezmia into two states;

and other Chinese travellers heard these words in the same form (in the Chinese transcription Da-shi-ma, da-shi-man and te-she-man. *Works of the Pekin Mission*, iv, 326, 417; Bretschneider, *Med. Researches*, i, 90, note 231).

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الخطيب.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 337.

[3] The author of the Tumansky MS. (i. 24 a) says of Īlāq that the chiefs of this district are called the dihqāns of Īlāq; in ancient times, the Īlāq dihqān was one of the local kings (mulūki aṭrāf).

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 277.

[5] On whom see Sachau, *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwârizm*, Wien, 1873, Theil i.

the Southern part with the town of Kāth remained under the rule of the Khwārazm-shāh; the Northern, with the town of Gurgānj, under that of the amīrs. The two rulers were engaged in a perpetual conflict, which was ended in 995 by the conquest of the territory of the Khwārazm-shāh by the Amīrs of Gurgānj, who assumed the title of the former[1].

The ruler of Isfījāb signified his allegiance to the Sāmānids only by the annual payment of four coins and the dispatch of a broom[2], together with presents. On his side, he exercised some influence over the Turks of the Eastern part of the Syr-Darya province and the Western part of Semiryechye, who were subjects of the Sāmānids. Of the "Turkmen King", who lived
244 in the town of Ordū, we are told that he "never ceases | to send presents to the ruler of Isfījāb[3]." Unfortunately we do not know whether the ruler of Isfījāb showed any resistance to the Qarākhānids on their invasion of Transoxania.

The origin of the rulers of Ṣaghāniyān, or, as Ibn Ḥawqal[4] calls them, the Muḥtājids (Āl Muḥtāj), is unknown. They bore the Arab title of Amīrs; the title of the pre-Muslim rulers of Ṣaghāniyān (Ṣaghān-Khudāt) we no longer find in use at this period. After the fall of the Sāmānid dynasty Ṣaghāniyān still remained under the rule of its own Amīrs[5]. In Khuttal also we no longer find at this time the pre-Muslim titles of Khuttalān-Shāh and Shēr-Khuttalān[6]. In the twelfth century the Amīrs of Khuttal still derived their origin from the Sāmānid King, Bahrām-Gūr[7] (Varahrān V, A.D. 420–38).

The office of ra'īs[8], head of a town and its neighbourhood, was not infrequently hereditary from father to son as well, but had not attained its present police character in the pre-Mongol period[9]. The ra'īs was the chief person in the town and the representative of its interests; through him the sovereign made known his will to the inhabitants[10]. It is very probable that, at any rate at first, they were nominated from amongst the members of important local families.

As regards the masses, their condition in the Sāmānid period was fairly prosperous in view of the guarantee of external peace and the considerable development of trade and industry. We have quoted elsewhere[11] Narshakhī's information on the purchase

[1] *Texts*, p. 12–13 (Gardīzī); Nerchakhy, p. 189 (from 'Utbī). See below, p. 263.
[2] Cf. p. 212.
[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 275.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 401. On Muḥtāj see Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 196.
[5] *Texts*, p, 15 (Gardīzī).
[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, VI, 29
[7] Ibn el-Athīr, XI, 155.
[8] Baihaki, pp. 298, 352; *Texts*, p. 77 (Al-Baghdādī).
[9] At the present time the title of ra'īs is given to the official who in medieval times was called Muḥtasib.
[10] Besides the passages quoted, also *Texts*, p. 157 (Ḥāfiẓ-Abrū).
[11] *Sredneaz Vyestnik* (1896), June, p. 31.

of their land from the owners by the inhabitants of industrial townships with the concurrence of the Government; besides this, in the time of Isma'īl the vast properties of the Bukhār-Khudāts[1], together with some other villages[2], were transferred to the Crown. The most complete conception of the development of the industries and trades cultivated in Transoxania | is 245
given by the list of exports from the various towns found in Maqdisī[3].

"As regards merchandise the following was exported: from Tirmidh, soap and asafoetida; from Bukhārā, soft fabrics, prayer carpets, woven fabrics for covering the floors of inns, copper lamps, Ṭabarī tissues, horse girths (which are woven in places of detention), Ushmūnī[4] fabrics, grease, sheepskins, oil for anointing the head; from Karmīniya, napkins; from Dabūsiya and Wadhār, Wadhārī fabrics, which are dyed in one colour. I have heard that one of the sulṭāns of Baghdād called them the satin of Khurāsān[5]. From Rabinjan, winter cloaks of red felt[6], prayer carpets, pewter ware, skins, strong hemp, and sulphur; from Khorezmia, sables, miniver, ermines, and the fur of steppe foxes, martens, foxes, beavers, spotted hares, and goats; also wax, arrows, birch bark, high fur caps, fish glue, fish teeth[7], castoreum, amber, prepared horse hides, honey, hazel nuts, falcons, swords, armour, khalanj wood, Slavonic slaves, sheep, and cattle. All these came from Bulghār, but Khorezmia exported also grapes, many raisins, almond pastry, sesame, fabrics of striped cloth, carpets, blanket cloth, satin for royal gifts, coverings of mulham[8] fabric, locks, Āranj[9] fabrics, bows which only the strongest could bend, rakhbīn (a kind of cheese), yeast, fish, boats (the latter also exported from Tirmidh). From Samarqand is exported silver-coloured fabrics (sīmgūn) and Samarqandī stuffs, large copper vessels, artistic goblets, tents, stirrups, bridle-heads, and straps; from Dīzak, fine kinds of wool and woollen clothes; from Banākath, Turkistān fabrics; from Shāsh, high saddles of horse hide, quivers, tents, hides (imported

[1] Nerchakhy, p 10. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 14, 26, 27.

[3] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 323–26. We have excerpted from this list only the sections relating to Transoxania. Cf. also Chwolson, *Ibn Dasta*, pp. 180–81, and Jacob, *Welche Handelsartikel bezogen die Araber aus den nordisch-baltischen Ländern?*, Zweite Aufl, Berlin, 1891. The latter has not, in my opinion, succeeded in proving his contention that بُوز means hawks, not falcons.

[4] From the Egyptian town of Ushmūnayn (*Bibl Geog. Arab*, i, 53).

[5] Cf Ibn Hawqal's estimate of the Wadhārī fabrics (*ibid.*, II, 403), and article "Dībādj" in *Encyc. of Islām* (by C. H. Becker).

[6] Ṭabarī also mentions the woollen fabrics of Rabinjan (II, 1249).

[7] Perhaps walrus tusks; the expression "fish teeth" is met with in this sense in Russian lists of articles (see *Trudy Vost. Otd.*, pt. XXI, pp. 303–4); turk. Balyq tishi, cf. A. Samoylovich in *Bull. Acad. Sciences*, 1917, p. 1278.

[8] See Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, p. 17.

[9] According to *Lataif 'l-ma'arif* (p. 129) a cotton fabric.

from the Turks and tanned), cloaks, praying carpets, leather capes, linseed, fine bows, needles of poor quality, cotton for
246 export to the Turks, and scissors; | from Samarqand again, satin which is exported to the Turks, and red fabrics known by the name of mumarjal, Sīnīzī[1] cloth, many silks and silken fabrics, hazel and other nuts; from Farghāna and Isfījāb, Turkish slaves, white fabrics, arms, swords, copper, iron; from Ṭarāz (Talas), goatskins; from Shalji, silver; from Turkistān, horses and mules are driven to these places, and also from Khuttal. There is nothing to equal the meats of Bukhārā, and a kind of melon they have called ash-shāq (or ash-shāf), nor the bows of Khorezmia, the porcelain of Shāsh, and the paper of Samarqand."

As is evident from the enumeration we have quoted, Iṣṭakhrī[2] was right in affirming that the inhabitants of Transoxania possessed everything in abundance, and were dependent for nothing on the produce of other lands. Industry was undoubtedly developed under Chinese influence, with which country Ibn al-Faqīh[3] compares Khurāsān in this respect. The Arab conquerors found numerous Chinese products in the country[4], the sale of which must, of course, have decreased with the development of local industries[5]. The impression made on the Muslim by the skill of the Chinese craftsmen is evident from the fact that subsequently the Arabs called all artistically worked vessels Chinese[6]. Of the products of Transoxania the greatest reputation in the Muslim world was enjoyed by the silk and cotton fabrics of the valley of the Zarafshān and the metal articles of Farghāna, especially arms, which found a sale even in Baghdād (see p. 169). The development of the metal industry in Farghāna was undoubtedly promoted by the coal mines mentioned above (p. 161). Not only Chinese industry but also that of Egypt had some influence on the development of artistic fabrics; this is attested by the name of the Dabīqī[7] fabrics (from the town of Dabīq in Egypt) manufactured throughout Khorezmia, as well as by the Ushmūn textiles mentioned in Maqdisī. |
247 Samarqand paper is of special importance in the history of civilization. According to the Muslim accounts it was from

[1] These fabrics derived their name from the town of Sīnīz in Fārs; the flax for their manufacture was sometimes imported from Egypt, but by the tenth century was for the greater part grown locally (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 442). This is important as showing the influence of Egyptian industry on the manufactures of Transoxania through Fārs. Cf. also on Dabīqī fabrics note 7 below.

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 287 [3] *Ibid.*, v, 316. [4] Ṭabarī, iii, 79.

[5] The circumstance communicated by Maqdisī, that amongst others the handiwork of prisoners was offered for sale, is very characteristic.

[6] *Lataifo-'l-ma'arif*, p. 127

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 129. On the Dabīqī fabrics cf. the article "Dabīḳ" in *Encyc. of Islām* (by C. H Becker) "woven of linen, but occasionally or regularly interwoven with gold and silk." The Dabīqī was also made in Fārs (*Bibl Geog. Arab.*, iii, 343).

Chinese craftsmen taken prisoner by Ziyād b. Ṣālih in 751 (cf. p. 195) that the Samarqandians learned how to manufacture paper. Until recently it was thought, on the ground of the researches of Prof. Karabacek[1], that the manufacture of paper from rags was an invention due to the Samarqandians, as Chinese rag paper was not known of earlier date than 940. It has now been established, however, by Sir M. Aurel Stein's explorations in Central Asia[2], that pure rag paper was made in China as early as the second century A.D., and was not, therefore, an independent invention of the Arabs, nor do the Arabic accounts speak of it as a novelty. Towards the end of the tenth century Samarqand paper had already succeeded in entirely replacing papyrus and parchment in the Muslim countries[3].

As a parallel to the mention of "almond pastry" in the list of articles of export from Khorezmia we may quote the passage in which Tha'ālibī[4] speaks of the Khorezmian water-melons which were exported to the court of the Caliphs Ma'mūn (813–33) and Wāthiq (842–7) in leaden moulds packed with snow: the price of a melon which arrived intact at the appointed place amounted to 700 dirhams. Of the articles of luxury we may note musk, which was imported from different countries, the Tibetan kind being considered the best[5].

The trade with the nomads was always of great importance, a large quantity of cattle for slaughter[6] and of pack animals being obtained from them, as well as hides, furs, and slaves. Trade with the settled peoples was indeed indispensable for the nomads, who received in this way clothing and grain[7]. In Transoxania, as in China and Russia, the nomads themselves drove their herds to the frontiers of the neighbouring settlements, without awaiting the arrival of caravans in the steppes[8]. The greatest advantage from the trade with the nomads was derived by the Khorezmians, whose prosperity, according to Iṣṭakhrī[9], was founded exclusively on their trade relations with the Turks. From Gurgānj caravans travelled South to Khurāsān, | and West 248

[1] *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus des Erzh. Rainer*, B. II and III, Wien, 1887, S. 108–17.

[2] Cf. Stein, *Serindia*, pp. 650 and 673.

[3] *Lataifo-'l-ma'arif*, p 126 In the eleventh century paper was also made in Syria; Nāṣir-i-Khusraw speaks of the paper made in Tripoli as "fine paper, like that of Samarqand, but even better": Nāṣir-i-Khusraw, ed. Schefer (*Relation de voyages, &c.*, texte, p. 12, trad., p. 41).

[4] *Ibid.*, p 129.

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii, 365.

[6] For the low prices of meat on the northern borders of Transoxania cf. *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 274, 12. On the importation of sheep from the Turks, *ibid.*, i, 288; ii, 336.

[7] On the dispatch of grain to the nomads see above, p. 178. At the present day also, as I have been able to observe, nomads receive with satisfaction even stale millcakes from the Sarts, giving airan in exchange.

[8] *Bibl. Geog Arab.*, i, 303; ii, 391.

[9] *Ibid*, i, 305.

to the Khazars[1]. Gardīzī[2] quotes yet another road along the Western shore of the Sea of Aral, and thence across the steppes to the country of the Pechenegs. The Khorezmians became the chief representatives of the trading class in Khurāsān; in every city of Khurāsān they were to be met with in considerable numbers, distinguished from the local inhabitants, as now, by their high fur caps[3]. In the town of Nasā all landed property had come into their hands[4]. The development of material prosperity was, as everywhere, accompanied by that of intellectual pursuits. Maqdisī[5] says that he rarely met any teachers of law, the humanist sciences, and the reading of the Koran, who did not number Khorezmians among their pupils. Finally, the need of merchandise for exchange with the nomads led to a considerable development in the production of woollen and cotton fabrics[6].

As regards the wages of those days, we can quote only Gardīzī's[7] statement that Ya'qūb b. Layth received fifteen dirhams a month as the hired workman of a copper-smith.

Finally, it was favourable to the development of industry and trade that there were no burdensome taxes and duties[8]. The Sāmānid revenues equalled approximately forty-five million dirhams[9], and were entirely at their disposal; tribute from the Eastern provinces was already completely excluded[10] at this time from the Caliph's budget. The greatest expense of the State was the pay of the armies and officials, twenty million dirhams (five millions every three months, see above p. 230). The allowances of officials were fixed for each province; each individual serving in the same district (and, of course, occupying the same
249 grade in the official hierarchy) received an identical sum[11]. According to Nizām al-Mulk[12], "former kings" (*i.e.* the Sāmānids and Ghaznevids) paid their officials in money only (bistagānī or mawājib), and did not distribute territorial grants to the army (iqṭā', plural iqṭā'āt). There were, however, exceptions, as so extensive a region as Quhistān formed the feudal territories of

[1] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, I, 299
[2] See my *Otchet &c.*, p. 119–20; *Texts*, p. 95 ('Awfī).
[3] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, I, 304–5
[4] *Ibid*, III, 320.
[5] *Ibid.*, III, 284.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, 304.
[7] *Texts*, p. 3; cf. above, p. 216.
[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 340–41.
[9] Attempts at more accurate definition result in different figures (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 340; V, 328–29).
[10] *Zapiski*, IV, 136.
[11] *Bibl Geog. Arab.*, II, 341–2.
[12] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 91–2, trad, pp. 134–5. In Schefer's translation the word iqṭā'dār (possessor of an assignment) is referred by a grammatically impossible reading to persons who received grants in money only. Abū 'Abdallāh al-Khwārizmī, who is contemporary with the Sāmānids, already mentions the term اقطاع (Mafātīh al-'olūm, p. 59 sq.), and points out the difference between qaṭī'a (hereditary fief) and ṭu'ma (life fief). Cf. the text of 'Imād ad-Dīn Iṣfahānī (*Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoucides*, II, 58), translated and commented by C. H. Becker (*Der Islam*, V, 89).

the Sīmjūrids, the descendants of Turkish slaves[1]. Finally, those ghulāms who attained the highest military offices could acquire land by purchase. Alptagīn owned about 500 villages in Khurāsān and Transoxania; in each town he had a palace, a garden, karavanseraï, and bath[2]. Undoubtedly the organization which existed under the Sāmānids and Ghaznevids gave a better guarantee against illegal requisitions than did the system of military fiefs subsequently established[3]; but it was not possible, of course, to avoid requisitions altogether; moreover, as we shall see below, the Government itself when in difficulties collected extraordinary taxes, introduced new imposts, and delayed the payment of wages to its servants. All this gave sufficient cause for dissatisfaction; to say nothing of the Guards and the organization of the "Warriors for the Faith," the custom of bearing arms which prevailed at that time in Transoxania could easily convert this discontent into a danger to the Government, especially in the big urban centres. The inhabitants of Samarqand, the largest commercial town, were considered seditious elements[4], and have maintained this reputation down to the latest times[5]. Less dangerous, but still unwelcome to the Government, must have been the rise of an educated proletariat, *i.e.* the representatives of the numerous official class who had failed to gain a position in the service of the State. As a proof of the danger arising from the existence of such a class, Nizām al-Mulk[6] quotes an account relating | to the kingdom of the Būyids, who were 250
contemporaries of the Sāmānids. In order to prevent this danger, Nizām al-Mulk censures particularly the practice of uniting several offices in the same hands, a practice of which we already find instances in the Sāmānid period[7].

As regards customs duties[8], they were collected chiefly at the crossings of the Amu-Darya, on a scale of 2 dirhams per camel and one dirham for material conveyed by a mounted man (probably whether riding a horse or a donkey); bars of silver had to be conveyed exclusively to Bukhārā, and on this account customs inspection was organized; at the halting places (probably at the

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السمجورى.

[2] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp 101–2, trad., 149–50.

[3] It is interesting that it was reserved for Niẓām al-Mulk himself, in spite of his disapproval of military fiefs, to introduce that system on a greater scale, at least in Western Asia.

[4] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, iii, 278 (cf. above, pp. 87 and 215).

[5] J. Wolff, *Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara*, Edinburgh and London, 1848, p. 203.

[6] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 145–48, trad, pp. 215–19.

[7] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الخازن.

[8] *Bibl Geog. Arab*, iii, 340–41. *Darība*: the term is used in the *Mafātīḥ* (p 59) in the same sense as *Maks*. Cf also the Persian word *bāj* in *B. G. A.*, vii, 168, 3. It is well known that customs have always been considered in Muhammadan countries to be contrary to the religious law.

final destination of the merchandise) from ½ to 1 dirham was levied. Turkish slaves could be conveyed only by a special licence on each occasion from the Government, such certificates costing from 70 to 100 dirhams[1], the same sum was levied for the transport of Turkish slave-girls, but no special licence was required; for the transport of married women the levy amounted only to 20 or 30 dirhams.

Thanks to the organization described above, the Sāmānid dynasty was able to maintain itself for about a hundred years, although of all its representatives after Ismaʿīl there was not one whom we can recognize, from our historical information, as possessing outstanding ability. Ismaʿīl's first successor, Aḥmad (907–14), was distinguished by great piety, and in his reign Arabic was again made the language of official documents[2] (probably not for long). The patronage which he extended to officials who were familiar with the Arabic idiom was probably one of the causes of the Guards' dissatisfaction; on the night of Jan. 23, 914[3], the Amīr was killed at Farabr by his own ghulāms. After this the court party took the power into their own hands
251 and having accused the Kātib (official) Abu'l-Ḥasan Naṣr | b. Isḥāq[4] of abetting the murderers of the Amīr put him to death[5]. The Shaykhs and the leaders of the Guard raised the eight-year-old Naṣr II b. Aḥmad (914–43) to the throne: the words ascribed to the youth[6] show that the leaders of the Guard were considered the real authors of the death of Aḥmad. The administration of the kingdom, by agreement with the representatives of the Palace[7], was taken over by the wazīr Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Jayhānī, who was able to restore order in the kingdom[8], with the active assistance of the military leader Ḥamūya b. ʿAlī. In Samarqand the revolt of Ismaʿīl's brother Isḥāq b. Aḥmad, who was relying on the support of the population of that seditious town, was quelled: Isḥāq was defeated by the armies of Ḥamūya, accepted the pardon offered him, and returned to Bukhārā. His son Ilyās fled to Farghāna, and another member of the dynasty, the

[1] According to Ibn Khurdādhbih (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi, 28) the value of the 2,000 slaves sent annually by the Ṭāhirids to the court of the Caliph equalled 600,000 dirhams; thus the average price of a Turkish slave in the ninth century was 300 dirhams.

[2] *Taʾrīkh-i-Guzīda*, ed. Browne, p 381, trans., p 73. The word "proclamations" is not quite adequate to the "manāshīr wa aḥkām" of the original.

[3] The accurate date in Samʿānī (*s. v.* السامانى); the day was actually Sunday and not Thursday, as is stated in all other sources.

[4] Nerchakhy, p. 92. His full name in Gardīzī (f. 114; Camb. MS., f 92 b).

[5] Gardīzī (f. 115; Camb. MS., *l. c.*) مشايخ وحشم.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 58; Mirkhond, *Histoire des Samanides*, texte persan trad. par M. Defrémery, Paris, 1845, pp. 19 and 131.

[7] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 59.

[8] *Texts*, p. 6 (Gardīzī).

grandson of Naṣr I[1], was appointed governor of Samarqand. Another of Isḥāq's sons, Abū Ṣāliḥ Manṣūr, who also had risen in revolt, died at Nīshāpūr[2]. On his death the command of the rebels was taken over by his ally the general Ḥusayn b. 'Alī Marwazī (in some sources Marw-ar-Rūdī), who had rendered great services to the Government in the reign of Aḥmad, and now considered that these services were insufficiently appreciated. The rebel leader apparently relied for support on national elements, as Nizām al-Mulk[3] and the author of the *Fihrist*[4] include him in their list of leaders of the Shi'ite movement. The conduct of the operations against him was entrusted to a member of the aristocracy, the famous dihqān Aḥmad b. Sahl[5]. Ḥusayn was made prisoner in the summer of 918[6]. Immediately after this occurred the revolt of Aḥmad himself, which was put down at the end of | 919[7] by Ḥamūya b. 'Alī. After this peace 252
in the land was scarcely broken for a space of ten years[8]. The revolt stirred up in Farghāna in 922 by Ilyās b. Isḥāq was easily put down, thanks to the skill of Abū 'Amr Muḥammad b. Asad[9], who with an insignificant division (2,500 men) laid an ambush for the army of Ilyās and dispersed his forces. The strength of the latter is said to have amounted to 30,000 men. The chief adherent of Ilyās, Muḥammad b Ḥusayn b. Mut[10], fled to Ṭarāz, where in accordance with the wishes of the Bukhārā Government he was put to death by the local dihqān. After an unsuccessful attempt to renew the rebellion with the help of the governor of Shāsh, Abu'l-Faḍl b. Abū Yūsuf, Ilyās fled to Kāshghar, where he allied himself with the local "dihqān" Ṭughān-tagīn. After an unsuccessful invasion of Farghāna Ilyās finally received a pardon from his cousin and returned from Kāshghar to Bukhārā[11]. About this time, one of the most famous statesmen of the Sāmānid period, the wazīr Abu'l-Faḍl Muhammad b. 'Ubaydallāh Bal'amī, was called to power.

[1] Ṭabarī, III, 2289-90; Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 60; Mirkhond, *Histoire des Samanides*, p. 132 Perhaps Ṭabarī gives the name of the prince appointed as ruler of Samarqand incorrectly, and the person mentioned by him is identical with Abū 'Amr Muḥammad b. Asad, on whom see below.

[2] Nerchakhy, pp. 92-3.

[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 187, trad., p. 274.

[4] *Fihrist*, pp. 138, 188.

[5] On whom see *Texts*, pp. 6-7 (Gardīzī).

[6] Date in Ibn al-Athīr (VIII, 65) and Gardīzī (f. 116; Camb. MS., f. 94 b).

[7] Date in Ibn al-Athīr (VIII, 89).

[8] Amongst the rebels who appeared at the beginning of the reign of Naṣr, Ibn al-Athīr (VIII, 59) mentions also a certain Ja'far, of whose activities we have no knowledge; but possibly the coins with the name of Mikā'īl b. Ja'far, coined at Samarqand and Shāsh in 306 (918-19) and 308 (920-21), are related to this movement (A. Markov, *Catalogue*, p. 141).

[9] On a copper coin with the name of this prince cf. my article in *Zapiski*, XII, 059.

[10] As we shall see farther on, this name was borne by a military leader who belonged to Isfījāb. It is quite possible that the adherent of Ilyās was also a member of the family of the rulers of Isfījāb.

[11] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 97; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 237.

A new movement occurred about 930[1] at the time of Naṣr's journey to Nīshāpūr. In the citadel of Bukhārā three of the Amīr's brothers were imprisoned: Yaḥyā, Ibrāhīm, and Manṣūr. By means of a baker Abū Bakr they entered into communication with the seditious elements among the people and army of Bukhārā[2], were liberated from the fortress, and seized the city. Yaḥya was proclaimed Amīr. The seditious elements, according to Ibn al-Athīr[3], consisted of Daylamites, Shi'ites, and "robbers"
253 (*i. e.* Ghāzīs): the participation | of Shi'ite elements in the movement is evident also from the fact that its leader, together with Abū Bakr, was the son of Ḥusayn Marwazī. The wazīr Bal'amī entered into an agreement with the son of Ḥusayn, who abandoned Abū Bakr to the armies of Naṣr. Abū Bakr was flogged to death, but the extent of his influence over the people is shown by the legend that his body was thrown into a red-hot oven and was taken out next day unharmed[4]. After some conflicts with Yaḥyā order was restored: the governorship of Khurāsān was given to the Amīr of Ṣaghāniyān, Abū Bakr Muhammad b. al-Muzaffar, and after him to his son, the famous Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad[5].

A much more extensive Shi'ite movement, to which the Amīr himself was attracted, occurred in the last year of the reign of Naṣr[6]. The Shi'ite propaganda had never been given up in Khurāsān, where one of their chief sanctuaries was situated, and the descendants of 'Alī long enjoyed great influence over the population. According to Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī[7], who quotes from the work of Al-Bayyi'[8], even under 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir the Khuṭba was read at Nīshāpūr in the name of one of the 'Alids, Abu'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, to whom 'Abdallah himself gave his niece in marriage. In the reign of Naṣr the population of Nīshāpūr swore allegiance to Abu'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā, grandson of the above, as their Caliph; Naṣr invited him to Bukhārā, and kept him there some time, but later on set him free, bestowed on him a robe of honour, and even granted him a pension. He was the first of the 'Alids of Khurāsān to whom a pension from the State Treasury was granted. The means of the Shi'ite propaganda were considerably increased by the rise of the Fāṭimid Caliphate (at the beginning of the tenth century). Fāṭimid emissaries penetrated into Khurāsān and

[1] The exact date of this event is uncertain (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 154; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, pp. 138, 245).

Gardīzī, f. 117; Camb. MS., f. 94 b–95 a: این ابو بکر میان برادران سعید ومیان فضولیان بخارا ولشکر واسط بود

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 155.

[4] *Texts*, p. 7 (Gardīzī).

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 196; Gardīzī, f. 118; Camb. MS., f. 95 a–b.

[6] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 187 sq., trad., pp. 274 sq.; *Fihrist*, p. 188.

[7] Cod. Mus. Brit. Or. 3587, f. 149.

[8] See above, p. 16.

converted Ḥusayn b. 'Alī Marwazī to the Shi'ite doctrine. He was succeeded by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Nakhshabī (or Nasafī), who, in fulfilment of his teacher's testament, transferred his activities to Transoxania, where he gained some success first in his native town of Nasaf, and subsequently in the capital as well. He succeeded in converting to his belief several nobles, amongst whom were | the chief ḥājib Āytāsh, the private secretary (dabīr- 254
i-khāṣ) Abū Bakr b. Abū Ash'ath, the 'āriḍ Abū Manṣūr Chaghānī [1], the ra'īs of Bukhārā, the head of the finance department [2], and the ruler of Īlāq [3] Ḥusayn-Malik. Through these he gained access to the Palace and soon the Amīr himself became a "qarmaṭ [4]." At Nakhshabī's request Naṣr agreed to pay the Fāṭimid Caliph Qā'im (934-46) 119,000 dīnārs [5] as a fine for the death of Ḥusayn b. 'Alī, who had perished in a Bukhārā prison [6]. The Amīr's conversion to the Shi'ite heresy cannot have pleased the priesthood, who turned to their habitual allies, the representatives of the Turkish guard. The Turks offered the throne to the "great sipahsālār" [7]: the plan of the conspiracy was drawn up, according to which the sipahsālār, under the pretext of an intended expedition to Balāsāghūn (not long before conquered by the heathen Turks), was, with the knowledge of Naṣr, to summon all the military leaders to a feast, attract them to his side, take the oath from them, and with their assistance depose the Amīr and kill the qarmaṭs. The plot became known to Naṣr's son Nūḥ. at his request, Naṣr craftily inveigled the leader of the conspirators into his presence, and ordered him to be executed. After this father and son appeared at the feast of the military leaders. Naṣr announced that he knew of their conspiracy, and ordered the head of the executed man to be thrown before them: at the same time he abdicated in favour of | Nūḥ, 255

[1] Perhaps the son of Abū 'Alī, who subsequently ruled in Ṣaghāniyān and Tirmidh (*Texts*, p. 10).

[2] Ṣāḥib-kharāj: this term probably designates the same official as the term mustawfī (see p. 229)

[3] For particulars of this district see above, p. 233, and my article "Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen," p. 22.

[4] The works of Niẓām al-Mulk and of Bayhaqī show that this term had a wider meaning than that in which it is generally used.

[5] The text of *Fihrist* is not quite clear here, cf. *Fihrist*, ii, 79.

[6] According to Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 66) Ḥusayn b. 'Alī, after his treason was liberated from prison by the wazīr Abū 'Abdallāh Jayhānī, and again took service. His death probably occurred after a fresh revolt of which, however, we know nothing. Tha'ālibī (*Journ. Asiat.*, 5, 1, 204) quotes verses of Ḥusayn addressed to the wazīr Bal'amī, in which the poet thanks him for his liberation from prison.

[7] It is difficult to determine which official is meant here. It cannot be the chief ḥājib mentioned amongst the converts to the heresy, nor the governor of Khurāsān, who at that time was Abū 'Alī Chaghānī. Possibly the term Ḥājib-i-khāṣ, used with reference to Āytāsh, does not mean the head of the Guard, but the favourite ḥājib of the ruler. In that case, the official mentioned by Niẓām al-Mulk as the "Sipahsālār" may be the chief ḥājib.

against whom there was no accusation of heresy. The Turks, taken by surprise, were obliged to submit: Nūḥ ordered his father to be put in chains and taken to the citadel. Thereafter it was announced that before the campaign against the Turkish infidels it was necessary to extirpate those at home; their property, beginning with the treasury of the deposed heretic Amīr, was to be transferred to the orthodox. A slaughter of the heretics in Transoxania and Khurāsān was inaugurated, beginning with Nakhshabī and his aristocratic converts: at the same time measures were taken to prevent the slaughter of the Faithful as well (for reasons of personal revenge). Henceforward the Shi'ites continued to exist in Transoxania as a secret sect only.

Such is the story as told by Nizām al-Mulk. The quelling of the Shi'ite movement is somewhat differently described in the *Fihrist*. The principal cause of the "repentance" of Naṣr is explained as an illness, which kept him to his bed, and was apparently accepted by him as a punishment from above. Before his death he succeeded in making this clear to Nūḥ, who, on his accession to the throne, ordered Nakhshabī to be summoned, and set on foot an argument between him and the faqīhs, in which the latter succeeded in convicting and refuting the heretic. Nūh discovered also that Nakhshabī had appropriated 40,000 dīnārs of the sum appointed to be paid as a fine for the death of Ḥusayn, whereupon he and his partisans were executed.

The historians have not a word to say of the heresy of Naṣr: his death took place on Thursday, April 6, 943[1], from tuberculosis of the lungs, after an illness lasting thirteen months. Some time before his death Naṣr built a cell for himself near the gate of the palace, and spent all his time there in pious exercises[2]. According to a few accounts only, Naṣr, like his father Aḥmad, was killed by ghulāms; in these sources[3] a different date is given for his death, May 31, 942. Very likely in this we have the date, not of his death, but of his abdication and of the transfer of the actual power into the hands of Nūḥ; the account of the construction of the cell by Naṣr also, probably, refers to this event. |
256 Contrary to the statement of Nizām al-Mulk, the formal accession of Nūḥ to the throne took place only after his father's death: according to the account of his contemporary Narshakhī[4], Nūḥ ascended the throne on April 10, 943, *i.e.* after the customary

[1] The exact date in Sam'ānī (*s. v.* السامانى) and in the Persian translation of 'Utbī (Nerchakhy, p. 228).

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 301; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p 141.

[3] The oldest of them is Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī (Nerchakhy, p. 103; *Ta'rīkh-i-Guzīda*, ed. Browne, p. 383, trans., p 74, where the same date (12 Ramadān, 330) is given, but nothing is said about the killing of the Amīr). Cf. also Nerchakhy, pp. 111–12, and Raverty, *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, p 37.

[4] Nerchakhy, p. 94.

three days' mourning for the deceased ruler. Ibn al-Athīr [1] also mentions the execution of Nakhshabī: the body of the executed teacher was stolen from the gallows, but the robber remained unknown.

Ibn al-Athīr [2], and from him Mīrkhwānd [3], quote some anecdotes on the unusual mildness of Naṣr: but other stories have also come down to us [4], from which it is evident that he possessed an extremely irritable nature, and in the end, on the advice of the wazīr Bal'amī and the 'amīd Muṣ'abī [5], found it necessary to decree that his orders relating to executions and severe punishments should be carried out only after a delay of three days; besides this, three old men, chosen for the purpose, were commissioned to intercede for those overtaken by the wrath of the sovereign. That this measure did not achieve its aim is clear from the statements of Ibn al-Athīr [6] and Gardīzī [7] that at the time of Naṣr's death not one of his chief supporters remained alive; "they were constantly intriguing one against the other: some of them perished (*i.e.* were executed), others died (a natural death)." It is hardly likely that a weak sovereign who died of consumption before reaching the age of forty could exercise any substantial influence on the course of affairs of state: the better aspects of his reign must probably be put to the credit of his wazīrs, Abū 'Abdallāh Jayhānī and Abu'l-Faḍl Bal'amī. In the account of the heresy of Naṣr and of the revolution of 942 we are not told, unfortunately, who stood at the time at the head of the bureaucracy, and what part the wazīr played | in these events. The transfer of authority from Bal'amī 257
to Abū 'Alī Jayhānī was connected, according to Gardīzī, with a disturbance in the normal course of public life: according to Ibn al-Athīr [8] this event occurred in the year 326/938. Bal'amī lived till November 940 [9]. Jayhānī died in 330/941–2 "under ruins [10]," an expression generally used of those who perished in earthquakes [11]. We have no knowledge otherwise of an earth-

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 302.

[2] *Ibid.*, viii, 300–301.

[3] Mirkhond, *Samanides*, pp. 139–41. Here the same anecdotes are quoted as in Ibn al-Athīr, and even in the same order. Cf. also *Texts*, pp. 88–9 (on Naṣr and his teacher, from 'Awfī).

[4] Baihakī, pp. 117–19.

[5] Abu'ṭ-Ṭayyib Muḥammad b. Ḥātim. According to Tha'ālibī (*Journ. Asiat.*, 5, 1, 196–97) Naṣr was pleased with his intelligence, and attracted him to his side. Muṣ'abī attained the rank of wazīr, but was executed in the end. According to Gardīzī, he "showed opposition" on the appointment of the wazīr Abū 'Alī Jayhānī (*Texts*, p. 8; in the MS. by mistake الصبعى).

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 300.

[7] *Texts*, p. 8.

[8] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 283.

[9] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* البلعمى.

[10] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 294.

[11] So in Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 302) in the account of the earthquake of 331, in which the town of Nasā in Khurāsān was involved.

quake in the year 330. If the wazīr's death was not directly connected with the revolution of 330, it must in any case have facilitated the victory of the clergy and the military party. In the *Fihrist*[1], Abū 'Alī Jayhānī is accused of leaning towards the dualist heresy.

In the reign of Nūḥ b. Naṣr (943–954)[2] we already see distinct signs of the decline of the dynasty. In consequence of the events which marked the end of Naṣr's reign, the power was now transferred to a man of strict piety, the faqīh Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad as-Sulamī, who was subsequently known as "al-hākim ash-shahīd" ("the martyr ruler"). The new wazīr[3] (the pious faqīh for long refused this title, but finally yielded to Nūḥ's insistence) fasted on Mondays and Thursdays, performed all the prescribed prayers, even during the night, and even when travelling did not avail himself of the usual exemptions. He devoted only a very small amount of time to receiving various individuals on affairs of state, and at the first opportunity returned hastily to his theological writings. Naturally, such a ruler was unable to extricate the kingdom from the difficult position created by the plundering of the treasury in 942. The army was needed for the suppression of a revolt in Khorezmia in 944[4], for the war
158 with the Turks[5], and finally for another | with the Governor of Khurāsān, Abū 'Alī Chaghānī. The people of Khurāsān had complained of him to Nūḥ in the spring of 945[6], and Nūḥ determined to replace him by the leader of the Turkish party Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr, who united in his person "the prestige of temporal power and the authority of religion."[7] Abū 'Alī was not at all prepared to make room for his successor voluntarily; the Government was not able to use force against him, as the army, not having received the pay due to them, were openly murmuring against the Amīr and the wazīr. The financial difficulties resulted in an increase of tribute and taxes; Maqdisī[8] recounts that on one occasion during the reign of Nūḥ the annual taxes were levied in advance in the form of a loan, which was

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 138. The mention in this passage of Ḥusayn b. 'Alī Marwazī and Abū Zayd Balkhī shows that the author of the *Fihrist* did not clearly distinguish the two Jayhānīs, father and son (cf. p. 12): perhaps the accusation of heresy was made against both. In Yāqūt's *Irshād* (II, 59–60) Abū 'Abdallāh Jayhānī is identified even with his grandson; the first Jayhānī is mentioned again in the same work (VI, 293–94).

[2] In Yāqūt's *Irshād* (III, 99) he is called "one of the cultured kings of the Sāmānid dynasty" (من أدباء ملوك آل سامان).

[3] On whom see Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الشهيد.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 310–11; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 249.

[5] The son of the Turkish king was in prison under Nūḥ (*ibid.*).

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 334; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 143.

[7] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السيمجورى: يجمع الى هيبة الملك سياسة الدين.

[8] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 340.

never repaid by the Government. The poets of the period[1] complained that "the officials of the tax department" had collected arrears at a time when even the payment of the ordinary taxes was too burdensome for the population. In the autumn of 946 Nūḥ sacrificed to the wazīr the leader of the military party, Aḥmad b. Ḥamūya[2] (probably the son of the famous Ḥamūya b. 'Alī): but in the course of two months he was obliged to tolerate the bloody vengeance of the soldiery on the wazīr, whom they blamed for the delay in their pay, and accused of complicity with Abū 'Alī. According to the narrative of the historians[3], the wazīr was put to death by Nūḥ's orders: according to the narrative of al-Bayyi', quoted in Sam'ānī[4], the government sent a division to protect the wazīr, but it was repulsed by the rebels.

Meanwhile Abū 'Alī[5] had previously summoned Nūḥ's uncle Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad from Mesopotamia. Nūḥ's army, which had apparently not received any pay even after the death of the wazīr, went over to the rebels: barely a month after the death of the "martyr-ruler," in Jan. 947, Abū 'Alī and Ibrāhīm entered Bukhārā and the khuṭba was read in the name of the latter, while Nūḥ fled to Samarqand. | Abū 'Alī's rule at Bukhārā did 259
not last more than two months. The hostility of the inhabitants forced him to retire; he handed over the chief offices of the dīwān to his partisans and left at Bukhārā, besides Ibrāhīm, still another member of the dynasty, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad the brother of Nūḥ[6]. Abū 'Alī himself left Bukhārā under the pretext of marching on Samarqand, but on reaching Nasaf he returned to his native Ṣaghāniyān. Both princes immediately entered into negotiations with Nūḥ, who promised them forgiveness, and in April he was able to return to his capital. In his struggle with the rebels, Nūḥ did not show such moderation as his father had done; in defiance of his promise he ordered his

[1] *Journ. Asiat.*, 5, i, 176. The translation of Barbier de Meynard ("l'excédant et le droit ordinaire") is hardly successful. On the sense of البقايا cf. also *Mafātīḥ al-'olūm*, p. 60: it seems not to be the same as الباقي (*ibid.*).

[2] *Texts*, p. 8 (Gardīzī). [3] Besides Gardīzī, also Ibn-al-Athīr (viii, 345).

[4] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الشهيد.

[5] On whom and his activities see Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 344–48; Gardīzī, f. 120–22, Camb MS., f. 97 a–99 b; *Texts*, p. 8–9.

[6] The accounts of Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 345) and Mīrkhwānd (*Samanides*, pp. 146, 147) of the departure of Abū 'Alī for Turkestan and his return to Bukhārā are not confirmed by Gardīzī. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Ibrāhīm, in agreement with the Bukharans, decided to make peace with Nūḥ, but before the arrival of the latter Abū 'Alī defeated the Bukharans, intended to burn the city, and was only dissuaded by the prayers of the Shaykhs. According to Mīrkhwānd, Ibrāhīm had already succeeded in joining Nūḥ, and both were defeated by Abū 'Alī. Gardīzī says nothing of a battle between Ibrāhīm and Abū 'Alī: according to him Abū 'Alī wished to burn Bukhārā because the inhabitants had shown him hostility.

uncle and two brothers (Abū Ja'far Muḥammad[1] and Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad) to be deprived of their sight, and executed one of the chief nobles, the ḥājib Ṭughān. The head of the house of Isfījāb, Manṣūr b. Qarā-tagīn, was appointed governor of Khurāsān: Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr died in the spring of 948[2].

The chief rebel Abū 'Alī was not yet defeated. On learning that Nūḥ was collecting an army against him he retired to Balkh (this circumstance compels us to suppose that the ruler of the latter place was on his side) and thence for the second time marched on Bukhārā. Near Kharjang[3], in spite of Nūḥ's retreat with the main forces, he was defeated (at the end of 947). The victory of the government was signalized by fresh severities and executions, one of the victims being a member of the 'Utbī family. The further activities of Abū 'Alī (his retirement to Balkh
260 and Gūzgān, alliance with the Amīr | of Khuttal and junction with his armies near Simingān[4], and his alliance with the Kumījīs[5] and the Amīr of Rāsht) prove that he succeeded in stirring all the vassal rulers of the provinces along the upper course of the Amu-Darya to revolt against the central Government. In consequence of this the army of Bukhārā, after sacking Abū 'Alī's capital Ṣaghāniyān, found itself in difficulties, and was cut off from all communication with Bukhārā. At the very end of 948 both sides agreed on peace, and Abū 'Alī sent his son to Bukhārā as a hostage. We do not know what concessions the government made to Abū 'Alī and his allies: that the victory lay on the side of the rebels is clear from the honours on the reception of Abū 'Alī's son; to celebrate his arrival the city was decorated, and he was presented with a robe of honour and invited to the royal table. Abū 'Alī remained in Ṣaghāniyān and, at the request of the government, put down a local religious movement of an anti-Muslim character. In Khurāsān Manṣūr b. Qarā-tagīn vainly endeavoured to restore discipline among the troops, and constantly begged the Amīr to relieve him of such

[1] It has been suggested that it was to this Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Aḥmad that the qaṣīda by Rūdagī, beginning مادر می بکرد باید قربان was addressed. This is now disproved by the discovery of a *Ta'rīkh-i Sīstān*, from which it is clear that the *mamdūḥ* of the poem in question was Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf b. al-Layth, governor of Sijistān. See Sir E. D. Ross's article "A Qasida by Rudaki" in *J.R.A.S*, 1926, pp. 213 ff. [G.]

[2] Sam'ānī, *s.v* السمجوری.

[3] According to Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 132) there was a "rabāṭ of the King" near Kharjang (rabāṭ-al-malik or rabāṭi malik) built by Shams-al-mulk; on this and other buildings of this Khān see below. The rabāṭ was probably in the Malik steppes, west of Karmīnīya: thus, in editing the *Texts* (p. 8), I evidently mistakenly identified Kharjang with Khartang (on the latter see p. 126).

[4] In the text of Gardīzī سمنکان (in Arabic سمنجان, see p. 67) should evidently be read instead of سمکان.

[5] See p. 70.

a heavy task: evidently the pay of the army was, as before, issued irregularly. Manṣūr died in 951, and Abū 'Alī was appointed his successor. He arrived in Khurāsān in 952, leaving Ṣaghāniyān and Tirmidh to his son Abū Manṣūr Naṣr b. Aḥmad. Abū 'Alī restored order in Khurāsān and Khorezmia and began a war against the Būyids[1]. The war was concluded by a peace which roused Nūḥ's displeasure: Abū 'Alī was again deposed and Abū Sa'īd Bakr b. Malik al-Farghānī appointed in his place. Before Bakr had time to set out, Nūḥ died on Monday, August 28, 954[2].

Nūḥ left five sons: 'Abd-al-Malik, Manṣūr, Naṣr, Aḥmad[3], and 'Abd-al-'Azīz; like some of the Caliphs, he had in his own lifetime ordered the population to take the oath of allegiance to the princes who were intended to rule one after the other[4]. The | importance enjoyed at this period by the military aristo- 261
cracy is evident from the fact that each of the three elder sons had one of the leaders of the guards attached to him as his companion[5]. 'Abd-al-Malik ascended the throne. The high opinion which Maqdisī held of the capabilities of this Amīr ("amongst the Sāmānid dynasty there was none to equal him"), is hardly justified by the facts: we shall see that towards the end of his reign the power was entirely in the hands of the commander of the Guard[6]. On his accession 'Abd-al-Malik confirmed the edict of his predecessor relating to the deposition of Abū 'Alī and the appointment of Bakr, and appointed as his wazīr Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr[7]. This turn of affairs was evidently unfavourable to Abū 'Alī, as, according to Ibn al-Athīr[8], he realized that he would not be in a position either to remain in Khurāsān or to return to Ṣaghāniyān. And, as a matter of fact, in spite of the assistance of the Būyids and the decree of investiture sent by the Caliph, Abū 'Alī was unable to maintain his position in Khurāsān, and only the corpse of the former ruler returned to Ṣaghāniyān on his death in Nov. 955.

The new government did not hold the power long in its hands. Bakr b. Malik "treated the Guards disdainfully, neglected their requests, and aroused their enmity": in December 956 he was killed by their captain Alptagīn at the gates of 'Abd-al-Malik's

[1] *Texts*, pp. 8–9; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 370–71, 378.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 379–81; Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السامانى. According to 'Utbī (Manīnī, 349, and Nerchakhy, 229) on Tuesday, August 22 (eleven days remaining from Rabī' II).

[3] He is mentioned also in Narshakhī (p. 16).

[4] Gardīzī, f. 124; Camb. MS., f. 100 a, where only four princes are mentioned (Manṣūr being omitted).

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 337.

[6] *Ibid.*, iii, 337–8.

[7] So in Gardīzī. Maqdisī (*loc. cit.*) calls Abū Manṣūr b. 'Uzayr Nūḥ's wazīr.

[8] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 379.

palace, probably with the Amīr's consent. After this the wazīr also was deposed and his office transferred to Abū Ja'far 'Utbī. Bakr's successor in Khurāsān was his former subordinate, the General Abu'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Sīmjūrī, whose decree and standard were brought to him by Alptagīn's son in 957. Both 'Utbī and Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī roused general discontent by their administration, in consequence of which they were for a time deprived of their posts; Abū Manṣūr Yūsuf b. Isḥāq was appointed wazīr in 959 and Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Abd-ar-Razzāq, whom Gardīzī calls a just ruler, governor of Khurāsān (from 960). Evidently Alptagīn also was deposed for
262 a time, as the decree of appointment of the new sipahsālār | was brought by Abū Naṣr Manṣūr b. Bāyqarā[1], whom Maqdisī calls the chief ḥājib of Manṣūr. That 'Abd-al-Malik and his wazīr made an attempt to emancipate themselves from the domination of the military party is proved also by Ibn al-Athīr's account (under the same year 960) of the execution of a commander of high rank, which provoked disorders in the country. In any case the attempt ended unsuccessfully, as 'Abd-al-Malik, in order to free himself from the presence of Alptagīn, whom he disliked, was obliged to appoint him governor of Khurāsān, where he arrived in February 961. A former slave of Alptagīn's was appointed ḥājib: before this Alptagīn had succeeded in persuading the Amīr to depose the wazīr and appoint in his place Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Bal'amī, who had not inherited his father's capacity, and was a subservient tool in the hands of the all-powerful military leader[2].

Such was the condition of the country when the unexpected death of 'Abd-al-Malik (in Nov.[3] 961) caused fresh disorders: as we have seen (p. 110), even the Amīr's palace was sacked and burnt by the rebels. In accordance with Alptagīn's wishes, Bal'amī raised to the throne Naṣr[4], the young son of the late ruler, but his government lasted only one day: the members of the Sāmānid dynasty and the leaders of the Guard took the part

[1] As is well known, the name of this ḥājib is met with on the coins of Manṣūr; cf. *Trudy*, &c., I, 218.

[2] *Texts*, pp. 10–11 (Gardīzī); Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 396; *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 338.

[3] The exact date is doubtful: cf. Sam'ānī, *s.v.* السامانى; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 398; Nerchakhy, pp. 96, 103, 112, 229; 'Utbī-Manīnī, I, 249, where Thursday, 11 Shawwāl, 350, is given, but this day was a Saturday, Nov. 23.

[4] The latter is mentioned only in Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 338), but the fact of his accession is corroborated by Alptagīn's advice, quoted in Gardīzī (f. 126; Camb. MS., f. 101 b) هم از فرزندان او یکی صواب تر بود نشاندن. In opposition to this Niẓām al-mulk (*Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 97, trad., p. 144) asserts that Alptagīn considered Manṣūr too young to occupy the throne. The later compilers (Nerchakhy, p. 104; *Ta'rīkh-i-Guzīda*, ed. Browne, p. 384, trans., p. 74; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 153) also maintain that Alptagīn wished to place Manṣūr's uncle on the throne.

of Abū Ṣāliḥ Manṣūr b. Nūḥ, and with the help of Fāiq, who from childhood had been the companion of Manṣūr, the latter seized the throne. Alptagīn was apparently abandoned by all. Bal'amī evidently sided with the new government, as he retained the office of wazīr until his death. In Khurāsān Abū Manṣūr b. 'Abd-ar-Razzāq, whom Alptagīn had left as governor of Ṭūs, willingly set out against his old enemy, the more so that the government offered him Alptagīn's place. | The latter retired to 263
Ghazna, where in 692 he deposed the local ruler and founded an independent kingdom[1]. Abū Manṣūr, according to Gardīzī, knew that he also would be removed from his post at the first opportunity: he therefore allowed his soldiery to pillage the country and entered into relations with the Būyids. In 962 Abū'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad Sīmjūrī, once more appointed governor of Khurāsān, was sent against him (amongst others in his army was Ahmad, the son of Manṣūr b. Qarā-tagīn). Abū Manṣūr was killed; Abu'l-Ḥasan remained governor of Khurāsān to the end of Manṣūr's reign, and fought with success against the Būyids and Ziyārids[2]. The object of these wars is evident from Manṣūr's answer to Abū'l-Ḥasan's request for money for the army: "The pay of the army must be taken from Bīsutūn"[3] (a Ziyārid prince). Both Abu'l-Ḥasan and Abū Ja'far 'Utbī, who shared the office of wazīr with Bal'amī, now behaved very differently from the character they had shown in the reign of 'Abd-al-Malik, and gained the reputation of prudent and just rulers. At Ghazna also the authority of the Sāmānids was restored, nominally at least; Isḥāq[4], the son and successor of Alptagīn, who had died in 963, was defeated by the former native ruler of Ghazna in 964, and fled to Bukhārā; it was only with the assistance of the Sāmānid government that he was able to overcome his opponent in 965[5]. After this the money coined at Ghazna bore the name of the Sāmānids as well as that of the local ruler[6]. The remainder of Manṣūr's reign, so far as is known, passed off peacefully. After the death of Bal'amī in the spring of 974 (see p. 10, note 1) the office of wazīr again fell to Yūsuf b. Isḥāq, who survived his predecessor only five months. In the last year of Manṣūr it was given to Abū 'Abdallāh Aḥmad

[1] Niẓām al-Mulk's account (*loc. cit.*) of Alptagīn is clearly very sympathetic to the latter.

[2] See above, p. 225, note 7.

[3] Gardīzī, f. 128; Camb. MS., f. 103 a: مال حشم از بی ستون بن وشمکیر باید ستد.

[4] His real name was perhaps Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm, cf. Ibn Ḥawqal, 13–14.

[5] On these events see *Texts*, p. 160 (تاریخ فصیحی); Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 70–73. The date given by Faṣīḥ for the establishment of Alptagīn's rule at Ghazna (322) is undoubtedly wrong. On the whole, in spite of the value of Faṣīḥ's work, he cannot be considered, as Raverty asserts (p. 40), "an excellent authority," even for the events of the tenth century.

[6] *Trudy, &c.*, i, 240.

264 b. Muḥammad Jayhānī, | son of Abū 'Alī Muhammad and grandson of the famous Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. Manṣūr died in June 976[1].

Manṣūr's son and successor, Abu'l-Qāsim Nūḥ, was only thirteen years old[2]: the kingdom was administered in his stead by his mother[3] and the wazīr Abu'l-Ḥusayn 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad 'Utbī, who was appointed at the end of 977[4]. At the beginning of the new reign the government endeavoured to conciliate the principal leaders of the military party, especially Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī, who was overwhelmed with favours and honourable titles[5]. Having consolidated his power, the ambitious wazīr resolved to restore the supremacy of the bureaucracy and to subdue the military leaders. At the beginning of 982[6] he was successful in deposing the all-powerful Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī and in replacing him by the ḥājib Tāsh, who had formerly been a slave of 'Utbī's father, and was absolutely devoted to the wazīr. According to some accounts[7] he was also influenced by private resentment against Abu'l-Ḥasan, who considered 'Utbī too young to occupy the post of wazīr, and advised Nūḥ to leave Jayhānī in office. Abu'l-Ḥasan was obliged to retire to Quhistān, which formed the appanage of his family (see p. 238). Other leaders of the Guard, amongst them the influential Fāiq, were dispatched to take part in the war against the Būyids. The triumph of the wazīr did not last long. In March, 982, the armies of Khurāsān were defeated by the Būyids, and only the death of Aḍud ad-Dawla prevented them from invading Khurāsān[8]. New armies were got ready at Merv by the orders of 'Utbī, who prepared to join them himself, but perished by the hand of murderers in the pay of Fāiq and Abu'l-
265 Ḥasan. The historian 'Utbī[9] rightly calls his kinsman | the last

[1] According to 'Utbī (Manīnī, 1, 349) on Tuesday, 11th Shawwal = 13th June. Gardīzī is the most accurate authority on the events of this reign (ff. 126–30; Camb. MS., ff. 101 b–104 b). From 'Utbī's work only the events relating to Transoxania are mentioned; for a fuller account see *Notices et Extraits*, iv.

[2] Thus Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 495.

[3] On her see 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 136; Nerchakhy, p. 140).

[4] Date in Gardīzī (f. 130; Camb. MS., f. 105 a) Rabī' II, 367. The same date in Yāqūt, *Irshād*, II, 60, from the continuation of Sallāmī's work by Abu'l-Ḥasan Muḥ. b. Sulaymān b. Muḥ., probably the source of Gardīzī. فريد التاريخ is a mistake for مزيد التاريخ: cf. *Irshād*, III, 140.

[5] *Texts*, p. 11 (Gardīzī).

[6] Date in 'Utbī (Manīnī, 1, 105: the words في منتصف شعبان منها only in Manīnī's commentary) and in Gardīzī (f. 131; Camb. MS., f. 105 b) middle of Sha'bān, 371.

[7] *Texts*, pp. 11–12 (Gardīzī), 91–2 ('Awfī); Nerchakhy, p. 105; *Ta'rīkh-i-Guzīda* ed. Browne, p. 385 sq., trans., p. 75; see above, p. 17.

[8] Gardīzī, f. 131; Camb. MS., f. 106 a: واكر نى خراسان وتاشرا لاش كردندى. Maqdisī (*Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 338) considers the death of 'Aḍud ad-Dawla and the decline of his dynasty as a punishment for the attack on the Sāmānids.

[9] Ed. Manīnī, i, 121 sq., on his superiority to other wazīrs who figure in the history

wazīr worthy of the name: his successors possessed no power whatever, and did not even try to combat the representatives of the Dargāh. Tāsh was summoned to Bukhārā by the government to restore order, but came to an agreement with his opponents, thanks to which he maintained his position as sipahsālār. Abu'l-Ḥasan remained in Quhistān; his son Abū 'Alī was appointed governor of Herāt, and Fāiq governor of Balkh. After Tāsh had left Bukhārā the hostile party gained the upper hand: in August 986 [1] 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr, a rival of the 'Utbī family, was appointed wazīr [2], and the office of sipahsālār was again restored to Abu'l-Ḥasan. Tāsh endeavoured to show armed resistance to Abu'l-Ḥasan and Fāiq, with some assistance from the Būyid Fakhr ad-Dawla and 2,000 horsemen from another member of the same house, Sharaf ad-Dawla Abu'l-Fawāris, king of Fārs, but he was defeated on Dec. 2, 987 [3], and fled to Gurgān, where he died of plague in the following year [4]. The last wazīrs, according to 'Utbī [5], had no longer the power to restore order: "The majority of the provinces were in the power of the rebels, the revenues of the government diminished, the soldiery did not scruple to oppress the population: the dominion passed into the hands of the Turks, and the decrees of the wazīrs lost their force." Abu'l-Ḥasan, on his death in the spring of 989 [6], was succeeded by his still more talented and ambitious son Abū 'Alī. The decided preference for Fāiq shown by the Bukhārā government caused Abū 'Alī to take up arms. Fāiq was defeated and fled to Marw ar-Rūd, while Abū 'Alī sent an envoy to Bukhārā with an explanation of his actions and a declaration of submission. The government had perforce to accept the excuses of the victor and confirm him as viceroy of all the provinces south of the Amu-Darya. In these provinces Abū 'Alī, who had received from Nūḥ the title of "Divinely-aided Amīr of Amīrs [7]," soon made himself absolute ruler, and under plea of the requirements of his army appro-

books; Nerchakhy, p. 130. It is worthy of remark that at the end of his life the wazīr received a military appointment as well ('Utbī, *l. c.*; Nerchakhy, p. 129), so that he united in his own hands both civil and military authority.

[1] Date in Gardīzī (f. 132; Camb. MS., f. 106 b), Rabī' I, 376; Ibn al-Athīr (IX, 19) refers this event to 373/983-4.

[2] In the "History of Bayhaq" (MS Brit. Mus. Or. 3587, f. 69 a) we find complaints of the bad character of this wazīr.

[3] Date in Gardīzī (f. 133; Camb. MS., f. 107 a), 7th Sha'bān, 377.

[4] According to Utbī (Manīnī, i, 145) he remained in Gurgān for three years, but the plague and the death of Tāsh are dated by 'Utbī himself (*ibid.*, 149) in A. H. 377 (May 3, 987–Apr 20, 988). In *Not et Extr.*, iv, 349, the date is given as A. H. 379, but this does not agree with the dates of events mentioned below.

[5] Nerchakhy, p. 152; Manīnī, i, 152.

[6] According to Gardīzī (f 133; Camb. MS., f. 107 a) in the month of Dhu'l-Ḥijja, 378.

[7] Thus in 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 155); cf. Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 170.

266 priated all the state revenues, even from the crown | properties[1]. Meanwhile Fāiq, after his unsuccessful march on Bukhārā[2], had seized Balkh and marched on Tirmidh; on Nūḥ's orders the Amīr of Gūzgān, Abu'l-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Aḥmad[3] b. Farīghūn marched against him, but was defeated and formed an alliance with Fāiq against their common enemy the ruler of Ṣaghāniyān, Ṭāhir b. Faḍl (it is not known whether he was a relative of the Muḥtājids); according to 'Utbī[4], Ṣaghāniyān had previously been incorporated in the territories of the amīr of Gūzgān. Ṭāhir was killed at the siege of Balkh, after which his army took to flight. The Sāmānid kingdom fell into complete confusion and became an easy prey to the conqueror, whose army now approached the Northern frontiers of Transoxania.

We have no information on the origin of the kingdom of the Turkish Khāns who put an end to the rule of the Sāmānids; even the question to which Turkish tribe they belonged remains in dispute. The accounts we have quoted elsewhere[5] of the victories of the Toquz-Oghuz over the Qarluqs, the occupation of Kāshghar by the Yaghmā tribe, a branch of the Toquz-Oghuz, and the conquest of Balāsāghūn by the heathen Turks, seem to indicate that the Qarā-Khānids were the leaders of the Toquz-Oghuz who had destroyed the Qarluq kingdom; but against this there is the position which, as we shall see later, the Qarluqs occupied in the Qarā-Khānid kingdom, and which exactly corresponds to that of the Oghuz in the Saljūq empire[6]. Also with regard to the conversion of the Qarā-Khānids to Islām we possess only legendary accounts: the oldest version of
267 this legend is found in Jamāl Qarshī[7], | who quotes the "History of Kāshghar," written in the eleventh century (see p. 18).

[1] *Texts*, p. 12 (Gardīzī). The categories of the revenues are enumerated here: land taxes, duties on merchandise, taxes in kind, occasional receipts, and revenues from crown properties.

[2] He was defeated, according to 'Utbī (Manīnī, I, 165) on Sunday, 11th Rabī' I, 380 (June 8, 990).

[3] 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 166) and the later sources call him Ahmad b. Muhammad; cf. *Zapiski*, x, 127–30.

[4] Manīnī, i, 167 (here ابو المظفر محمد بن احمد); Nerchakhy, p. 157.

[5] *Zapiski*, xi, 348–9; *Handbook of Semiryechye*, vol. ii, pp. 94–5; *Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen*, p. 28.

[6] Cf. also *Zapiski*, viii, 22, W. Barthold, *Zur Geschichte des Christentums*, p. 49. At the end of the eleventh century, as we shall see, the kernel of the army of the Qarā-Khānids bore the name of jikils, but we are told by the contemporary Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (دیوان لغات الترك, I, 330) that all the Eastern Turks were called jikil (or chikil) by the Turkmens of the Saljūq empire.

[7] *Texts*, p. 130 sq. Another legend (on the prophetic dream of the Turkish khān) is related in Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 54); the ruler is here called Qarā-Khāqān. It is very probable that he bore both titles; his grandson, the conqueror of Transoxania, is called in Tha'ālibī (یتیمة, iv, 316) Bughrā-qarā-khāqān.

According to this legend, Islām was first embraced by Satūq Bughrā-khān 'Abd-al-Karīm, grandfather of the first and great-grandfather of the second conqueror of Transoxania, who died in 344/955. Notwithstanding the antiquity of this tradition it contains many anachronisms, especially as regards the Sāmānid dynasty: therefore the chronological data quoted can hardly be considered reliable, and need scarcely prevent our referring Ibn al-Athīr's statement[1] that in 349/960 Islām was embraced by numerous Turkish tribes (200,000 tents) to the Qarā-Khānids. In view of the close trade relations always existing between Transoxania and the steppes[2], the creeds which numbered adherents in Transoxania must have been gradually disseminated amongst the nomads. From the data I have collected elsewhere on the spread of Mazdeism, the dualistic doctrines, Christianity and Islām, it is evident[3] that the Muslim propaganda was already active in the steppes in the Umayyad period, although without much success. Islām in its official form, *i. e.* the teaching of the Muslim lawyers, was always regarded by the nomads, not excluding the Arabs[4], as a religion unsuited to their requirements; the shaykhs and other representatives of Muslim mysticism had incomparably more influence, and still have to-day the greatest number of adherents in the steppes. We have hardly any information on Muslim propaganda amongst the Turks in the Sāmānid period; we only know from Sam'ānī[5] that during the reign of 'Abd-al-Malik there lived in the land of the Turks a certain Abu'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Sufyān al-Kalamātī of Nīshāpūr, who left Nīshāpūr in 340/951–2, and after spending some years in Bukhārā passed into the service of the "Khān of Khāns," and died at his court before 350/961. In view of this chronological coincidence it is possible that the activity of Kalamātī | has some connexion with the event of 349. 268
If the legend of the activity of the Sāmānid prince has any historical foundation, and if this prince was called Naṣr[6], then this

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 396. The same fact is mentioned by Miskawayh, *Eclipse, &c.*, ii, 181; trans., v, 196. The original source must have been the work of Thābit aṣ-Ṣābi'.

[2] On the colonies founded in the Turkish dominions by emigrants from Transoxania see above p. 178: also *Zapiski*, viii, 20–21; *Handbook of Semiryechye*, pp. 83, 89; *Zur Geschichte des Christentums*, pp. 46–7. Cf. also Sam'ānī's account (*s. v.* ازركيان) of the Bukharan Zoroastrian Azrakyān, a contemporary of the Caliph 'Alī, who travelled to China for purposes of trade, and thence (by sea) to Basra, where he embraced Islām. See now also the information on "Soghdian colonies in Eastern Turkistan and China" in Sir A. Stein's *Serindia* (Index).

[3] *Zapiski*, viii, 9; Yāqūt, i, 839

[4] Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, p. 526.

[5] *S v.* الكلماثى. The name of the Khān's capital is evidently altered in the manuscript. Cf. the text in the facs., f. 486 a (ثم وقع الى لخان حامان وادصل ولبل بالسلاطين (*sic*)

[6] *Texts*, p. 131 (Jamāl Qarshī). On the later versions in which the Sāmānid prince

may be only the son of Nūḥ b. Naṣr. As we have seen (p. 249) Naṣr b. Nūḥ is mentioned as one of the princes to whom the population swore allegiance in the lifetime of their father, but after this there is no information about him. We also saw (p. 241) that as early as the first half of the tenth century a Sāmānid prince fled to the Turks, but we have no information by which we may solve the question whether the "dihqān" of Kāshghar, Tughān-tagīn, had any connexion with the Qarā-Khānid dynasty. Of other representatives of Islām who worked among the Turks, we know of Abu'l-Ḥasan Sa'īd b. Ḥātim al-Usbānīkatī, who "went to the land of the Turks" sometime before 380/990[1].

As regards the political relations between the Sāmānids and the Turks, we have seen that in the ninth century and the first half of the tenth the Sāmānids themselves dispatched armies to the steppes to subdue the Turks: this is indicated by the accounts of the conquest of Isfījāb by Nūh b. Asad (p. 211), the expeditions of Isma'īl to Ṭarāz (p. 224) and of Naṣr to Shāwghar[2], and the occupation of the village of Haftdih in Farghāna by the Muslims. The only occasion on which Transoxania was invaded by a large Turkish army was in 904, in the reign of Isma'īl b. Aḥmad[3], when the invaders were driven out with the help of volunteers from the dominions of the Caliph. We do not know whether a campaign was undertaken against the heathen Turks who took Balāsāghūn in 942; all that is known is that in the following year the son of the Turkish Khāqān[4] was a prisoner in the hands of the Sāmānids. That the Sāmānid government still possessed some influence in the Turkish lands in the second half of the tenth century is shown by the statement that a rabāt was built by Fāiq's orders near Mīrkī[5]. Standing in need of the products of a cultivated country, and unable at that period, owing to the power of the Sāmānids, to obtain them by sudden raids, the nomads, as always happened in similar cases, came in large
269 numbers to the frontier towns for purposes of trade[6]. | Besides this some hordes of Oghuz, who had for some unknown reason abandoned their native land, with the consent of the government occupied a section of land in Transoxania, suited only to nomads,

is called Khwājah Abu'n-Naṣr Sāmānī, see *Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues orientales*, viii, 160–61; F. Grenard, "La Légende de Satuk Boghra Khan et l'histoire" (*J. As*, xv, 5–79) (p. 7: Khodja Aboul-Naṣr Sāmānī).

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الاسبانيكتي.

[2] Compare my *Otchet o poyezdkye*, &c., p. 10, from *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i. 291. In spite of the statements there made, the town referred to is undoubtedly Western (cf. *ibid.*, 346) and not Eastern Shāwghar (see p. 177), which is not mentioned in Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal.

[3] According to Ṭabarī, iii, 2245.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 310; Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 249 (from Ibn Khaldūn).

[5] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 275.

[6] See above, p. 237.

and in return engaged to protect the frontier from all inroads. We have spoken above (p. 177) of the Turkmens (Oghuz) who were settled in the district west and south-west of Isfījāb. Another branch of the Turkmens, under the leadership of Seljuk[1], separated from their fellow-tribesmen in the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya: Seljuk embraced Islam and freed the Muslim population of Jand from paying tribute to the infidels[2]. Seljuk died and was buried in Jand, but his successors evidently quarrelled with the Muslims whom they had liberated and went farther south. In the eleventh century we find a Muslim ruler in Jand showing a most hostile attitude to the successors of Seljuk[3]. The latter were received by the Sāmānids, and settled in the neighbourhood of Nūr (cf. p. 119). Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī[4] puts this in the year 375/985. Some years later Isfījāb was occupied by the Khān of Balāsāghūn, in the struggle between whom and the Sāmānids the Turkmens, as we shall see later, also took part.

Bughrā-Khān Hārūn b. Mūsā[5], the grandson of Satūq, and dignified with the title of "Light of the Empire and Support of the Summons to the Faith[6]" (Shihāb ad-Dawla wa Zāhir ad-Da'wa) met with hardly any opposition in Transoxania. Abū 'Alī concluded a secret pact with him for the division of the territories of the Sāmānids, by which Bughrā-Khān was to be left to occupy Transoxania, and the provinces south of the Amu-Darya were to remain under the rule of Abū 'Alī. Besides this Bughrā-Khān | received invitations also from many dihqāns, 270
who, as we have seen, played a fairly important part in the kingdom, but were nevertheless discontented with the government[7].

[1] The correct spelling is not Saljūq or Salčuq, in spite of the orthography adopted by modern scholars in Western Europe (English, French, and German alike), but Seljuk, as is shown by the spelling سلجك in such genuine Turkish monuments as the Kitāb-i Qorqūd and the materials collected in the Dīwān lughāt at-Turk of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (i, 397).

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 322.

[3] Baihaki, p. 856.

[4] *Journ. Asiat.*, 4, XI, 421: *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda*, ed. Browne, p. 434, trans., p. 93. See also Raverty, *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, p. 117.

[5] Thus in Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 132), by whom we are given the most detailed and apparently most reliable information on the genealogy of the Qarā-Khānids. According to Ibn al-Athīr (XI, 54) and 'Awfī (*Texts*, p. 84), the descendants of Mūsā, son of Satūq, formed a different branch of the Qarā-Khānids, to which Naṣr belonged; the former calls Bughrā-Khān Hārūn b. Sulaymān. The earliest sources, 'Utbī and Gardīzī, call Bughrā-Khān only "the son of an Īlak," and according to Jamāl Qarshī the father of Bughrā-Khān was only an Īlak at the time when another son of Satūq's, the grandfather of Naṣr, bore the title of Khān. Cf. also Hilāl, *Eclipse, &c.*, iii, 393: هرون بن ايلك

[6] We find the same titles on the coinage of Bughrā-Khān struck in Īlāq in 382/992, see A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 198.

[7] 'Utbī-Manīnī, I, 163 (طائفة من دهاقين ماوراء النهر): cf *Sredneaz. Vyestnik*, June, p. 33. The Persian translation (Nerchakhy, 155) has in place of "dihqāns" only "certain nobles of Transoxania": *Notices et Extraits*, IV, 352, "autres émirs."

We do not know the attitude of the priesthood to the first conqueror of Transoxania, but the historians' accounts of the piety of Bughrā-Khān[1] and of his chief supporters, Abū 'Alī and Fāiq[2], allow us to assume that he was received by them with the same goodwill that they subsequently showed to Naṣr. Tha'ālibī[3] mentions another adherent of Bughrā-khān, namely, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. 'Uthmān al-Wāthiqī, who was considered to be a descendant of the Caliph Wāthiq. The descendants of the Caliphs received a fixed pension both in their own dominions and in the Sāmānid state; Wāthiqī, however, had been unable to procure for himself either a pension or a lucrative post, in consequence of which he went over to the Turks and acquired such influence over their khān that the latter "was guided by his opinion and looked to him for everything." Wāthiqī persuaded his master to undertake a campaign in Transoxania, and Tha'ālibī consequently regards him as the chief author of the fall of the Sāmānid dynasty. After the conquest of Transoxania, Wāthiqī surrounded himself with a retinue of 300 ghulāms, and already began to dream that he would be proclaimed Caliph, and that Bughrā-Khān would rule Transoxania and Khurāsān as his vassal, but the illness and withdrawal of the Khān forced him to fly to 'Irāq. This last fact leads us to suppose that Tha'ālibī greatly exaggerated his importance[4]. It is more than probable that Wāthiqī was a nonentity of no more importance than other actual and reputed descendants of the 'Abbāsids in Khurāsān, and was only of importance in his own eyes. In the same year (992) Tha'ālibī saw at Bukhārā another descendant of the Caliphs, Ma'mūnī, who was in receipt of a pension from the Sāmānids, and heard from him an assurance that he would soon march on Baghdād, at the head of his numerous Khurāsān adherents, and seize the Caliph's throne[5]. |
271 Still less do we know of the attitude of the masses to this struggle between the old dynasty and the conquerors. According to 'Utbī[6] the population of Bukhārā on the withdrawal of the Turks took part in their pursuit, and welcomed with joy the return of Nūḥ; but we are not told of any resistance to Bughrā-Khān on his advance from Isfījāb to Samarqand and Bukhārā,

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 70.
[2] *Texts*, p. 56, 60 (Sam'ānī).
[3] *J. A.*, 5, iii, 339–41.
[4] Wāthiqī is also mentioned by the historians. From the narrative of Hilāl (*Eclipse, &c.*, iii, 393–7; trans., vi, 420–24), who gives the fullest account of him and his influence on Bughrā-Khān, but makes no mention of Naṣr, and confounds him with Bughrā-Khān, it would seem that Wāthiqī did not leave Transoxania until after the death of Naṣr and the accession of his brother Aḥmad (see below). Afterwards Wāthiqī again left Mesopotamia for the Eastern provinces, but was in the end arrested by order of Maḥmūd of Ghazna, and kept in "honourable confinement" until his death.
[5] *J. A.*, 5, iii, 333–9.
[6] Manīnī, i, 176; Nerchakhy, p. 161.

and his occupation of the capital of the Sāmānids. It is very probable that the people, who had been the chief sufferers in the constant strife, remained fairly calm over the change of dynasty. As the Sāmānids had been in financial straits from the days of Nūḥ b. Naṣr they were obliged to increase the taxes. In the "History of Bayhaq" there is an interesting passage on a tax which appears to us quite just, but which then caused great dissatisfaction, a tax, namely, on inheritance. In the final period of Sāmānid rule, it was decreed that on the death of an official of the dīwān, part of his property should pass to the crown; later on, in the district of Bayhaq at least, a law was introduced that on the death of each inhabitant who was not survived by sons, notwithstanding the existence of other heirs, a part of his property should be retained for the benefit of the crown; finally, this law was extended even to the property of those who left direct heirs[1].

The Hājib Āyach was sent against Bughrā-Khān, but was completely defeated and himself taken prisoner. The only possible saviour of the kingdom was Fāiq, who was pardoned, received in Bukhārā with honour, and dispatched to Samarqand to parry the attack of the enemy. Near Kharjang (see above, p. 248, note 3) he was defeated. This defeat was explained, probably not without reason, by the treason of the general. Nūḥ was obliged to abandon his capital, and in May 992[2] Bughrā-Khān entered Bukhārā. Fāiq went out to meet the conqueror, made his submission to him, and was appointed governor of Tirmidh and Balkh. In spite of the decay of Sāmānid dynasty, Bughrā-Khān, if Bayhaqī is to be believed, found abundant booty in the Bukhārā treasury. The Khān took up his quarters in | the 272 famous palace of Jū-i-Mūliyān (see p. 110). Meanwhile Nūḥ collected an army at Āmul, summoned 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr[3] from Khorezmia, and appointed him as his wazīr. As before, Abū 'Alī refused to come to the assistance of his sovereign, but at the same time a coolness arose between him and Bughrā-Khān, who, on consolidating his position at Bukhārā, had violated the agreement on the division of the Sāmānid territories, and began to write to Abū 'Alī as the rulers of Khurāsān were in the habit of writing to their sipahsālārs.[4] In view of this Abū 'Alī at length agreed to join Nūḥ with his army, but

[1] MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 3587, f. 75

[2] Exactly the same date (Rabī' I, 382) is given by two historians of the eleventh century, Gardīzī (*Texts*, p. 12) and Bayhaqī (p. 234), in consequence of which the account in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 67-8) of the two campaigns of Bughrā-Khān (382 and 383) must be rejected. In 'Utbī's work dates are not mentioned.

[3] In Gardīzī, by mistake, عبد العزيز. 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 170; *Not. et Extr.*, iv, 353) mentions also Abū 'Alī Bal'amī, who can scarcely, however, have been alive at this period See p. 10, note 1.

[4] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 177; Nerchakhy, p. 162.

demanded in return the title of "Walī of the Commander of the Faithful," which had till then belonged to the Sāmānids only[1]. Even to this condition Nūḥ gave his consent; but before the arrival of Abū 'Alī circumstances took a turn favourable to the Sāmānids, and Nūḥ was able to return to Bukhārā without the help of his undutiful viceroy. An illness (hemorrhoids) induced by the fruits and climate[2] of Bukhārā caused the Khān to retire first of all to Samarqand, whither he took with him the Sāmānid wazīr, Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. 'Īsā Dāmghānī[3]. 'Abd-al-'Azīz b. Nūh, the son of Nūḥ b. Naṣr, was left at Bukhārā, with a declaration from Bughrā-Khān that he restored to him the throne which belonged to him by right[4]. In this probably he had in view the will of Nūḥ b. Naṣr (see p. 249). From one passage in Ibn al-Athīr[5] it may be concluded that the retreat of the Khān was due also to the attacks of the Turkmens, whom Nūḥ had succeeded in attracting to his side; at any rate the Turkmens, together with the inhabitants of Bukhārā, now pursued the retiring army, extirpated the rearguard, and pillaged
273 the baggage[6]. | Under such conditions Bughrā-Khān was unable to keep his promise to support 'Abd-al-'Azīz against his enemies. On August 17th, 992[7], Nūḥ returned to Bukhārā, and 'Abd-al-'Azīz was blinded by his orders. The Khān's illness grew worse at Samarqand, and he died on the way to Turkestan, at a place called Quchqār-bāshī[8]. Thus Sāmānid rule was re-established at least in the basin of the Zarafshān. Deprived of his protector, Fāiq nevertheless made an attempt from Balkh to seize Bukhārā, but was defeated and retired to Merv, where he offered his help to his former enemy, Abū 'Alī. Fāiq's forces seem to have been still fairly considerable, as Abū 'Alī accepted his proposal with joy, although at first, in view of the victory of the Sāmānids, he had collected rich presents, the money for which, according to 'Utbī, was levied from the rich inhabitants of Khurāsān, in order to propitiate Nūḥ. The gifts were now presented to Fāiq. Against the alliance of two powerful vassals the Government found no other means than to have recourse to a third, who up to that time had taken no part in current events, but had made

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 174; Nerchakhy, p. 160.

[2] See for this Th'ālibī (*Yatīma*, Eastern ed., iv, 113, 316), who quotes the official Abu'l-Fath Aḥmad b. Muhammad b. Yūsuf, who had transferred from the service of the Sāmānids to that of Bughrā-Khān, and was a rival to the wazīr Dāmghānī. In Barbier de Meynard's translation (*J. A.*, 5, iii, 341) this official is called Abu'l-Faḍl.

[3] On whom see Gardīzī (f 133; Camb. MS., i. 107 a). The wazīr died in Samarqand 1st Rajab, 382 (2 Sept., 992).

[4] A mistake in Gardīzī; cf. *Texts*, p. 12, note 5.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 322.

[6] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 176; Nerchakhy, p. 161.

[7] Date in Baihaki (p. 234).

[8] *Texts*, p. 12. Perhaps the fortress of Qāchār-bāshī (or Quchqār) mentioned in the Shāh-Nāmah, cf. *Zapiski*, viii, 16; Barthold, *Zur Geschichte des Christentums*, p. 35; Marquart, *Osttürk. Dialektstudien*, p. 110.

use of the turbulent times to consolidate his rule in the southern part of Afghanistan.

Sabuktagīn [1], who by obliging genealogists was afterwards declared to be a descendant of the ancient Persian kings [2], was one of the number of infidel Turks [3] taken prisoner either by members of his own people, or by Sāmānid "warriors for the Faith." He had been taken to Khurāsān by slave dealers and bought at Nīshāpūr by the sipahsālār Altptagīn [4]. The merit of the young ghulām attracted the attention of his master from the first, and his promotion was consequently much more rapid than was usually the case [5]. | After the accession of Manṣūr, Sabuktagīn 274
followed his leader to Ghazna, where he rendered valuable service both to him and to his successors, the last of whom, Pīrī, had to retire in favour of Sabuktagīn who was proclaimed amīr of Ghazna on April 20, 977 [6]. Having gained renown by his victories in Afghanistan and in India he now appeared in Transoxania at the invitation of Nūḥ; an interview took place between them near Kish, when Sabuktagīn took the oath of allegiance to Nūḥ, and promised him help against his enemies. At the time of Nūḥ's sojourn at Āmul, he had been assisted by the Khwārazm-Shāh and amīr of Gurgānj (see p. 233); in order to reward them, Nūḥ gave the former the town of Abīward as an appanage, and the latter the town of Nasā. As a matter of fact these towns in Khurāsān were under the rule of Abū 'Alī, and it is evident that by this present Nūḥ wished to create new enemies for him. Abū 'Alī voluntarily relinquished Nasā, but firmly refused to allow the representative of the Khwārazm-Shāh to enter Abīward; by this means he strengthened the already existing differences between the two Khorezmian sovereigns and removed all danger to himself from that side. Military operations were undertaken in Khurāsān: the amīrs of Gūzgān and Gharjistān joined the army of Nūḥ and Sabuktagīn; Dārā b. Qābūs, the amīr of Gurgān, who was allied to Abū 'Alī, went over to Nūḥ during the battle, which ended in a complete victory for the Sāmānid forces (994) [7]. For this victory Sabuk-

[1] We keep to the accepted spelling of this name, although, as noted by Prof Noldeke in a private letter to me, such a combination of the Persian adjective *sabuk* (light, thoughtless) with the Turkish title *tagīn* (prince) appears very improbable. Etymologically the reading Su-beg-tegīn is more probable; the union of the two last titles is met with fairly often (*e.g. Texts*, p. 20 (from an anonymous historian of the twelfth century)), but we have not met with them joined to the word *su* (army). *Sabuk* is perhaps the Turkish *sebik* for *sewik*, "beloved." Marquart (*Osttürk. Dialektstudien*, p 50) spells, for reasons which he does not state, Sübuk-tigin.

[2] *Texts*, p. 158 (Ḥāfiẓ Abrū); *Siasset Nameh*, trad., p. 141.

[3] Baihaki, p. 107.

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 237–38.

[5] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 96 sq., trad., pp. 140 sq.

[6] Date in Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, p. 73).

[7] According to 'Utbī (Manīnī, p. 189) on a Wednesday in the middle of Ramaḍān 383, perhaps Ram. 13 = Nov. 1, 993.

tagīn received the title of honour of "Protector of the Faith and State" (Nāṣir ad-Dīn wa'd-Dawla) and his son Abu'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd the title of "Sword of the State" (Sayf ad-Dawla). Abū 'Alī and Fāiq retired to Gurgān: Maḥmūd replaced the former at Nīshāpūr and took measures for the re-establishment of peace and safety in Khurāsān, while Nūh returned to Bukhārā[1]. |

275 Abū 'Alī and Fāiq found a refuge in the Būyid territories and were allotted part of the revenues of the province of Gurgān, but any further support was firmly refused them. In the spring of 995[2] at Fāiq's wish and against Abū 'Alī's advice, it was decided to return to Khurāsān. They succeeded in defeating Mahmūd and in occupying Nīshāpūr, Ṭūs and some other towns. Neither of the rebels hoped for final success; each separately endeavoured to open communications with the government, and obtain a pardon for himself. The decisive battle, which ended in the complete victory of Sabuktagīn and his allies (Nūh himself was not present on this occasion), took place in the neighbourhood of Ṭūs. Both rebel leaders fled to Sarakhs and thence to Āmul, taking advantage of the fact that Sabuktagīn and his numerous army were not able to move equally rapidly through the desert. From Āmul both dispatched envoys to Bukhārā praying Nūh for forgiveness; the government returned a decided refusal to Fāiq's request, but Abū 'Alī was promised a full pardon and was instructed to go to Gurgānj and remain there with the amīr Abu'l-'Abbās Ma'mūn b. Muhammad. The aim of the government, to separate the forces of the rebels, was fully attained. Abū 'Alī accepted pardon and set out for Khorezmia along the bank of the Amu-Darya[3]. Fāiq, left alone, determined to enter Transoxania without Nūḥ's consent: a division sent against him, under the command of the hājib Begtūzūn, came up with him near Nasaf but did not attack him, and Fāiq was successful in gaining the Qarā-Khānid territories, where he was cordially received. Meanwhile Abū 'Alī's forces

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, 1, 180–99; Nerchakhy, pp. 164–73 Gardīzī's account of these events contain nothing new except a narrative (*f.* 135; Camb. MS., f. 108 b) on the cunning of Sabuktagīn, who, aware of the proposed treason of Dārā, said in the presence of one of Abū 'Alī's spies that Dārā, Fāiq, and Abū 'Alī's brother Abu'l-Qāsim, had promised to come over to the side of the government at the time of the battle, and that one of them had promised to deliver Abū 'Alī himself into Sabuktagīn's hands. Therefore, when Dārā went over to the enemy, Abū 'Alī lost faith also in his two other allies.

[2] According to 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 205) in Rabī' I, 385 (began 5th April, 995).

[3] Thus in 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 199–219; Nerchakhy, pp. 174–86). According to Gardīzī (f. 136; Camb. MS, f 109 b) Abū 'Alī fled to Rayy after the battle, where he received a pension of 50,000 dirhams per month from the Būyid 'Alī (*i. e.* from the famous Fakhr ad-Dawla), but nevertheless he returned to Nīshāpūr on account of a love affair (زنی را زیبا), was seized by Maḥmūd, and escaped from prison to Khorezmia.

were dispersed by the Khwārazm-shāh Abū 'Abdallāh near Hazārasp; and Abū 'Alī himself was taken prisoner (Saturday, Sept. 19, 996)[1]. Of his supporters the ḥājib Ilmangū alone reached Gurgānj. The amīr Mā'mūn took advantage of this to go to the rescue of his protégé, and at the same time make an end of his ancient enemy. The Khwārazm-shāh Abū 'Abdallāh was thrown into prison and his territories and | title were trans- 276
ferred to Ma'mūn. By the intercession of Ma'mūn a full reconciliation was effected between Abū 'Alī and the Bukhārā Government. Abū 'Alī returned to Bukhārā, where he was met with much ceremony by the wazīr 'Abdallāh b. 'Uzayr, the ḥājib Begtūzūn and other nobles, and received by Nūḥ in the palace on the Rīgistān (see p. 110), but subsequently he was confined in the citadel of Bukhārā by order of Nūḥ together with eighteen of his brothers and military leaders[2].

In the same year a fresh invasion of the Qarā-Khānids took place. As Nūḥ was now the ruler of only a part of Transoxania, he could not oppose the Turks in considerable strength and was obliged to apply for assistance to Sabuktagīn. The latter, who was then at Balkh, on receiving Nūḥ's summons, entered Transoxania with a large army, which was joined by the amīrs of Gūzgān, Ṣaghāniyān, and Khuttal. Sabuktagīn encamped between Kish and Nasaf and requested Nūḥ to join his army. The wazīr 'Abdallāh b. 'Uzayr persuaded the Amīr that for the head of the Sāmānids to join the powerful army of Sabuktagīn with the wretched force at his disposal would be a humiliation for the throne, and in consequence of this Nūḥ refused to grant the request. Sabuktagīn thereupon dispatched a division of 20,000 men to Bukhārā under the command of his son Maḥmūd and his brother Bughrāchuk. This was sufficient to force the Sāmānid government to all concessions. The wazīr was dismissed and surrendered to Sabuktagīn, whose adherent Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abū Zayd was appointed in his stead. At Sabuktagīn's request Nūḥ surrendered Abū 'Alī and his ḥājib Ilmangū along with the wazīr[3]; all these were im-

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 224, Saturday, 1st Ramaḍān, 386, but this date is probably incorrect Ram. 386 began on Thursday, Sept. 17. See note 3 below.

[2] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 219–31; Nerchakhy, pp. 186–91; *Texts*, pp 12, 13; Gardīzī, f. 137; Camb. MS., f. 110a (where the number of those arrested with Abū 'Alī is given).

[3] According to Gardīzī (Camb. MS., f. 110a; in the Oxford MS. there is a gap here) this happened in Sha'bān 386, *i. e.* in Aug. or Sept. 996, which is contradicted by the date quoted above for the imprisonment of Abū 'Alī in Khorezmia. It is very probable that in 'Utbī 386 is a mistake for 385, and that Abū 'Alī's imprisonment in Khorezmia occurred on Sept. 28, 995 (according to Wüstenfeld's tables the first day of Ramaḍān 385 was Sunday, Sept. 29, 995); otherwise too short an interval of time is left for the succeeding events before Nūḥ's death. Besides this in 386 there were already rumours among the people of the murder of Abū 'Alī (see Sam'ānī, *s. v.* السيمجورى, facs., f. 323b).

prisoned in the fortress of Gardīz. Sabuktagīn concluded a peace with the Qarā-Khānids, by which it was agreed that the frontier
277 between the Sāmānid and Qarā-Khānid territories should be the Qaṭwān steppe. Thus the whole basin of the Syr-Darya remained under the rule of the Qarā-Khānids and at their request Fāiq was appointed governor of Samarqand[1].

Sabuktagīn of course remained complete master of all the provinces situated south of the Amu-Darya and Nūḥ ceased to have any concern with the events which occurred in Khurāsān. In Transoxania the wazīr Abū Naṣr endeavoured to restore order by severity and "washed out blood with blood,"[2] but within five months he was killed by ghulāms. Fearing that his protector Sabuktagīn would accuse the government of complicity with the murderers, Nūḥ condemned the latter to cruel executions and sent an envoy to Sabuktagīn with the request that he would nominate a successor to the murdered man[3]. Sabuktagīn left the choice to the sovereign himself. The choice fell on Abu'l-Muzaffar Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Barghashī who remained in office until Nūḥ's death, which followed on Friday, Rajab 14, 387 (July 23, 997)[4].

The oath of allegiance to Nūḥ's son and successor, Abu'l-Ḥārith Manṣūr, was not taken (according to Sam'ānī's[5] account) until November 997. According to Bayhaqī[6] he was distinguished by great qualities of mind and character, but though in course of time he restored order in his dominions by his severity, he was unable to save the dynasty. The power remained in the hands of Fāiq and the wazīr Barghashī. Abū 'Alī and his adherents perished in prison under Sabuktagīn[7]; only the wazīr 'Abdallah b. 'Uzayr, for what reason is unknown, was liberated, and allowed to return to Transoxania. At his instigation Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn b. Mut Isfījābī (probably belonging to the family of the rulers of Isfījāb, see
278 above, p. 241, note 10) raised a revolt and summoned to his assistance the Qarā-Khānid ruler of Transoxania, the īlak Naṣr. The īlak promised him help and set out for Samarqand but here he ordered the two chief rebels to be seized; on the other hand, Fāiq, who had been summoned to the īlak's camp, was received

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 231–41; Nerchakhy, pp. 191–5.

[2] The expression is 'Utbī's (Manīnī, i, 241 يغسل دما بدم; Nerchakhy, p. 196).

[3] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 250; Nerchakhy, pp. 199–200.

[4] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 255 (لثلث عشرة ليلة خلت): in the Persian translation (Nerchakhy, p. 201) and in other Persian sources سيزدهم رجب, but Friday was more correctly the 14th.

[5] *S. v.* السامانی, facs., f. 286 b (the last words of the article).

[6] Baihaki, p. 803. The historical facts scarcely justify this characterization.

[7] Cf. Sam'ānī, *loc cit* The story that the body of the pious Abū 'Alī did not suffer corruption witnesses to the attitude of the priesthood towards the Sīmjūrids.

with great honour and dispatched to Bukhārā at the head of 3,000 horsemen. Manṣūr left his capital and fled to Āmul. On occupying Bukhārā, Fāiq declared himself the faithful servant of the Sāmānids and induced Manṣūr to return[1]. The other ḥājib Begtūzūn was sent as sipahsālār to Khurāsān, which Maḥmūd had been obliged to leave on the death of his father Sabuktagīn, in the same year 997, and the accession to the throne of his younger brother Ismā'īl, who was unwilling to resign the power to his elder brother.

In order to avert a new civil war, Manṣūr endeavoured to restore concord between the chief nobles, especially between Fāiq and Begtūzūn. In spite of this Fāiq secretly persuaded Abu'l-Qāsim Sīmjūrī, the ruler of Quhistān, to attack Begtūzūn, but to his great dissatisfaction this conflict ended in a victory for Begtūzūn (in March 998)[2], who thereafter concluded a peace with his opponent and in July 998 returned as conquerer to Bukhārā. This was followed by a dispute between Fāiq and the wazīr Barghashī, who took refuge with the Amīr himself. On this occasion also Manṣūr unsuccessfully appeared in the role of peacemaker. Fāiq demanded the surrender of his enemy and rudely reproached the Amīr. Finally by the mediation of the Bukharan shaykhs an agreement was arrived at; Barghashī was deprived of the office of wazīr and banished to Gūzgān[3]. The last wazīrs of the Sāmānids, according to Gardīzī, were Abu'l-Qāsim 'Abbās b. Muhammad Barmakī, and Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ahmad | Jayhānī[4] (probably the son of Abū 'Abdallāh 279
Aḥmad). 'Utbī[5] mentions also Abu'l-Ḥasan Hāmulī who had been dispatched to Bukhārā as envoy of Maḥmūd, but while there accepted the office of wazīr from the Sāmānids. These wazīrs had apparently no influence on the march of events.

The most difficult task of all was to reconcile the interests of Begtūzūn with those of Maḥmūd, who by this time had gained a victory over his brother Ismā'īl, had seized Ghazna, and now did not wish to retire in favour of Begtūzūn from the viceroyalty of Khurāsān. In vain did Manṣūr endeavour to indemnify

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 268–71; Nerchakhy, pp. 205–6; Gardīzī, f. 137; Camb. MS., f. 110 b.

[2] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 287, Rabī' II (April), but in Reynolds's translation (p. 221) Rabī' II: so also in Gardīzī (f. 138; Camb. MS., f. 111 a) and in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 97).

[3] *Ibid.*, i, 289; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 369. According to Bayhaqī pp 442–5) the wazīr foresaw the fall of the dynasty and therefore decided to get out of the business himself in good time, preserving his possessions. With this object in view he pretended he had broken his leg, and with the help of the doctor bribed by him, he contrived that the Amīr should relieve him of his office, and retired to the property he had acquired in Gūzgān not long before. Having arrived there he proceeded to sell it, and with "a light heart and cured leg" settled at Nīshāpūr, where for many years after he led a luxurious life and enjoyed great honour.

[4] In both MSS. (Oxford MS., f. 138; Camb. MS., f. 111 a) الحيانى.

[5] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 292; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 370.

Maḥmūd by appointing him governor of Balkh, Tirmidh, Herāt, Bust and other towns; Maḥmūd insisted on the viceroyalty of the whole of Khurāsān for himself and forcibly compelled his rival to evacuate Nīshāpūr[1]. Manṣūr, together with Fāiq, entered Khurāsān with an army, but, according to Bayhaqī, all still hoped to settle the matter by agreement. This time the Amīr's indecision proved fatal to him. Begtūzūn, who had joined him with his army at Sarakhs, attributed his indecision to a secret intention to enter into an agreement with Mahmūd. Fāiq fully shared this apprehension, and feared, not without reason, that he and Begtūzūn might be overtaken by the fate of Abū 'Alī[2]. In consequence of this they decided to forestall Manṣūr: on the evening of Feb. 1, 999[3], the Amīr was deposed, a week later deprived of his sight, and sent to Bukhārā. His younger brother Abu'l-Fawāris 'Abd-al-Malik was proclaimed his successor.

Mahmūd gave himself out as the avenger of the deposed Amīr, but nevertheless very soon came to an understanding with his enemies, renounced Nīshāpūr in favour of Begtūzūn and kept Balkh and Herāt for himself, *i.e.* he accepted the same conditions which had formerly been offered him by Manṣūr. Evidently he was induced to do this by the numerical predominance of his enemies, with whom Abu'l-Qāsim Sīmjūrī had united his forces. In spite of this obviously disadvantageous agreement, Mahmūd
280 was so pleased with it that as a mark of his joy | he bestowed 2,000 dīnārs in alms to the poor[4] (in May 999). The agreement, however, was soon violated; Mahmūd's rearguard was treacherously attacked, after which the war was renewed. Maḥmūd succeeded in gaining a brilliant victory which delivered all Khurāsān to his rule. The letter in which Mahmūd notified the Caliph al-Qādir of his victory has been preserved[5]; in it Maḥmūd affirms that the sole cause of the war was the refusal of the Sāmānids to acknowledge the Caliph. Mahmūd "inherited the dominions of the Sāmānids" (as it is expressed by 'Utbī) in the provinces south of the Amu-Darya. How much the circumstances had changed is evident from the fact that Maḥmūd did not now take the title of sipahsālār, but himself appointed his brother Naṣr as sipahsālār of Khurāsān. 'Abd-al-Malik and Fāiq fled to Bukhārā, where, after a vain attempt to renew the struggle with Maḥmūd, Begtūzūn also joined them. In the summer of the same year Fāiq died, after

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 291–4; *Notices et Extraits, loc. cit.*

[2] Baihaki, pp. 803–4.

[3] Identical date in Baihaki (p. 804) and Gardīzī (f. 138; Camb. MS, f. 111 a): Wednesday, 12th Ṣafar, 389.

[4] Thus according to Gardīzī; in Baihaki (p. 805) there is mention only of the distribution of large sums.

[5] Hilāl, *Eclipse, &c.*, iii, 341–5; trans., vi, 366–70. The battle took place near Merv on Tuesday, 3rd Jumādā 1, 389 (16th May, 999).

which the Īlak Naṣr[1] decided to put an end to the last remnants of Sāmānid rule in Transoxania. According to the accounts of contemporaries and eye witnesses[2] the Sāmānids determined to show their enemies a desperate resistance. By order of the government the khaṭībs of the mosques of Bukhārā sought to persuade the people to take up arms in defence of their dynasty. At that time the Bukharans, like the inhabitants of Transoxania generally, still bore arms; had the Sāmānids been able to organize a national movement in their favour, it would have raised a serious obstacle to the Qarā-Khānids, although it would scarcely have averted the fall of the dynasty. The sermons of the khaṭībs however produced no effect. The Sāmānids, not excluding Ismā'īl himself[3], had never tried to acquire the confidence of the masses, and to make them a mainstay of their throne, as is witnessed by their persecution of the Shi'ite movement, which undoubtedly bore a democratic character.

We know that the Shī'ite sect also under the later Sāmānids had secret followers in Transoxania, to the number of whom belonged, among others, the father and brother of the famous Avicenna[4]. The sympathies of the Sunni priesthood, as we have seen, in spite of all the solicitude of the Sāmānids for religion and its representatives[5], were also enlisted not on the side of the | dynasty, but on the side of its enemies, such as Abū 281
'Alī and Fāiq. The population, unpersuaded by the preaching of the khaṭībs, turned "to those who were regarded as faqīhs by them," *i.e.*, according to the well-grounded surmise of Baron v. R. Rosen, to the representatives of the unofficial priesthood, who always possessed much greater influence with the people than the khaṭībs and imāms appointed by the government. As always happened in analogous cases[6], the superstitious nomads, who had embraced Islām comparatively recently, showed a much more fervent respect for religion and its ministers than did the cultured administration. Therefore, in spite of Baron Rosen's opinion, we have scarcely grounds for assuming that the faqīhs were "undoubtedly" bribed by the Qarā-Khānids. However this may have been, the population followed the advice of its

[1] He is called in Gardīzī (Camb. MS., f. 111 b) "brother of the Khān."
[2] Hilāl, *Eclipse, &c.*, III, 372 sq.; trans., VI, 400 sq.
[3] See the characteristic account of him in 'Awfī (*Texts*, pp. 90–91).
[4] Ibn Abi Useibia, ed. A. Muller, Konigsberg, 1884, II, 2; Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā*, ed. Lippert, p. 413.
[5] Cf. the interesting account given by Prof. V. A. Zhukovsky of a religious manual in the Arabic and Persian languages composed in the time of the Sāmānids (*Zapiski*, XII, 65). The Abu'l-Qāsim Samarqandī mentioned in his account is called, along with Abū Manṣūr Māturīdī, the chief defender of orthodoxy against the Mu'tazilites and Karrāmites (*Texts*, p. 50, from Qandīya, cf. Vyatkin's translation in *Handbook of Samarkand*, VIII, p. 263).
[6] Cf. Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, p. 364.

teachers and decided that "when the struggle is for the goods of this world" Muslims are not obliged to "lay themselves out to be murdered." The īlak announced that he was going to Bukhārā only as a friend and protector of the Sāmānids; the population met the conquerors quite passively, and the leaders of the armed forces of Bukhārā, Begtūzūn, and Yanāltagīn, voluntarily appeared in the conqueror's camp, where they were arrested. On Monday[1], October 23, 999, the īlak occupied Bukhārā without opposition and seized the Sāmānid treasury. 'Abd-al-Malik and all the other members of the dynasty were dispatched to Ūzgand, whither the īlak himself returned, leaving his own governors in Bukhārā and Samarqand. Thus, amid general indifference, was the downfall of the famous dynasty accomplished. It is doubtful if any one at the time realized the importance of the historical event, which had for ever put an end to the dominion of the native Aryan element[2].

We possess no accurate data to solve the question who stood at the head of the dynasty of the Qarā-Khānids after the death of Bughrā-Khān Hārūn. It may have been the father of Naṣr, Arslān-Khān 'Alī, who, according to Jamāl Qarshī[3], died a martyr's death in January 998: the nature of his death may be guessed
282 from | the epithet Ḥarīq ("the burned") applied to him. Naṣr, who bore the title of Arslān-īlak, was in any case only vassal-ruler of Transoxania and lived at Ūzgand. In the kingdom of the Qarā-Khānids, as in all nomad empires, the conception of patrimonial property was carried over from the domain of personal law to that of state law. The kingdom was considered the property of the whole family of the Khān and was divided into a number of appanages, the large ones being in turn sub-divided into many small ones. The authority of the head of the empire was on occasion entirely disavowed by powerful vassals. The partition system was, as always, the cause of personal feuds and of a constant change of rulers; therefore it is impossible for us to determine with accuracy the chronology of the reigns of the separate members of the dynasty. Even the coins of the Qarā-Khānids, which have come down to us in fairly large numbers, give no assistance in solving this question, as owing to the lack of accurate historical data we often do not know whether the different titles mentioned on one and the same coin represent one person or several.

[1] Thus correctly in Gardīzī (f. 139; Camb. MS., f 111 b); 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 319; Nerchakhy, p. 216) and the later sources (Mirkhond, *Samanides*, p. 197) give Tuesday by mistake.

[2] Cf. the remark of Prof. Noldeke in *Grundriss der iran. Philologie*, ii, 152, note 6, "eine der traurigsten Katastrophen in der Geschichte jener Lander."

[3] *Texts*, pp. 132–3.

In the early years of the eleventh century the Qarā-Khānids in Transoxania had to suppress a movement stirred up by the Sāmānid Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl, one of the brothers of Manṣūr and 'Abd-al-Malik who had been imprisoned at Ūzgand, whence he had succeeded in escaping in woman's clothes[1]. Ismā'īl, who took the title of Muntaṣir, *i.e.* "the victorious," went to Bukhārā and thence to Khorezmia, where a considerable number of adherents gathered round him, probably not without the connivance of the Khwārazm-shāh Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī, son and successor of Ma'mūn, killed by his soldiers in 997[2]. The ḥājib Arslān-Yālū was put in command of the army collected by Muntaṣir, and succeeded in driving Ja'far-tagīn, the Qarā-Khānid governor of Bukhārā, out of the town. The remnants of the defeated army united with the army of the governor of Samarqand, Tagīn-khān, but the latter also was defeated by the Sāmānid armies near the bridge across the Zarafshān and was forced to flee. Muntaṣir returned | to Bukhārā[3] where, if 283
'Utbī[4] is to be believed, he was received with joy by the inhabitants. In spite of these successes it proved impossible to face the main forces of the īlak; on his approach Muntaṣir and Arslān-Yālū fled through Āmul to Persia. Their struggle with Maḥmūd and his brother Naṣr, in spite of some temporary successes, also fell out disastrously. Muntaṣir ascribed the blame to his principal assistant, the ḥājib Arslān-Yālū, with whom he was already dissatisfied for his too independent conduct of affairs, and ordered him to be killed[5]. When the last forces of Muntaṣir had been destroyed by Naṣr, the pretender returned to Transoxania in the year 1003 and sought assistance from the Ghuzz (Turkmens). According to Gardīzī[6], it was on this occasion that the Ghuzz leader Payghū (probably to be read Yabghū) first embraced Islām, but there is more reason for thinking that this was the son of Seljuk, who had already, as we have seen, rendered assistance to the Sāmānids in their struggle with the Qarā-Khānids. Counting on rich booty, the Ghuzz willingly rallied to Muntaṣir and enabled him to defeat the army of Subāshī-tagīn on the bank of the Zarafshān, and subsequently that of the īlak himself near Samarqand (Summer 1003), when eighteen of his commanders were taken prisoner. The Ghuzz resolutely refused to hand over the prisoners to Muntaṣir and kept them in their own hands, evidently in the hope of holding them to ransom, but Muntaṣir

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 320; Nerchakhy, p. 217. In Lane Poole's book and in my translation (*Mohammedan Dynasties*, pp. 132, 133) he is called Ibrāhīm by mistake.
[2] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 254 sq.; Nerchakhy, p. 201.
[3] Probably this occurred in 1000; to this year (A. H. 390) belongs one of the coins minted by Muntaṣir at Bukhārā (cf. A. Markov, *Catalogue*, p. 169).
[4] Manīnī, i, 323; Nerchakhy, p. 218.
[5] Manīnī, i, 329; Nerchakhy, p. 221.
[6] *Texts*, p. 13. In 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 335 sq.; Nerchakhy, p. 222) with less detail.

suspected them of wishing to enter into communication with the īlak and decided to abandon them. In the late autumn of 1003 he crossed the Amu-Darya on the ice at Darghān with a small force (300 horse and 400 infantry) and arrived at Āmul.

In 1004 he made an attempt to establish himself in Nasā and Abīward, but was defeated by an army sent by the Khwārazm-Shāh at the request of the inhabitants. Amongst his adherents who perished in this battle was the son of Tāsh[1]. Muntaṣir with the remainder of his army appeared for the third time in Transoxania, and although defeated by the governor of Bukhārā | 284 established himself in a fortified position at Nūr, whence he attacked the enemy, who were at Dabūsīya. This time the battle ended in a victory for Muntaṣir, after which a national movement in favour of the Sāmānids finally took shape. The leader of the Ghāzīs of Samarqand, Ḥārith, known as Ibn 'Alamdār (literally "son of the standard-bearer") joined Muntaṣir with 3,000 soldiers, while the shaykhs[2] of the town armed 300 ghulāms, and the Ghuzz also again joined his army. With these forces he succeeded in Sha'bān 394 (May–June 1004) in defeating near Būrnamadh the main forces of the īlak, or even, if Gardīzi[3] be believed, the army of the "Great Khān." But this triumph did not last long. The Khān returned with fresh forces and offered battle in the Hunger Steppe between Dīzak and Khāwas. The Ghuzz, satisfied with the plunder they had gained at Būrnamadh, returned to their nomad camps and took no part in this battle; while it was proceeding, one of Muntaṣir's captains, Ḥasan b. Tāq, went over to the īlak with 5,000 men. Muntaṣir again fled to Khurāsān, whence for the fourth time he returned to Transoxania, lured by the promises of his relative, the Sāmānid Ibn Surkhak, who was living at Bukhārā. The latter had a secret understanding with the īlak that he should endeavour to tempt Muntaṣir into Transoxania by promising him his co-operation. On the way to Bukhārā, Muntaṣir was abandoned by his soldiers, who transferred their allegiance to Sulaymān and Ṣāfī, the ḥājibs of the īlak; the remainder of Muntaṣir's army was surrounded by enemies and the latter seized all the crossings of the Amu-Darya. Muntaṣir succeeded in escaping with only eight followers, but his brother and adherents were taken prisoner and dispatched to Ūzgand. Muntaṣir himself was killed at the beginning of 1005[4] by the chief of one of the Arab tribes living in the neighbourhood of Merv.

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, 1, 340; Nerchakhy, p. 225.

[2] In the Arab original (Manīnī, i, 341) مشايخ; in the Persian translation خواجكان.

[3] *Texts*, p 13. The size of Ibn 'Alamdār's division is put here at only 1,000 men.

[4] According to Gardīzī (f. 142; Camb. MS., f. 114 a) in Rabī' II, 395; according to 'Utbī (Manīnī, i, 346; Nerchakhy, p. 228) Rabī' I.

After the death of the last representative of the Sāmānid dynasty there remained only the question of the division of the spoils between the Qarā-Khānids and Maḥmūd. Mahmūd's solemn accession to the throne, | as an independent ruler, occurred 285
in the same month as the entry of the īlak's army into Bukhārā, *i.e.* in Dhu'l-Qa'da 389 (Oct.–Nov. 999). The new "Walī of the Commander of the Faithful" received from the Caliph Qādir a diploma of investiture with Khurāsān, a crown, and the titles of "Right hand of the State, and trusted representative of the religious community"[1] (Yamīn ad-Dawla wa Amīn al-Milla). On his side Mahmūd introduced in Khurāsān the khuṭba in the name of the Caliph Qādir, who had been raised to the throne by the Būyids in 991 but was not recognized by the Sāmānids[2]. Mahmūd surrounded himself with still greater pomp than the Sāmānids; under him the title of "sulṭān" was brought into use, at any rate in court circles. Contrary to the accounts of the historians[3] it cannot be maintained that this word, which originally signified "authority, government" and in particular the government of the lawful Caliph, was never applied to individual rulers before Mahmūd; in this sense it is met with in Ṭabarī[4]. The title of Sulṭān was also borne by the Fāṭimids, the astronomical tables of Ibn Yūnus[5] being dedicated to "the Commander of the Faithful, Abū 'Alī al-Manṣūr, Sulṭān of Islām, the Imām al-Ḥākim-bi-amri'llāh" (996–1021). Maqdisī[6] conversed "with sulṭāns and wazīrs," and he says of one small town in Central Asia that the "larger part of the inhabitants were infidels but its sulṭān was a Muhammadan." Mahmūd was called Sulṭān by the court historians and poets, and probably also by the writers of official documents; in ordinary life he, like his successors, continued to be called Amīr. In Bayhaqī the different persons in their conversation constantly call Maṣ'ūd the Amīr; Gardīzī scarcely | ever makes use of the word "sulṭān," 286
nor is it met with on the coins of the early Ghaznevids[7].

The Qarā-Khānids also declared themselves to be "clients (mawlā) of the Commander of the Faithful"[8] at any rate in

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 317; Gardīzī, f. 140. A third title, "Refuge of the State and of Islām" (Kahf ad-Dawla wa'l-Islām) was, according to Gardīzī (f. 158), received by Mahmūd only in 1026. The anecdote related in Niẓam al-Mulk (*Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 131–6, trad., pp. 193–200) has probably no historical foundation.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 103; Hilāl, *Eclipse, &c.*, iii, 341; trans., vi, 366; cf. *Trudi*, i, 234.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 92, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 75–6; *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p 44; trad., p. 68.

[4] Ṭabarī, iii, 1894, where the presence of the Sulṭān at the battle is mentioned.

[5] Leyden MS., no. 143 (on it see *Catalogus codicum orient. Bibl. Acad. Lugduno-Batavae*, iii, 88).

[6] *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 44, 275. [7] *Mohammedan Dynasties*, p. 286, note.

[8] These words are already found on Bukharan coins of 390 (1,000) (A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 198).

Transoxania, where from the earliest years of their rule the dynasty began to coin money in the name of the Caliph Qādir[1]. The īlak Naṣr bears on his coins the title of "Protector of the Truth" (Nāṣir al-Ḥaqq). He came to an agreement with Maḥmūd while the struggle with Muntaṣir was still in progress; in 1001 Mahmūd dispatched the Shāfi'ite imām Abū Ṭayyib Sahl b. Muḥammad Ṣa'lūkī and the governor of Sarakhs Ṭughānchik as ambassadors to Ūzgand. Naṣr received them amicably and sent back precious gifts to the Sultan by them; the produce of mines, musk, horses, and camels, slaves of both sexes, white falcons, black fur, horns of the "khutuww,"[2] pieces of nephritus and precious objects from China. Maḥmūd took the daughter of Naṣr to wife, and a pact was concluded on the same conditions as the former pact between Bughrā-Khān and Abū 'Alī, *i. e.* the Amu-Darya[3] was accepted as the frontier between the two kingdoms. Peace was soon broken by the Qarā-Khānids. Maḥmūd had taken on himself the obligation of making an expedition to India every year[4]; during one of these campaigns, in 1006, when he was at Multān, the Qarā-Khānids dispatched two divisions to Khurāsān, of which the first under the command of Subāshī-tagīn was to occupy Nīshāpūr and Ṭūs, and the second under Ja'far-tagīn, Balkh. Both divisions accomplished their object; the inhabitants of Balkh showed an obstinate resistance, in retaliation for which their city was given up to pillage[5], but at Nīshāpūr the attitude of the population toward the invaders was entirely passive, while the aristocracy[6], as in Transoxania, took their side. On receiving news of the invasion Maḥmūd quickly returned to Ghazna and forced Ja'far-
287 tagīn to | retire from Balkh to Tirmidh. Subāshī-tagīn was likewise unable to maintain the struggle with Mahmūd and his leaders, and after dispatching his baggage train to the Khwārazm-shāh 'Alī[7], regained Transoxania with but a negligible fraction

[1] From 393/1003 (*ibid.*, p. 200).

[2] *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, iv, 222, خُرْتٌ. This is now explained as walrus and narwhal ivory, cf. T'oung Pao, xiv (1913), pp. 315–70 (B. Laufer and P. Pelliot; cf. now B Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, 565 sq.); J. Ruska in *Der Islam*, v, 239 (another opinion expressed by the same author, *ibid.*, iv, 163 sq.); G. Ferrand, *Relation de voyages, &c.*, pp. 679 sq. The Chinese word is hu-tu.

[3] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 28–32; Gardīzī, f. 140; Camb. MS, f. 113 a.

[4] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 318.

[5] Baihakī, p. 688; *Texts*, p. 157 (Ḥāfiẓ Abrū).

[6] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 77: ومايلهم كثير من اعيان خراسان.

[7] Wilken, in his translation of Mīrkhwānd (*Mirchondi Historia Gaznevidarum*, p. 163), ascribes the dispatch of the baggage to Khorezmia to Arslān-Jādhib, but the text (*ibid.*, p. 31) does not require this rendering. This error was carried over into the works of Sachau (*Zur Geschichte, &c.*, ii, 8) and Prof. Veselovsky (*Otcherk istoriko-geograf. svyedyenii o Khiviskom Khanstvye*, p. 45). Notwithstanding Sachau's note, Reynolds is quite correct in this case: cf. MS. As. Mus., no. 510, f. 98, and *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 385.

of his army, having lost his brother and 900 soldiers as prisoners. In order to divert Mahmūd from Subāshī, the īlak dispatched Ja'far-tagīn to Balkh for the second time with 6,000 soldiers; but this division was annihilated on the bank of the Amu-Darya by Mahmūd's brother Naṣr[1]. Gardīzī[2] gives some details of one of these battles on the bank of the Amu-Darya, where an attack was made on the remains of the Turkish army. Mahmūd's soldiers "sang a Turkish song to a Khotanese melody;" on hearing the sounds the Turks threw themselves in terror into the river, where part were drowned. Mahmūd prevented his troops from pursuing them, fearing that the enemy would be filled with the courage of despair, and that the issue of the conflict would be changed.

To the īlak's reproaches his commanders, we are told, answered that "it was impossible to fight with these elephants, weapons and men[3]." The īlak resolved to take his revenge on Maḥmūd for the defeat, and in the following year renewed the campaign with stronger forces; he summoned "the dihqāns of Transoxania"[4] to his assistance and concluded an alliance with his kinsman Qadir-Khān[5] Yūsuf, the ruler of Khotan. 'Utbī gives a detailed description of the appearance of these Turks "with broad faces, small eyes, flat noses, little hair (in their beards), iron swords, and black clothing." A battle took place near the Shaikhiyān bridge, four farsakhs[6] from Balkh, according to Gardīzī on Sunday 22nd Rabī' II, 398 (Jan. 4, 1008). Mahmūd's army included 500 elephants which the Turks did not understand how to fight and which, judging from the historians' account, mainly determined | the issue of the battle. 288
The Qarā-Khānid army was completely defeated and a considerable number of his soldiers were drowned in the river during the flight[7].

This battle ended the aggressive movement of the Qāra-Khānids on Khurāsān. Further combined action was rendered

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 77–82; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 384–7

[2] *Texts*, pp. 13–14. Unfortunately the text is greatly mutilated in both the Oxford and Cambridge MSS.

[3] Gardīzī, f. 144; Camb. MS., f 116 a: بسیار سرهنکان کفتند که با آن فیلان وسلاح وآلت ومردان هیچکس مقاومت نتواند کرد.

[4] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 83: واستنفر دهاقین ما وراء النهر.

[5] The word قدر in the title قدر خان is not, of course, the Arabic substantive, but a Turkish adjective; cf. Radloff, *Versuch eines Worterbuches*, &c., ii, 326. The spelling قَدِر is given by Mahmūd Kāshgharī, i, 304, where the title is explained by الجبّار الصعب من الملوك.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 135), 2 farsakhs.

[7] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 83–6; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 386–7; Gardīzī, f. 144–5, Camb. MS., f. 116 a–b.

impossible by disputes among the Qarā-Khānids themselves. The īlak's elder brother [1], Ṭughān-Khān of Kāshghar, concluded an alliance with Maḥmūd against his brother; the latter projected an invasion of Kāshghar from Ūzgand but was forced by the deep snow to retrace his steps. After this, both sides sent envoys to Maḥmūd, who assumed with success the role of arbitrator in their quarrels; at the same time he endeavoured to impress the envoys by the brilliance of his court and received them in solemn audience, surrounded by his guards in resplendent garments. From 'Utbī's account, it may be inferred that this event took place in 402/1011–12.

According to 'Utbī [2] the īlak died in 493/1012–13 and was succeeded in Transoxania by his brother Ṭughān-Khān. The clearing up of the history of the Qarā-Khānids presents great difficulty, as we have already seen; on the basis of numismatic data Dorn [3] came to the conclusion that Transoxania was conquered by two brothers, Nāṣir al-Ḥaqq Naṣr, and Quṭb ad-Dawla [4] Aḥmad, of whom Naṣr was the elder and therefore occupied the first place, but Aḥmad survived his brother. Coins with the name of Naṣr b. 'Alī [5] are extant, dated down to 401/1010–11. We do not know whether his successor also took the title of Nāṣir al-Ḥaqq; if not, it must be assumed that he reigned till 406/1015–16 [6]. Coins with the name of Aḥmad b. 'Alī come down to 407/1016–17. It is difficult to determine whether the rule of Ṭughān-Khān of Kāshghar extended in reality to Trans-
289 oxania, | as neither the year nor the mint-city [7] is found on the coins of this Khān which have come down to us. Ṭughān-Khān as "elder" brother was probably the nominal head of the dynasty, even during the lifetime of the īlak Naṣr, whom Gardīzī in his narrative of the conquest of Transoxania calls "the brother of the Khān." The number of different titles and names on the coins struck in Transoxania during the first years of the fifth century A.H. is so large that on their basis it is difficult to arrive at any historical conclusion. The name of the fourth brother, Abū Manṣūr [8] Muḥammad b. 'Alī, who subsequently took the

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 128: الكسر.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii, 219; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 397.

[3] *Mélanges Asiatques*, viii, 706–7.

[4] On some coins also Naṣr al-Milla (A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 210, 221). The title of Qarā-Khān or Qarā-Khāqān met with on coins probably refers neither to one of the brothers nor to their suzerain, but to their father 'Alī (cf. Ibn al-Athir, ix, 210; *Texts*, p. 84 ('Awfī)). Hilāl (*Eclipse, &c.*, iii, 396; trans., vi, 424) mentions only احمد بن علی قراخان as the successor of بغرا خاقان.

[5] The name Naṣr in Uighur letters on coins minted at Ushrūsana in 409 and 410 (A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 233) probably refers to another person.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 217. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 224; *Mélanges Asiatiques*, viii, 717.

[8] Thus in 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 227 (ارسلان خان ابو منصور الاصمّ); in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 210) and on many coins Abu'l-Muẓaffar.

title of Arslān-Khān, is already found on coins minted at Bukhārā in 403/1012–13[1]. Arslān-Khān also quarrelled with Ṭughān-Khān, as is shown by Bayhaqī's[2] account of "the Khāns and the īlak," who fought between themselves near Ūzgand and made peace in 1016, thanks to the mediation of the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn, who was seeking allies for his impending struggle with Maḥmūd. It is also possible that the military operations in the neighbourhood of Ūzgand were between Arslān-Khān, the ruler of Transoxania, and Qadir-Khān who, as we shall see later, was at that time ruler of Kāshghar.

We find in Bayhaqī a very detailed and characteristic account[3] of how Maḥmūd seized Khorezmia, taken from al-Bīrūnī's "History of Khwārazm." The Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn was succeeded, as we have seen, by his son Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī. The account of Subāshī-tagīn's campaign (p. 272) shows that 'Alī was for some time dependent on the Qarā-Khānids; his friendship with Maḥmūd was probably brought about by the defeat of the īlak and his allies. According to 'Utbī[4], 'Alī married Maḥmūd's sister. The brother and successor of 'Alī, Abu'l-'Abbās Ma'mūn b. Ma'mūn, was similarly allied to Maḥmūd, having also received in marriage a sister of the Sultan; according to Gardīzī[5] this wedding took place in 406/1015–16. When the Caliph Qādir sent Ma'mūn a robe of honour, together with | a diploma of 290
investiture, a standard and the title "Eye of the State and Ornament of the religious community" ('Ayn ad-Dawla wa Zayn al-Milla), Ma'mūn feared that his acceptance of these gifts directly from the Caliph would provoke the anger of Maḥmūd. He decided therefore not to receive the envoy in his capital and sent al-Bīrūnī out to meet him in the steppe and receive the gifts there. When Maḥmūd concluded peace with Ṭughān-Khān and the īlak, the Khwārazm-shāh, against the wish of his powerful ally, firmly refused to be a party to it, which caused some coolness between the two princes. On the advice of the wazīr Abu'l-Qāsim Aḥmad b. Ḥasan Maymandī, Maḥmūd decided to test Ma'mūn's fidelity. In conversation with the Khwārazm-shāh's envoy, the wazīr, as though on his own initiative, expressed a desire that the Khwārazm-shāh should introduce the khuṭba in the name of the Sultan in his territories, adding moreover that he acted without the knowledge of the latter. All this, according to Bayhaqī, occurred in 1014. The Khwārazm-shāh, of course, understood perfectly that the wazīr would not have

[1] A Maikov, *Katalog*, p. 226. [2] Baihaki, p. 844.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 838 sq. Sachau also makes use of this account in his monograph on Khorezmia (see above, pp. 1, 20).
[4] 'Utbī-Manīnī, II, 251 (ابو الحسن علی); *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 398, where the Khwārazm-shāh is called Abū 'Alī by mistake.
[5] Gardīzī, f. 147; Camb. MS, f. 118 b.

made such a request without the permission of the sovereign, but nevertheless hesitated to accede to Maḥmūd's wish. The demand was then repeated by the wazīr more categorically. Ma'mūn summoned his military leaders and the most important representatives of the population, put before them Maḥmūd's request and announced his intention of complying with it, as otherwise he and the country would perish. The nobles firmly refused to support such a decision, left the palace, unfurled the standards and drew their swords, uttering bitter imprecations (probably directed against Ma'mūn and Maḥmūd). In order to appease the malcontents, Ma'mūn was obliged to give an assurance that no request had been proffered, and that his sole intention had been to test their fidelity. After this al-Bīrūnī "with a tongue of gold and silver" persuaded them to express regret and apologize to the sovereign for their insolence. At the same time the Khwārazm-shāh on al-Bīrūnī's advice offered to mediate between the Qarā-Khānids in their internal conflicts, brought about a peace, and concluded an alliance with them. On learning of this Maḥmūd dispatched an embassy from Balkh to the "Khān and īlak," expressing his displeasure. They replied that they regarded the Khwārazm-shāh as the friend and brother-in-law of Maḥmūd and in accordance with the former wish of Maḥmūd himself, looked on the treaty with him merely as a supplement to the treaty with the Sultan; if there existed any misunderstandings between the Sultan and the Khwārazm-shāh
291 they offered their mediation. To this offer no answer was returned. The Qarā-Khānids acquainted the Khwārazm-shāh with Maḥmūd's embassy and he proposed that both they and he should send some divisions from different directions into Khurāsān to carry on a guerilla warfare, but that the peaceful inhabitants should not be disturbed, and the campaign should be regarded only as a means to restoring peace. The Qarā-Khānids refused to give the Khwārazm-shāh armed assistance, but renewed their offer of mediation, which was accepted by Ma'mūn. In the winter of 1016–17 Maḥmūd received the envoys of the Khān and īlak at Balkh and sent them back with the polite answer, that there was no serious disagreement between him and the Khwārazm-shāh, and that what differences there were had been entirely removed by the intercession of the Qarā-Khānids.

Immediately after this Ma'mūn received the following characteristic letter in the name of the Sultan: "It is known under what conditions a treaty and an alliance was concluded between us, and how much the Khwārazm-shāh owes us. In the matter of the khuṭba he showed submission to our will, knowing how the matter might turn out for him; but his people did not leave him a free hand. I do not employ the expression 'guards and subjects' as it is impossible to call those persons guards and subjects

who are in a position to say to the king: do this, do not do that. In this is evident weakness and impotence to rule; such indeed it was. Moved to anger by these people, I have long stayed here at Balkh, and have collected 100,000 horsemen and infantry and 500 elephants for the task of punishing the traitors who showed opposition to the will of their sovereign, and to put them in the right way. At the same time we shall rouse the Amīr, our brother and brother-in-law, and will show him how to rule a kingdom; a weak amīr is unsuited to the task. We shall return to Ghazna only on receipt of a complete apology, together with which he must fulfil one of the three following demands: (1) either to introduce the khuṭba (in the name of the Sultan), in complete obedience and willingness, as he has promised; (2) or to send us money and presents worthy of us, in order that they may thereafter be secretly returned, as we do not need superfluous money; and without that we have lands and fortresses tottering under heavy burdens of gold and silver; (3) or to send us from his country, with a petition for mercy, nobles, imāms and faqīhs, in order that we may return with the many thousand people whom we have brought." |

As a matter of fact the fulfilment of all three conditions was 292
required; at any rate Mahmūd's ultimatum was so understood by the Khwārazm-shāh. The latter introduced the khuṭba in the name of the Sultan to begin with in his Khurāsān territories, at Nasā and Farāwa[1], and subsequently in the other towns except the two capitals (Kāth and Gurgānj); he also sent off a number of shaykhs, qādīs, and nobles, together with 80,000 dīnārs and 3,000 horses. The Khwārazm-shāh's army, under the command of the chief hājib Alptagīn[2] of Bukhārā, which was at Hazārasp, probably in view of Mahmūd's military preparations, now turned against its own sovereign. The wazīr and some other adherents of the Khwārazm-shāh were killed, the remainder saving themselves by flight; the Khwārazm-shāh shut himself up in his castle, but the rebels set fire to it, and killed the sovereign while it was burning (Wednesday, March 20, 1017). The rebels raised to the throne Abu'l-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. 'Alī, the seventeen-year-old nephew of the late Amīr; but in actual fact the whole country remained in the hands of Alptagīn and the wazīr nominated by him; the rebels did as they chose, plundered and killed the rich, and those who could made use of the opportunity to get rid of their private enemies.

Fearing for the fate of his sister, the widow of Ma'mūn, Mahmūd on the advice of his wazīr at first exhibited hypocritical moderation, and demanded no more than the introduction of the

[1] See above, p. 154.

[2] Called نيالتكين (*i. e.* ينالتكين) in 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 254.

khuṭba in the name of the Sultan and the surrender of the murderers. The envoy was instructed to advise the Khorezmians, as if of his own accord, that the best means of placating the Sultan was to send him his sister with all respect. As the wazīr expected, the Khorezmians immediately dispatched the Khwārazm-shāh's widow to Khurāsān; at the same time the ring-leaders among the rebels ordered five or six men to be seized, and, denouncing them as Ma'mūn's murderers, imprisoned them and engaged to send them to Maḥmūd immediately after the conclusion of a treaty, together with 200,000 dīnārs and 4,000 horses. Maḥmūd made use of this interval for military preparations; on the wazīr's orders boats were made ready at Khuttal, Quwādhiyān, and Tirmidh, and provisions for the army at Āmul. In order to detain the Khorezmians still further, Maḥmūd set out for Ghazna, taking the envoys with him, and only there gave them a definite reply, requiring the surrender of Alptagīn and
293 other leaders of the rebels. | Nothing was left for the Khorezmians but to prepare themselves for a desperate resistance, and they succeeded in assembling 50,000 horsemen.

On setting out for the campaign, Maḥmūd informed the "īlak and Khān of Turkestan" that he went to avenge the death of his brother-in-law and to subdue the country which for himself as for them had been but a cause of trouble. The Qarā-Khānids certainly realized how disadvantageous to them would be the transfer of Khorezmia to the rule of Maḥmūd; nevertheless even then they did not decide to violate the treaty, and in their reply even approved Maḥmūd's intention to punish the rebels, "in order that others should not be tempted to spill the blood of kings." Depending only on their own forces, the Khorezmians could not resist Maḥmūd's army for long. The latter started on the campaign from Āmul, and evidently marched along the left bank of the Amu-Darya[1]. From Ja'farband[2], on the borders of Khorezmia, he sent forward an advance guard under the command of Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm aṭ-Ṭā'ī[3]; this force was attacked by the Khorezmians, who, under the command of Khumār-Tāsh Sharābī, unexpectedly appeared from the direction of the steppes and caused Maḥmūd's army severe losses, but the army was saved from destruction by the timely arrival of Maḥmūd

[1] The military operations are described both by Bayhaqī (pp. 850–51) and by Gardīzī (*Texts*, p. 14). In the notes below some amendments are given, from the Cambridge MS., to my published text.

[2] It is very probable that this town is identical with Jigarband (see page 142); on the different readings of this name see *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii, 287 g, and Zhukovsky's *Razvaliny, &c.*, pp. 60–61.

[3] In Bayhaqī Muhammad A'rābī; he was probably the leader of the Khurāsān bedouin division. 'Utbī (Manīnī, ii, 256) calls him Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥ. b. Ibrāhīm, who was طليعة السلطان فى كماة العرب.

himself. After this the Khorezmians were defeated, and Khumār-Tāsh himself taken prisoner. The next day a battle was fought near Hazārasp with the main forces of the Khorezmians, who were again routed, leaving behind on this occasion the two rebel leaders, Alptagīn of Bukhārā and Ṣayyādtagīn Khānī[1], as prisoners. After this Maḥmūd's army[2] advanced to the capital of Khorezmia (Kāth), which was taken on July 3, 1017[3]. | The 294
three leaders of the revolt were trodden under foot by elephants; their bodies were then fixed on the elephants' tusks and carried round the city, proclaiming the fate of murderers of kings, and were subsequently hung on three gallows, partly constructed of burnt bricks, set up over Ma'mūn's tomb. The other rebels suffered various punishments according to the degree of their guilt; according to 'Utbī it was not only the murderers of Ma'mūn who paid the penalty, but others as well whom Maḥmūd suspected of heresy, in other words those of whom he wished to rid himself for political reasons. The young Khwārazm-shāh and all the members of his dynasty had to follow Maḥmūd to his territories, where they were imprisoned in different fortresses; the Khorezmian forces were sent in chains to Ghazna, but were subsequently set free, incorporated in Maḥmūd's army and employed in the Indian campaigns. Maḥmūd's chief ḥājib Altūntāsh[4] was appointed Khwārazm-shāh, but until the final pacification of the country one of Maḥmūd's divisions, commanded by Arslān-Jādhib, was to remain with him.

The possession of Khorezmia gave Maḥmūd the preponderance over the Qarā-Khānids, added to which the civil war in the country of the latter made it impossible for them to undertake any campaigns of conquest. Our information on the history of Transoxania at this period is somewhat confused. According to 'Utbī[5] and Ibn al-Athīr[6], Ṭughān-Khān, Maḥmūd's faithful ally, died in the same year, 408/1017–8, soon after a great victory he had gained over a numerous army of infidels (more than 100,000[7] tents) who had arrived from the direction of China.

[1] Some details of these events are given also by 'Utbī (Manīnī, ii, 258), according to whom Alptagīn alone dared to answer the Sultan's reproaches sharply, the remainder replying by silence.

[2] In the text the words روی بخوارزم نهادند وشهر خوارزمرا بکرفتند اول کار آن کرد وسپاه یمین الدوله are omitted after the words یمین الدوله.

[3] The date quoted in Gardīzī (5th Ṣafar) is corroborated by the statement in Bayhaqī (p. 848) that the rule of the rebels lasted four months.

[4] In the text the words التونتاشرا بخوارزم شاهی نامزد کرد وخوارزم وکرکانج بدو وحاجب بزرك are omitted after داد واورا تا آخر عهد خویش.

[5] Manīnī, ii, 227, without dates. [6] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 209–10.

[7] 100,000 in 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 220; 300,000 in Ibn al-Athīr, who quotes also another account according to which this campaign took place in 403, in the reign of Aḥmad b. 'Alī.

His brother and successor, Arslān-Khān Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Alī, "the deaf[1]," who was noted for his extreme piety, maintained the friendship with Maḥmūd. He and "his brother the īlak" were requested by Maḥmūd to give their kinswoman to his
295 eldest son Mas'ūd; | the princess was received at Balkh with great ceremony, but Maḥmūd Kāshghaīī in the *Dīwān Lughāt at-Turk*[2] relates a characteristic anecdote of a quarrel which resulted in blows between Mas'ūd and his Turkish wife on their first night. According to Bayhaqī[3], the wife of Arslān-Khān sent a male and a female slave annually as a present to Mahmūd; on his part Maḥmūd sent her precious stuffs, pearls, and Greek satin. Ibn al-Athīr[4] relates that 'Alī-tagīn, the brother of the īlak-īlkhān (the conqueror of Transoxania), who had been imprisoned by Arslān-Khān, succeeded in escaping to Bukhārā, where he seized the town, and made an alliance with Arslān, the son of Seljuk. "The īlak, the brother of Arslān-Khān," marched against them, but was defeated. They remained in Bukhārā, but the bad conduct of 'Alī-tagīn was the cause of Maḥmūd's campaign which will be mentioned later. The same historian, in his sketch of the history of the Qarā-Khānids[5], says that after the death of Ṭughān-Khān, Qadir-Khān Yūsuf, the son of Bughrā-Khān Hārūn (the first conqueror of Bukhārā), who governed Samarqand in the name of Ṭughān-Khān, refused to submit to Arslān-Khān and appealed for help to Maḥmūd; the latter crossed the Amu-Darya in boats (this was his first campaign in Transoxania), but subsequently withdrew. Arslān-Khān and Qadir-Khān concluded peace and an alliance with the object of conquering the possessions of Mahmūd, and in 410/1019–20 they made a joint invasion of Khurāsān, but suffered a crushing defeat near Balkh. Soon after the battle Maḥmūd received congratulations from the Khwārazm-shāh Altūntāsh, who learnt of the victory of his sovereign only by the many caps of dead Turks carried into Khorezmia by the current of the Amu-Darya. After this occurred the meeting between Qadir-Khān and Maḥmūd.

Notwithstanding all these details, we may say with certainty that Mahmūd's march into Transoxania and the battle in 410 recounted here never took place; otherwise it is impossible to explain the complete silence of 'Utbī and Gardīzī. Gardīzī[6] gives as one of the reasons for the campaign of 1025 Mahmūd's desire "to cross the Amu-Darya and inspect that country," from

[1] الأصمّ (in 'Utbī). It is doubtful whether this is a surname or the indication of an actual physical defect.

[2] i, 394. [3] Baihaki, p. 305. [4] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 323.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 210–11. Cf. also Nerchakhy, p. 234 (from Ta'rīkhi Ḥaydarī) The year is not quoted in Ibn al-Athīr.

[6] *Texts*, p. 14.

which it may also be concluded that the campaign of 1025 was Maḥmūd's first in Transoxania. Maḥmūd was actually the ally of Qadir-Khān Yūsuf in his struggle with the other members of 296
the dynasty, but this struggle did not take place until some years later, when Qadir-Khān was ruler, not of Samarqand, but of Eastern Turkestan.

We have seen that in his account of the war of 1007–8 'Utbī calls Qadir-Khān the ruler of Khotan; if Ibn al-Athīr[1] is to be believed, the conquest of this town and the establishment of Islām in it was also the work of Qadir-Khān. It is very likely that Yūsuf, the son of Bughrā-Khān Hārūn, on the death of his father and the transfer of the kingdom to another branch of the Qarā-Khānids, did not receive an appanage, but was able to attract the restless elements amongst the people to his side, and with their help created a domain for himself[2]. Subsequently he gradually dislodged his rivals from the remaining towns of Eastern Turkestan. We have seen that at the beginning of the eleventh century the ruler of Kāshghar was Ṭughān-Khān, the eldest brother of the īlak Naṣr; but as early as 404/1013–14 in Yārkand, and also in 405 in Kāshghar, coins were being struck with the names of the Caliph Qādir and Qadir-Khān Yūsuf, on which the latter bears the title of "Protector of the State" (Nāṣir ad-Dawla) and "King of the East" (Malik al-Mashriq). Coins with the name of Qadir-Khān were struck at Kāshghar also in the following years[3], from which it may be concluded that Ṭughān-Khān had been deprived of Eastern Turkestan long before the time to which the historians refer his death, and remained ruler only of Semiryechye, perhaps also supreme ruler of Transoxania. His brother Muḥammad b. 'Alī, judging from numismatic data, was vassal prince of Transoxania, up to and including Ṭarāz, in the lifetime of his brother; after the death of the latter (which, in spite of the historians, may have occurred in 406) he took the title of Arslān-Khān and reigned till 415/1024–5[4]. At this period, possibly even in the last years of the reign of Arslān-Khān, disorders broke out of which 'Alī-tagīn

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 211.

[2] The conquest of Khotan by Qadir-Khān is probably referred to in the account given by Ibn al-Qalānisī (ed. Amedroz, p. 71) that the Turk Duzbirī, who subsequently became the wazīr of the Fāṭimid Caliph, had been taken prisoner in ختل, and carried to Kāshghar, whence he fled to Bukhāra, but was there enslaved for the second time and sent to Baghdād and Damascus The country of Khuttal had become Muhammedan long before this; moreover, the name always occurs in the form الختل, and is given in this form by Amedroz himself in the Index. It is most probable that ختن should be read.

[3] A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 192.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 226–45. Judging from some coins, the name of the īlak whom Ibn al-Athīr and 'Utbī (Manīnī, II, 219) call the brother of Arslān-Khān (see above, p. 280) was Aḥmad.

took advantage. It is difficult to say whether he was in fact the brother of the īlak Naṣr (and consequently of Ṭughān-Khān and Arslān-Khān himself) as Ibn al-Athīr assures us. In spite
297 of the prolonged reign of 'Alī-tagīn we have no coins with | this name. It is very probable that he is to be credited with the numerous copper coins of this period with the titles of īlak, Arslān-īlak and Arslān-tagīn. The name 'Alī b. 'Alī never occurs on coins; one coin minted at Karmīnīya in 424 has the name 'Alī b. Muḥammad on one side and 'Alī b. Ḥusayn[1] on the other; the name of 'Alī b. Ḥusayn is met with on coins of Dabūsiya of 425[2]. All this does not tally with the information of Ibn al-Athīr. As we shall see below, 'Alī-tagīn's brother bore the title of Ṭughān-Khān and ruled in Semiryechye. It is very likely that this Ṭughān-Khān II and 'Alī-tagīn were the sons of Ṭughān-Khān I, who *may* have borne the Muslim name of Ḥusayn. On some coins of this period we find the name Yūsuf or Yūsuf b. 'Alī[3]; as coins with this name are still found many years after the death of 'Alī-tagīn, it is very probably the name of the son and successor of the latter. In the East the name of the heir to the throne was often engraved on coins during his father's lifetime. 'Alī-tagīn himself came to Transoxania as early as the reign of Naṣr, as, according to Bayhaqī[4], the wazīr Maymandī told the sultan Mas'ūd in 1032 that 'Alī-tagīn had already been thirty years in Transoxania.

Maḥmūd took advantage of the disorders in the Qarā-Khānid kingdom to invade Transoxania. War was begun under the pretext that the inhabitants of Transoxania often came to Balkh with complaints against 'Alī-tagīn and that the latter would not give passage to Maḥmūd's envoys to the "Turkish Kings", *i. e.* the rulers of Eastern Turkestan[5]. In 1025 Maḥmūd crossed the Amu-Darya[6] on a bridge of boats connected by chains[7]. The first of the rulers of Transoxania to join him was the Amīr of Ṣaghāniyān and after him the Khwārazm-shāh Altūntāsh.
298 Maḥmūd established a camp for his enormous army, and | for himself ordered a tent to be prepared which could hold 10,000 horsemen. At the same time Qadir-Khān, who is called by Gardīzī "the Chief of all Turkestan" and "the Great Khān," invaded Transoxania from the Kāshghar side, and reached Samarqand. At the gate of this town, if Bayhaqī[8] is to be

[1] *Mélanges Asiatiques*, viii, 727.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 728–9; ix, 63. Attention is drawn to the same coins (in one case he quotes the reading Ḥasan) by Howorth (*J. R. A. S.*, new series, xxx, 485–6), who also attributes them to 'Alī-tagīn.
[3] *Ibid.*, viii, 724; A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 248.
[4] Baihaki, p. 418.
[5] The latter motive is given in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 323).
[6] For further details see *Texts*, pp. 14–17.
[7] The technical details given in the text are not entirely clear to me.
[8] Baihaki, pp. 82, 255.

believed, there took place a meeting of the most friendly description between him and Maḥmūd. The more detailed account given by Gardīzī compels the supposition that Maḥmūd's camp, to which the Khān went, lay much farther south, as the Khān "having arrived at Samarqand continued his advance, with the most peaceful intentions, and halted at a distance of one farsakh from the army of the Amīr Maḥmūd. The tents were pitched and (the Khān) dispatched envoys to acquaint Maḥmūd with his arrival and expressed the wish to meet him." Gardīzī's account gives us a good picture of the ceremonial observed at that period at a meeting between independent and equally powerful rulers.

In answer to Qadir-Khān's embassy, Maḥmūd appointed a rendezvous, to which both sovereigns came with a few horsemen. "On coming within sight of each other they both dismounted; the Amīr Maḥmūd had previously given the Treasurer a precious stone wrapped in a cloth, and (at this point) he ordered it to be delivered to Qadir-Khān[1]. Qadir-Khān had also brought a precious stone with him, but owing to his alarm and agitation he forgot it. Having taken leave of Maḥmūd he remembered the stone and sent it by one of his followers, begged forgiveness and returned (to his camp). The next day the Amīr Mahmūd ordered a large tent of embroidered satin to be pitched and everything to be prepared for an entertainment; (after this) he invited Qadir-Khān through an envoy to be his guest. When Qadir-Khān arrived Maḥmūd ordered[2] the table to be spread as magnificently as possible; the Amīr Mahmūd and the Khān sat at the same table. After the meal was finished they went to the 'hall of gaiety'; it was splendidly adorned with rare flowers, delicate fruits, precious stones, gold embroidered fabrics, crystal, beautiful mirrors and | (various) rare objects, so that Qadir-Khān could not regain his 299
composure[3]. They remained seated for some time; Qadir-Khān drank no wine, as it was not customary for the kings of Transoxania, especially the Turkish kings, to do so. They listened to music for a little, then (Qadir-Khān) rose. Thereupon the Amīr Maḥmūd ordered presents worthy of him to be brought, namely, gold and silver goblets[4], precious stones, rarities from Baghdād, fine fabrics, costly weapons, valuable horses with gold bridles, sticks studded with precious stones, ten female elephants with gold bridles and goads studded with jewels; mules from Bardha'a[5]

[1] According to the Cambridge MS.: تا در دست قدر حان داد.

[2] The letter و before the word بفرمود is not found in the Cambridge MS.

[3] In the Cambridge MS. خیرة ماند.

[4] In the Cambridge MS. انبها.

[5] A town situated, as is well known, in Transcaucasia. On the destruction of this town by the Russians cf. my article Bardha'a in *Encycl. of Islām*, and now D. S. Margoliouth in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 1918, pp. 82–95.

with gold trappings, litters[1] for journeys by mule with girths, gold and silver sticks[2] and bells, also litters of embroidered satin; valuable carpets, of Armenian work, as well as uwaysī (?) and parti-coloured carpets; embroidered headbands (?)[3]; rose-coloured stamped stuffs from Ṭabaristān; Indian swords, Qamarī[4] aloes, Maqāsīrī sandal wood[5], grey amber, she asses, skins of Barbary tigers, hunting dogs, falcons and eagles trained to hunt cranes, antelopes and other game. He took leave of Qadir-Khān with great ceremony, showed him many favours and made him his excuses (for the insufficiency of his entertainment and presents). On returning to his camp and examining all these precious things, jewels, arms and riches, Qadir-Khān was filled with astonishment and did not know how to requite him for them. Then he ordered the Treasurer to open the doors of the Treasury, took thence much money and sent it to Mahmūd, together with the products of Turkestan, namely fine horses with gold trappings, Turkish slaves with gold belts and quivers, falcons and gerfalcons, sables, minever, ermines, black fox and marten furs, vessels (*i.e.* leather bottles) of the skin of two
300 sheep | with horns of the khutuww (see above, p. 272), Chinese satin and so forth[6]. Both sovereigns parted entirely satisfied, in peace and amity."

As regards the political results of this meeting, it was decided that they should join forces in order to put an end to 'Alī-tagīn's rule in Transoxania and give it to Yaghān-tagīn[7], the second son of Qadir-Khān, who was to be married to Mahmūd's daughter Zaynab. Qadir-Khān promised to give his daughter in marriage to the Amīr Muhammad, Maḥmūd's second son, whom his father, dissatisfied with his eldest son Mas'ūd, intended to proclaim heir to the throne[8]. These projects however were not realized. Maḥmūd first of all dealt with the Turkmen allies of 'Alī-tagīn,

[1] After هرّاها in the Cambridge MS : با كمرها وباههای (*sic*) بزر هودجهای استران زرین وسیمین وجلاجل وهودجهایی از الخ

[2] By analogy with عصا it must be supposed that the word باهو is intended.

[3] دستها, perhaps pieces of clothing.

[4] Not from Cape Comorin (in India), as was stated in the Russian edition, but from Khmer (Cambodia) cf. G. Ferrand, *Relations*, &c., p. 284 (for other quotations see *ibid.*, Index).

[5] The reading مصفری in the text is corrupted from مقاصیری, cf. Ferrand, *Relations* &c., pp. 605 and 617, note 8.

[6] The term دار خاشالی (in the Cambridge MS. حاشاك) is incomprehensible to me.

[7] In the MSS. بغا and يغان ; the final *n* is not found on coins (*Mélanges Asiatiques*, viii, 706, 721; A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 243; in both cases referring to another person not the son of Qadir-Khān). Nevertheless it seems to us much more probable to read here Yaghān (elephant) by analogy with the words Arslān and Bughrā. The omission of the final *n* is met with on coins in other cases also (Markov, *Katalog*, p. 192).

[8] Baihaki, pp. 230, 655.

whose chief was Seljuk's son Isrā'īl[1]. He succeeded in capturing Isrā'īl (according to Ibn al-Athīr this was only achieved by perfidy) who was sent to India and there imprisoned in a fortress. His hordes were partly exterminated, but a number of them broke away from their leaders[2] (the descendants of Seljuk), and with Maḥmūd's consent emigrated to Khurāsān.

'Alī-tagīn abandoned Samarqand and Bukhārā and fled to the steppes; his baggage was overtaken by Bilgātagīn, Mahmūd's hājib, and his wife and daughters taken prisoner. In spite of these successes Mahmūd returned to Balkh and thence to Ghazna, without taking any measures to secure the interests of his allies. It is evident that his plans did not include the destruction of one of the two chief branches of the Qarā-Khānids, which would have made Qadir-Khān the all-powerful ruler of all Turkestan Later on we find under Ghaznevid rule only Tirmidh, Quwadhiyān, Ṣaghāniyān and Khuttal[3], *i.e.* the provinces contiguous | to Balkh, which were probably even before 301
this subject to Mahmūd (see above, p. 278). When the prince Yaghān-tagīn arrived at Balkh with the intention of proceeding to Ghazna to marry the Ghaznevid princess and of seizing Bukhārā and Samarqand with the help of his father-in-law, Mahmūd requested him to return and informed him that he was now on his way to the town of Sūmnāt (in India), that meanwhile he (Yaghān-tagīn) would probably succeed in defeating his rivals in Turkestan, and then it would be possible to conquer Transoxania with their united forces. The prince understood perfectly the true character of such an answer and left Balkh feeling that he had been insulted. Qadir-Khān and his sons were successful in defeating Ṭughān-Khān, the brother of 'Alī-tagīn and taking Balāsāghūn[4] from him. On his return from India Maḥmūd dispatched the faqīh Abū Bakr Ḥuṣayrī to Merv. In Transoxania, judging from Bayhaqī's statements, some military operations took place of which we know no details and which terminated in a peaceful settlement[5]. In any case 'Alī-tagīn remained ruler of Bukhārā and Samarqand. His brother Ṭughān-Khān, after his expulsion from Balāsāghūn, evidently reigned for some time at Akhsīkath, where in 417/1026 and 418/1027 money was coined in his name. In the southern part of Farghāna, at Ūzgand, the former capital of the īlak Naṣr, coins

[1] Thus in Gardīzī (*Texts*, p. 17) Ibn al-Athīr (IX, 266, 323) calls him Aslān; it is very probable that this was Isrā'īl's Turkish name.

[2] According to Gardīzī (f. 156; Camb. MS., f. 125 b) these, to the number of 4,000 families, complained to Maḥmūd against their leaders (ﻝﺍﺀ).

[3] Baihaki, p. 98. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 655.

[5] *Ibid*, pp. 655–6. It is much to be regretted that the chapter of Bayhaqī's book dealing with these events in detail has not come down to us.

were being struck as early as 416/1025 with Qadir-Khān's name, which is found also on coins minted at Akhsīkath[1] from 420.

In 1026 there arrived at Ghazna envoys from two non-Muslim rulers, Qayā-Khān and Bughrā-Khān; judging from their titles (the spelling of which is doubtful) they were Turkish Khāns and may also have belonged to the Qarā-Khānid dynasty. They expressed their submission to Maḥmūd and their desire to become allied by marriage with the Ghaznevids. Maḥmūd received the envoys with honour, but gave them this answer: "We are Muslims and you are infidels, (therefore) we cannot give you our sisters and daughters; but if you were to accept Islām then perhaps the matter might be arranged[2]." |

302 In the same year 1026, Maḥmūd received envoys from the Caliph Qādir, bringing him a diploma for the provinces conquered by him and new titles for himself, his sons, and his brother Yūsuf[3]. In his relations with the Caliph, Maḥmūd assumed the role of the true heir of the Sāmānids, supreme ruler of the entire East; a treaty was concluded between him and the Caliph, by which the latter bound himself not to enter into relations with the Qarā-Khānids, nor to send them gifts except through the agency of Maḥmūd[4]. According to Nizam al-Mulk's[5] account (very questionable, however) Maḥmūd in his relations with the Caliph called the Qarā-Khānids his vassals, although, as we have seen, in actual fact he conferred with the head of this dynasty on an absolutely equal footing.

The relations between the Qarā-Khānids and the Ghaznevids changed somewhat after the death of Maḥmūd, which occurred on Thursday 30th April, 1030. Maḥmūd's rule, as we have seen, extended only to a few provinces of Transoxania; but his reign is of great importance in the history of the whole of the East, as the system of government in the Eastern Muslim lands

[1] A Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 246, 250.

[2] *Texts*, p. 17; Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 905. Raverty calls these rulers the brothers of Qadir-Khān, quoting Gardīzī; but these particulars are not given in the Oxford and Cambridge MSS. This Turkish embassy is also mentioned, from a source which has not come down to us, in an anonymous philological treatise edited by P. Melioransky, *Arab. Filolog o turetskom yazykye*, p. 80 of the text and p. 041 of the translation. The author quotes the طبائع الحيوان by the physician Sharaf az-Zamān al-Marwazī, a work which would be of great interest to us. It is said that it contained the names of the districts (*nawāḥī*) of the Chinese and Turks. The letters are said to have been sent by the monarch (صاحب) of China and the monarch of the Turks in 418/1027, but the author adds that they were dated in the fifth month of the year of the mouse, corresponding to 1024. From these sources Sharaf az-Zamān had taken the names of the twelve animals of the cycle of the Turkish calendar. In this list the year of the fish (balıgh) takes the place of the year of the dragon, and the year of the tiger (bars or qaplan) is also called the year of the lion (arslān, in the MS. صلان, which Melioransky has failed to explain).

[3] Gardīzī, f. 158, Camb. MS., f. 127.

[4] Baihaki, p. 359.

[5] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 132, trad., p. 193.

reached its full development under him. Those who, like Nizām al-Mulk, upheld this system cite Maḥmūd most frequently. For this reason we consider it necessary to stress in somewhat greater detail some of the features of Maḥmūd's reign, all the more so that this has not so far been undertaken by any one. Even the latest historian of Islām, A. Müller[1], speaking of the salient points of Maḥmūd's character, emphasizes almost exclusively his untiring energy; of the other side of his character, he mentions only his "short-sighted fanaticism," thanks to which streams of infidel blood were shed in India, and heretics were mercilessly persecuted in the actual domains of the Sultan.

But Maḥmūd's reign also presents other and yet darker sides, and his subjects perished in thousands, not only by accusations of heresy, but by ruinous taxation. His Indian campaigns yielded vast booty for himself, | his guards, and the numerous 303
"volunteers" who had flocked to him from all parts, including Transoxania[2]; sometimes Maḥmūd devoted these sums to magnificent buildings, as for example the mosque and madrasa at Ghazna[3]; but for the mass of the people these campaigns were but sources of ruin. Maḥmūd was constantly in need of money for them; before one of his campaigns he ordered the indispensable sum to be collected within two days, which was actually achieved, but in the words of the court historian, the officials were "fleeced like sheep[4]." Such facts show that it is scarcely only on the wazīr Abu'l-'Abbās Faḍl b. Aḥmad Isfarāyinī, as the same historian maintains[5], that the responsibility rests for the ruinous imposts, in consequence of which "the agricultural districts were to a great degree deserted, and the irrigation works in some places had fallen into decay, in others had ceased altogether." On top of such conditions came the famine year (401 = 1011). Owing to early frosts the corn failed to ripen[6] and the inhabitants suffered terrible want, although corn was to be found in Nīshāpūr in sufficient quantity; according to 'Utbī's testimony[7] there were at one time in the bazaars 400 manns[8] of unsold corn. The historian, as he quotes this fact, is moved only by the omnipotence of Him "Who condemns to perish whom he chooses, although there may be food in plenty for each one." In Nīshāpūr and its neighbourhood alone

[1] *Der Islam*, ii, 53, 60–61, 75.

[2] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 262 sq., where he speaks of 20,000 Ghāzīs "from places near and far in Transoxania."

[3] *Ibid.*, ii, 290 sq.; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 404–5.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii, 168: سلحوا سلخ الغنم. [5] *Ibid.*, ii, 158 sq.

[6] Ta'rīkhi Bayhaq, MS. Brit. Mus., f. 102 a (extracts from the lost part of the Ta'rīkhi Bayhaqī).

[7] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 127. [8] Or al-mnā, cf. *Mafātīḥ al-'olūm*, pp. 14, 67 sq.

as many as 100,000 men are said to have perished; to this figure may be applied, with even grearter force than to the losses in the Indian campaigns, A. Müller's remark that "schor der vierte Theil wäre furchtbar." Dogs and cats were almost exterminated: there were cases of cannibalism; the guilty parties certainly were severely punished, but no punishment proved at all efficacious. The Sultan contented himself with ordering his Governors to distribute money to the poorest inhabitants.

304 It was necessary to take more effective measures, when, | in consequence of the ruin of the inhabitants, the payment of taxes ceased, and the wazīr replied to the Sultan's demands for money by a firm refusal. The Sultan was compelled to apply for assistance to the members of the aristocracy outside the bureaucratic elements, and particularly to the ra'īs of Balkh [1], the dihqān Abū Isḥāq Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn. It is not known by what means the ra'īs succeeded in collecting a large sum at Herāt in the same year 401. The wazīr nevertheless refused to take measures to make up the deficiency, and of his own free will went to prison, which threw the Sultan into a violent rage. The wazīr's property was confiscated, and he was forced to take an oath that he had never concealed money, but it was subsequently discovered, it is said, that he had given certain sums into the keeping of one of the merchants of Balkh. The trial was renewed, and the unhappy man was tortured every day, from which he finally died (404/1013–4). The Sultan took advantage of the fact that the death of the wazīr had occurred in his absence, and expressed his displeasure at the too zealous fulfilment of his instructions [2].

Maḥmūd's magnificent buildings were erected by means of the booty obtained in India, but their maintenance also imposed a heavy burden on the population. Ḥāfiz Abrū [3] quotes from the lost part of Bayhaqī's work a characteristic story of the splendid garden made by Mahmūd at Balkh, the upkeep of which was made obligatory on the inhabitants of the town. The Sultan held banquets in the garden, but they always came very quickly to an end. One day he asked the members of his entourage if they knew why, amidst all the charms of the garden, he could not succeed in organizing a gay feast in it. Abū Naṣr Mishkān (the 'amīd, Bayhaqī's teacher) asked permission to speak openly and said that "the inhabitants of Balkh were all saddened by the useless maintenance of this garden, and each year shared amongst themselves the payment of a large sum for this grievous item of expenditure; for this reason

[1] On the significance of this office see above, p. 234.
[2] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 160 sq.; the date on p. 161.
[3] *Texts*, pp. 157–8.

there could be no gaiety either in the heart of the Sultan." The Sultan was angered and did not speak to Abū Naṣr for some days. Soon after this he was stopped in one of the streets of Balkh by a crowd of people who | complained to him of this 305
heavy obligation; the Sultan at once decided that the complainants had been instigated by Abū Naṣr, although the latter knew nothing of their intention. After this Maḥmūd summoned the ra'īs of Balkh and asked how much damage the Qarā-Khānids whom he had driven off had done to the town in 1006. The ra'īs answered that this loss could not be expressed in any figures: "they subjected the town to thoughtless destruction; it would be long before it was restored to its former condition, and even that was doubtful." Then the Sultan observed: "We remove such calamities from the inhabitants of the town, and they find it a burden to keep up one garden for me." The ra'īs answered apologetically: "That man who complained has not seen us and the complaint was brought without the knowledge of the worthy and important townsmen." Notwithstanding this, four months later the Sultan, on leaving for Ghazna, issued a written order that the inhabitants of Balkh were released from the obligation of maintaining the garden, which obligation was transferred to the Jews, with the stipulation that not more than 500 dirhams should be exacted from them.

In the sense of taking thought for the welfare of his subjects, therefore, Maḥmūd cannot by any means be reckoned amongst enlightened despots. As regards the patronage which poets and scholars enjoyed at his court even A. Müller[1], despite his partiality for Maḥmūd, acknowledges that it was evidently dictated only by an ostentatious desire to make his court the centre of all brilliance and distinction and not by sincere love of enlightenment. Nor can his solicitude for matters of religion be taken as an indication of true piety. Maḥmūd cannot but have understood the link between political and religious conservatism; hence he gave his patronage to the 'ulamā and shaykhs, but only as long as they remained the obedient tools of his policy. In exceptional cases when it was a matter of a small sum of money, Maḥmūd might consider the petition of an individual member of the priesthood, and remit this or that tax[2], but his view of the role of the priesthood as a class is particularly clearly seen in his relations to the pietistic movement | which arose at 306
Nīshāpūr[3] at this period. The founder of the movement was the anchorite Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, the head of the Karrāmite sect, founded by Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b.

[1] *Der Islam*, ii, 62.
[2] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 247.
[3] A detailed account in 'Utbī (Manīnī, ii, 309 sq.; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 406–7).

Karrām[1]. The father of Abū Bakr had been an anchorite of some renown, and Abū Bakr himself was already a personage of importance in the time of Sabuktagīn. Maḥmūd continued to bestow his patronage on him as on other representatives of the sect. 'Utbī quotes verses from a poet of the period according to which the only true creed (*dīn*) was that of Muhammad b. Karrām, just as the only genuine system of law (*fiqh*) was that of Abū Ḥanīfa. Other 'ulamā however accused the Karrāmites of anthropomorphism. The sect was distinguished by extreme intolerance, and in the matter of the persecution of heretics Abū Bakr was the Sultan's right hand. As early as the period of the Turkish invasion Abū Bakr's influence on the inhabitants of Nīshāpūr was so great that it appeared to be a danger to the conquerors, and obliged them to take corresponding measures. When Maḥmūd's armies forced the Turks to quit the town, they carried Abū Bakr off with them; but he succeeded in escaping, after which his importance in Maḥmūd's empire became still greater. Although he wore woollen clothes (*i.e.* the dress of the Ṣūfīs) he was appointed ra'īs of Nīshāpūr, and all the inhabitants high and low "looked upon him with hope and fear." His merciless persecution of heretics and confiscation of their property, which gave rise to many abuses, finally roused general discontent, and the Sultan, after prolonged hesitation, decided to sacrifice Abū Bakr. The appointment of ra'īs of Nīshāpūr was once more given to a layman, the Sultan's favourite Abū 'Alī Ḥasan b. Muḥammad, who came of a famous family; his grandfather belonged to the "aristocrats and wealthy people" of the Sāmānid period, and his father had joined Maḥmūd when the latter was still sipahsālār of Khurāsān. The new ra'īs lost no time in taking severe measures against the Karrāmites; Abū Bakr was punished by confiscation of his possessions[2], and his chief adherents were imprisoned in various fortresses. To the remaining representatives of the priesthood, especially to the
307 'Alids, the ra'īs explained that the consideration they | enjoyed depended on their unconditional submission to the temporal power[3].

The religious wars of Maḥmūd, as has already been said by others[4], are fully explained by his endeavour to seize the riches

[1] Shahristānī also speaks of the Karrāmite sect (*Religionsparteien, &c.*, übers. von Th. Haarbrucker, 1, 29–30, 119 sq.): he also mentions the anthropomorphism of this sect, and its importance in the reign of Maḥmūd.

[2] This was not, however, the end of his career; after the death of Mahmūd he is mentioned with his friend, the qāḍī Sā'id, amongst the persons honoured by the new Sultan Mas'ūd when he came to Nīshāpūr (Baihakī, ed. Morley, p. 39). Both are mentioned as persecutors of heretics also in the biography of the shaykh Abū Sa'īd, edited by V. Zhukovsky, p. 84 sq. Cf. below, p. 311.

[3] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 325: فاشعرهم ان حشمتهم بالطاعة موصولة.

[4] Kazimirski, *Menoutchehri*, préface, p. 133

of India, and there are no grounds for regarding them as due to religious fanaticism. The persecution of heretics is also explained by the political motives quoted above; sometimes the accusation of heresy was but the pretext for seizing the property of the suspected person[1]. It would be just as erroneous to see in Maḥmūd the patron of Persian national aspirations, although Firdawsī's work was dedicated to him. The military forces of Maḥmūd consisted exclusively of bought slaves and mercenaries; Nizām al-Mulk, desirous that the army should consist of representatives of various nations, quotes Maḥmūd particularly[2] and his words are entirely corroborated by historical facts[3]. All the remaining subjects were in the eyes of Maḥmūd only a body of taxpayers, in whom any kind of patriotism was wholly out of place. According to Bayhaqī[4] the inhabitants of Balkh received for their resistance to the Qarā-Khānids (see above p. 272) nothing but severe censure from Maḥmūd. "What have subjects to do with war? It is natural that your town was destroyed and that they burnt the property belonging to me, which had brought in such revenues[5]. You should have been required to pay an indemnity for the losses, but we pardoned you; (only) see to it that it does not happen again: if any king (at a given moment) proves himself the stronger, and requires taxes from you and protects you, you must pay taxes and thereby save yourselves." That Maḥmūd's reign was not a period in which the Persian language and literature triumphed is evident from the wazīr Maymandī's efforts to make Arabic once more the language of official documents. Formerly all state papers were written in Persian, | in consequence of which, in 'Utbī's expression[6], "the 308 bazaar of eloquence suffered loss" and "capable and incapable became equal," hence the wazīr Maymandī having again "raised high the standard of the scribes" allowed the use of the Persian language only in cases where it was indispensable, "on account of the ignorance of him to whom the letter was addressed." There is no doubt that at that period such cases were fairly frequent.

From this time evidently begins the division of the nation into an army to whom the king pays grants, requiring in return faithful service, and subjects whom the king defends from external and internal enemies, requiring from them unconditional

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 283.

[2] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 92, trad., pp. 135-6.

[3] According to 'Utbī (Manīnī, II, 84; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 386) the army of Maḥmūd which gained the victory near Balkh in 1008 consisted of Turks, Indians, Khalajis, Afghans, and Ghuzz (الغرنوية probably a mistake for الغزية).

[4] Baihaki, p. 688.

[5] This speech refers to the chief bazaar of the town, built by order of Maḥmūd, and burnt when the town was taken.

[6] 'Utbī-Manīnī, 88, 170 sq.; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 396.

obedience and the unmurmuring payment of taxes. Neither soldiers nor subjects have the right to oppose their wishes to the will of the sovereign; we have seen (p. 276) how definitely this view was expressed in Maḥmūd's letter to the Khwārazm-shāh. The development of despotism as always was accompanied by the extensive development of a system of espionage; Maḥmūd set spies even on his son Mas'ūd[1].

All these facts give us reason to conclude that Maḥmūd's reign undoubtedly weighed very heavily on his subjects[2]; if Maḥmūd himself was not destined to experience the dismal consequences of his system, and if the authority of the throne did not totter during his reign, this is explained entirely by his personal qualities, which sharply distinguished him from his successors. His firm will and fertile brain rendered impossible a too poignant revelation of the characteristic features of despotic obstinacy. Contradiction strongly irritated Maḥmūd, which caused those who spoke to him to pass very unpleasant moments, but did not in the long run prevent the sovereign from accepting a just decision[3]. The wazīr's position on these occasions was very difficult, and a clever woman observed, "If the Sultan appoints someone as wazīr, he will hate him from the first week no matter how he may have loved him before[4]." We have spoken above of the fate of one of these wazīrs (p. 288); his
309 successor | Maymandi also suffered arrest and imprisonment in a fortress. Cases of the death penalty in Maḥmūd's reign (if religious persecution be excluded) are comparatively rare; according to 'Utbī[5] the Sultan held the view that the king in a moment of anger could deprive his subject only of that which it lay in his power to restore in a moment of mercy, *i.e.* property and liberty, but not life. A worse fate might have overtaken the wazīr Maymandī; Maḥmūd had already given one of his followers, Abu'l-Qāsim Kathīr, a written order to put the wazīr to death "in expiation of the blood shed by his order," and it was only the firm refusal of Abu'l-Qāsim to take upon himself a commission of such a nature that saved his life[6]. For Abu'l-Qāsim himself this noble bravery evidently had no evil results, which at any rate demonstrates the self-control of Maḥmūd. The feeling of legality was still so strong in the Ghaznevid period that it was attempted to give even confiscations of the property of those who fell into disgrace the character of a legal purchase. Maḥmūd dethroned the native rulers of Gharjistān

[1] Baihaki, pp. 135, 154.

[2] Cf. the judgement (certainly too harsh and unjust) of Marquart (*Osttürk Dialektstudien*, p. 50, n. 1) on the Ghaznevids: "Jene Dynastie, welche von den Mordbrennern Sübük-tigin und seinem widerlichen Sohne Maḥmūd in Gaznīn gegründet wurde."

[3] Baihaki, p. 495.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 421.

[5] 'Utbī-Manīnī, i, 316 sq.

[6] Baihaki, p. 450.

and imprisoned them until their death, but all the same he paid them the value of their personal territorial property, which was seized for the Treasury[1] (though the price of the property may of course under such circumstances have been left to Maḥmūd's own discretion). Still more characteristic is the scene described by Bayhaqī of the confiscation of the possessions of a wazīr who had been disgraced (in the reign of Mas'ūd) and condemned to death, and who was forced to declare that he voluntarily sold to the Sultan all his possessions movable and immovable, and received in anticipation payment of a fixed sum of money. The officials present signed as witnesses, and the representatives of the judicial administration affixed the seal[2].

After the brief reign of Maḥmūd's younger son Muḥammad, the power passed to the elder, Mas'ūd (1030–1041), who inherited only his father's faults. Mas'ūd held the same high opinion of his power as Maḥmūd, and like him wished to decide everything according to his own judgement, but lacking his father's talents | came to disastrous decisions, which he obstinately maintained, 310
paying no heed to the advice of men of experience. The tales of Mas'ūd's prowess in the chase[3] and in battle[4] show that he was distinguished by physical bravery, but all the more striking is his complete lack of moral courage; in the hour of misfortune he showed himself more pusillanimous than a woman[5]. In cupidity he yielded nothing to Maḥmūd, and the overburdening of the inhabitants by forced levies was carried in his time to an extreme degree. During the reign of Mas'ūd we see individual examples of the punishment "of petty thieves for the satisfaction of large ones[6];" but the robbers who divided their spoils with the Sultan could quietly continue their activity. Particularly notorious amongst these was Abu'l-Faḍl Sūrī, the civil Governor of Khurāsān, from whom the Sultan received large presents, which represented, however, only the half of what he succeeded in extorting from the inhabitants. The population was reduced to despair, and the aristocracy began to send letters and envoys to Transoxania to the "Leaders of the Turks" with prayers for help[7]. These circumstances were turned to advantage not by the Qarā-Khānids themselves, however, but by the leaders of the Turkmens who had been in their service.

As regards the Qarā-Khānids, Mas'ūd continued the policy of his father. At the end of 1031 the treaty with the Caliph was renewed, by which the latter bound himself not to enter into relations with the Qarā-Khānids except through the Ghaznevids[8].

[1] 'Utbī-Manīnī, ii, 146; *Notices et Extraits*, iv, 394.
[2] Baihaki, p 215.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 288. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 783. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 828.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 556–57 (the Russian original is a quotation from Nekrasov).
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 509–10. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

At the same time Mas'ūd continued to treat with the head of the Qarā-Khānids as between equals, and his envoy was instructed to direct the attention of Qadir-Khān to the importance for the whole world of an agreement between "two such sovereigns" as they[1]. The true character of the relations between the Ghaznevids and Qarā-Khānids is best portrayed in a letter of the Khwārazm-shāh Altūntāsh to the Sultan, written in 1030[2]. "It
311 is well known that the late | Amīr spent much labour and money before Qadir-Khān with his assistance attained the Khanate and established himself on the throne. At present it is necessary to support him that the friendship may be made secure; they will not be our true friends, but good relations will be maintained on the surface, and they will not stir up (others against us). 'Alī-tagīn is our real enemy, and has kept a feeling of rancour in his heart[3], as his brother Ṭughān-Khān was expelled from Balāsāghūn with the help of the late Amīr. An enemy never becomes a friend, but with him also it is indispensable to conclude a treaty and establish friendly relations; it does not follow that we can rely on this, but it must be done. Moreover it will be necessary to fill the provinces of Balkh, Tukhāristān, Ṣaghāniyān, Tirmidh, Quwādhiyān, and Khuttal with warriors because he takes advantage of every opportunity to raid a defenceless province and to pillage it."

Mas'ūd followed the advice of Altūntāsh, and in the spring of 1031[4] dispatched an embassy to Kāshghar headed by Abu'l-Qāsim Ibrāhīm b. 'Abdallāh Ḥuṣayrī and the qāḍī Abū Ṭāhir 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad Tabānī[5]. The envoys were to acquaint Qadir-Khān with Mas'ūd's accession to the throne, transmit to him an assurance of friendship, and beg for the hand of Qadir-Khān's daughter for Mas'ūd himself, and the hand of the daughter of Bughrā-tagīn, the son and heir of Qadir-Khān, for the son and heir of Mas'ūd, Mawdūd. As the bride-price Mas'ūd offered 50,000 Herāt dīnārs on his own behalf and 30,000 on his son's behalf[6]. The report of the envoys from Kāshghar, which was dispatched in the course of the year 1031, showed that they had encountered some difficulties[7]. In 1032[8] the

[1] 'Uthī-Manīnī, p. 251.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 98. The part of the text in which Ṭughān-Khān is mentioned has been rectified with the help of p. 655.

[3] Literally, "and a serpent with a crushed tail."

[4] The date in Baihaki (p. 261). From the day of the week it may be concluded that by mistake the month Rabī' I, instead of Rabī' II, has been given in the text.

[5] For the full names of the envoys see Baihaki, p. 250. In one passage (p. 231) Abū Ṭāhir is called Abū Ṭālib.

[6] Baihaki, pp 253–4.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

[8] Thus according to Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 211); Bayhaqī does not quote dates, and in one place (p. 656) says that Qadir-Khān had already died a year after Mas'ūd's accession to the throne, in another (p. 89) two years. Jamāl Qarshī's date (1st Muḥarram 424: see *Texts*, p. 132) seems to be contradicted by numismatic data (A Markov, *Katalog*, p. 251).

course of negotiations was arrested by the death of Qadir-Khān, who was succeeded by his eldest son Bughrā-tagīn Sulaymān under the title of Arslān-Khān. The second son, Yaghān-tagīn Muḥammad, took the title of | Bughrā-Khān, and began to rule 312
in Talas and Isfījāb. As was customary, Mas'ūd dispatched a letter to Kāshghar expressing his condolence on the occasion of the death of the Khān and his felicitations to his successor. The envoys did not return to Ghazna till Sept. 6, 1034, having successfully fulfilled their mission. Mawdūd's bride, however, died on the way; Mas'ūd's bride Shāh-Khātūn arrived safely at Ghazna, where she was met with unusual pomp; according to Bayhaqī the Amīr wished to astonish the Turks by unprecedented splendour [1].

The negotiations with 'Alī-tagīn led to no result. Before his accession to the throne Mas'ūd had applied to 'Alī-tagīn for help against Muḥammad, and had promised to cede Khuttal to him in return. As the question of the succession to the throne was determined without bloodshed by the treason of Muḥammad's adherents, Mas'ūd was not obliged to fulfil his promise, which of course roused 'Alī-tagīn's ill-will [2]. Against the advice of Altūntāsh, who had proposed, as we have seen, a defensive policy only [3], Mas'ūd renewed his father's plan to help Qadir-Khān's second son to wrest Transoxania from 'Alī-tagīn; if this was considered unsuitable, it was proposed to entrust the conquest of Transoxania to Altūntāsh. The Sultan's advisers gave their preference to the second plan, which was put into practice [4]. In the spring of 1032 Altūntāsh, on the order of the Sultan, was obliged to enter Transoxania with an army; the Sultan sent him a supplementary division of 15,000 men from Balkh [5]. 'Alī-tagīn entrusted the defence of Bukhārā to volunteers (ghāzīs), and leaving 150 ghulāms in the citadel retired to Dabūsiya. On the approach of the enemy 'Alī-tagīn's representative left the town, whose inhabitants, together with the volunteers, submitted to Mas'ūd; the citadel was taken by assault, and seventy ghulāms were taken prisoner [6]. The attack on 'Alī-tagīn's main forces near Dabūsiya was less successful. Here the Turkmens | with the Saljūqids at their head [7] had joined 'Alī- 313
tagīn, whose red standard floated on the hill, alongside his umbrella, the mark of royal dignity [8]. The battle was indecisive, but Altūntāsh was mortally wounded, and it was due only to the clever resource of his wazīr that the army returned safely to Khorezmia. Concealing the wounds of the Khwārazm-shāh from his enemies, the wazīr entered into negotiations in his

[1] Baihaki, pp. 526, 656.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 348.
[3] Compare also *ibid.*, p. 426.
[4] *Ibid*, pp. 418-19.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 423.
[6] *Ibid.*, p 424.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 425.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

name with 'Alī-tagīn's wazīr, who on his advice persuaded his sovereign to present his excuses and request the Khwārazm-shāh to act as mediator between himself and the Ghaznevid. 'Alī-tagīn recalled that the late Sultan had called him his son, and that at the time of the dispute regarding the succession to the throne he was prepared to give armed assistance to Mas'ūd[1]. The dying Khwārazm-shāh made a great effort and received the envoy of 'Alī-tagīn, thus completing the deception of the latter. After the conclusion of an agreement 'Alī-tagīn withdrew to Samarqand[2], and made no attempt to hinder the return of the Khorezmian army to Āmul. The death of the Khwārazm-shāh occurred even before the retiral had begun, but the Khorezmians only became aware of it when a distance of twenty farsakhs lay between them and their enemies[3]. On May 2nd, 1032[4], the Sultan was informed of these events.

Mas'ūd's campaign probably forced 'Alī-tagīn to cultivate closer relations with the members of his family, and to recognize their overlordship; at Bukhārā and Samarqand money began to be coined in the names of Arslān-Khān and Bughrā-Khān[5]. Besides this, within two years 'Alī-tagīn found a new ally in the person of the ruler of Khorezmia.

Owing to its geographical position Khorezmia was always practically an independent State, especially when such an experienced military leader and ruler as Altūntāsh stood at the head of the province. On his appointment as viceroy of Khorezmia, Altūntāsh had successfully repulsed the invasions of the neighbouring nomads, amongst whom the Qipchāqs[6] are mentioned at this period for the first time. At the same time he and
314 his | successor, like the Khwārazm-shāhs of the twelfth century, took into their service some divisions of tribesmen from these peoples[7], and besides this Altūntāsh, like his sovereign, purchased ghulāms in large numbers for his guard. The numerical strength of the guard maintained by Altūntāsh had already aroused Maḥmūd's apprehensions[8]. Although Altūntāsh continued to acknowledge himself a vassal of the Ghaznevid government, Maḥmūd perfectly realized that he could raise the standard of revolt at any time, and with the support of his army flout the orders sent from Ghazna or Balkh. Maḥmūd's efforts to tempt the Khwārazm-shāh to Ghazna by trickery were unsuccessful; Mas'ūd[9] also had recourse to similar intrigues, and met with the like failure. Nevertheless Altūntāsh did not bring about an

[1] Baihaki, p. 432. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 424. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 436.
[4] Date in Baihaki (*ibid.*, p. 425).
[5] A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 251–2. [6] Baihaki, p. 91.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 398, 859.
[8] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 206, trad., pp. 300–302; *Texts*, pp. 89–90 ('Awfī).
[9] Baihaki, pp. 91, 389 sq.

open revolt, but on the advice of his wazīr showed in the most unmistakable manner the fate which awaited those of his subjects who were influenced by the intrigues of the Ghaznevid government[1]. Even after the death of Altūntāsh, Mas'ūd did not decide to depose his heir, although he took measures to decrease his power. The title of Khwārazm-shāh was given to Mas'ūd's son Sa'īd, and Hārūn the son of Altūntāsh was to rule in Khorezmia only as the representative (Khalīfat ad-dār) of the prince. The ceremonial presents received by Hārūn amounted only to half the number received by his father[2]. In the spring of 1034 Hārūn began to display insubordination; the outward motive for his revolt was the death of his brother, who was living at Mas'ūd's court, and by an unfortunate accident fell from the roof (at the end of 1033 or the beginning of 1034); "malevolent people" wrote to Hārūn that his brother had been thrown from the roof by order of the Sultan[3]. Hārūn entered into an agreement with 'Alī-tagīn and the Saljūqids, and in August, 1034, openly disavowed the Sultan by abolishing the khuṭba in his name[4]. There were rumours of an agreement between Hārūn and 'Alī-tagīn according to which the former was to advance | on 315
Merv and the latter at the same time on Tirmidh and Balkh[5]. It was perhaps in connexion with these plans that Khuttal was invaded (in the spring of 1034) by Kumījī mountaineers[6] and Quwādhiyān by the Turkmens (at the end of the same year). The commander of Tirmidh, Begtagīn, marched against the Turkmens, but the latter passed round his army and crossed the Amu-Darya near Mēla. Begtagīn overtook them only at Shapurqān, where he defeated them, but was killed while pursuing the enemy. The commander sent by Mas'ūd, 'Alī-tagīn b. 'Abdallāh, restored order[7].

In the same year 1034 Hārūn gained the Saljūqids as his allies. According to Ibn al-Athīr's account[8] disputes had arisen between 'Alī-tagīn and the Saljūqids as early as the year 1029; on 'Alī-tagīn's orders his general Alp-Qarā killed Yūsuf (the grandson of Seljuk) whom 'Alī-tagīn himself had formerly placed at the head of all the Turks in his service with the title of Inanch-Payghū[9]. In the following year (1030) the cousins of the murdered man, Ṭughrul and Dāwud, led a revolt, and killed Alp-Qarā and 1,000 of his men. 'Alī-tagin and his sons, supported by the population, marched against them; the Turkmens

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 410–11. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 439.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 499. Before the account of this event there is a blank space in all the MSS.; in the Teheran edition of A. H. 1307 (p. 410) we find three lines which are not in Morley's edition.

[4] Baihaki, pp. 854–5. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 535 [6] *Ibid.*, p. 499.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 543–4. [8] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 324–5.

[9] Payghū is perhaps to be read Yabghū; cf. Marquart, *Osttürk. Dialektstudien*, p. 45.

were completely defeated, their possessions seized, and a number of their wives and children taken prisoner. "Necessity obliged them to settle in Khurāsān," and on receiving an invitation from Hārūn to join him, they hastened to make use of the opportunity. Ibn al-Athīr alone speaks of these events; Bayhaqī[1] on the contrary asserts that to the end of his life 'Alī-tagīn endeavoured to gain the goodwill of the Turkmens by "speeches and silver," regarding them as the support of his throne. After him his two sons and their general began to quarrel with the Turkmens and obliged them to leave for Khorezmia, where they used frequently to winter during the lifetime of Altūntāsh[2]. Hārūn offered them land near Shurākhān and Māsh-rabāṭ[3]. Here the Turk-
316 mens in | October of the same year were invaded by Shāh-Malik, ruler of Jand, with whom they had a long-standing feud. Between seven and eight thousand Turkmens were killed and the remainder saved themselves by flight across the ice-covered river. Hārūn entered into negotiations with Shāh-Malik, who flatly rejected his offer of mediation in his quarrel with the Saljūqids, but agreed to make a treaty with him and to afford him the assistance of a division in his campaign in Khurāsān. It was decided that both armies should march to the river and that a meeting should take place between the sovereigns in boats in the middle of the stream. The meeting took place on 12th Nov.; but Shāh-Malik, alarmed by the number of Hārūn's army (30,000 men) did not fulfil his promises and without informing his ally hurriedly returned to Jand. Shāh-Malik's enmity could not prevent Hārūn from invading Khurāsān in the spring of 1035, as the march from Jand to Khorezmia was considered possible only in the winter[4].

The death of 'Alī-tagīn, if it was the cause of the migration of the Turkmens, took place in the summer or autumn of 1034. In the spring of 1035 Mas'ūd was informed of the accession to the throne of his eldest son, and dispatched a letter to Bukhārā with an expression of his condolence and congratulation; in this letter the young īlak was called "excellent Amīr, son[5]." But both 'Alī-tagīn's sons had by this time begun to carry out an agreement made with Hārūn, by which they had bound themselves to undertake an invasion of Ṣaghāniyān and Tirmidh, to cross the Amu-Darya and unite with Hārūn near Andkhūd. Abu'l-Qāsim, the ruler of Ṣaghāniyān, could not resist them, and fled north to the country of the Kumījīs. The army of the īlak passed through Dārzangī and besieged Tirmidh, but was unable

[1] Baihaki, pp. 551, 856.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 583.
[3] Here called ماشه; see above, p. 149.
[4] Baihaki, pp. 856–8. This story evokes some doubt; it is strange that as early as October a whole army could cross the Amu-Darya on the ice.
[5] الامير العاصل الولد (*ibid.*, p. 575).

to take the fortress. At this point news arrived that Hārūn had been killed at the very outset of the campaign by ghulāms bought by the Ghaznevid government[1], and 'Alī-tagīn's sons returned to Samarqand through the Iron Gate[2]. In the summer of the same year the news of the successes of the Saljūqids, who had entered Khurāsān after the death of Hārūn, induced 'Alī-tagīn's sons to make a second raid | on Ṣaghāniyān. They 317
set out from Samarqand, but only covered two or three stages this time, as they learnt that Abu'l-Qāsim and others of Mas'ūd's generals had collected considerable forces[3]. Mas'ūd prepared to avenge the invasion on 'Alī-tagīn's sons, but on Dec. 8th an envoy of noble birth sent by them in the company of a Samarqand dānishmand arrived in Balkh, bringing an apology in the name of their sovereign. The apology was accepted, but in order to mark his displeasure Mas'ūd did not grant the envoy an audience, and negotiations were carried out only between the wazīr and the dānishmand[4].

A year later, in Dec. 1036, Mas'ūd again received an embassy from 'Alī-tagīn's sons, consisting of Alp-tagīn and the khaṭīb of Bukhārā, 'Abdallāh Pārsī. This time the envoys were admitted to a ceremonial audience; the Sultan inquired after the health of "his brother the īlak," thus showing 'Alī-tagīn's son greater honour than in his first letter where he was called "son". Distrusting the envoys, Mas'ūd gave orders that care should be taken that they should receive no information on affairs of state. The īlak requested that he should be given one of the Ghaznevid princesses in marriage, and that one of the Qarā-Khānid princesses should marry one of the Sultan's sons; in return he promised to give up all pretentions to Khuttal, and in addition asked that Mas'ūd should mediate between him and the head of Qarā-Khānid dynasty, Arslān-Khān. On his side the īlak promised the Sultan armed assistance in his struggle with the Saljūqids. His wishes were granted, it being decided that the īlak's sister should be given to Sa'īd, Mas'ūd's son, and Maḥmūd's niece, the daughter of Naṣr, to the īlak. The ra'īs of Balkh, 'Abd as-Salām, was dispatched to Transoxania as envoy[5], and in Sept. 1037 was still at the court of 'Alī-tagīn's sons[6].

Mas'ūd's relations with the Qarā-Khānids of Turkestan also were not wholly friendly. In the autumn of 1034, simultaneously with the return of the Ghaznevid envoys, ambassadors arrived from Bughrā-Khān, asking that his bride, the princess Zaynab, should be sent to him. The Sultan was willing to comply with his request | until he heard that Bughrā-Khān intended to raise 318
a claim in the name of Zaynab to part of the inheritance left by

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 860. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 575–7. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 611.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 615–16. [5] *Ibid.*, pp. 631–4. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 661.

Maḥmūd. Bughrā-Khān's envoy was dismissed, after which the Sultan complained to Arslān-Khān of the pretentions of his brother. The reproaches of Arslān-Khān only irritated Bughrā-Khān, so that he became the open enemy both of his brother and of the Ghaznevids. Under these conditions he was greatly pleased by the success obtained by the Saljūqids in 1035, the more so that an old friendship existed between him and Ṭughrul[1]. In 1037 a shoemaker was arrested on the bank of the Amu-Darya who turned out to be a spy of Bughrā-Khān's carrying letters to the Turkmen leaders, in which the Khān promised the latter his help in whatever measure they might require it. On the advice of one of his suite, the Sultan made no sign that the action of the Khān was known to him; the shoemaker received 100 dīnārs and was sent to India, in order that the existence of the letters should remain unknown: and the imām Abū Ṣādiq Tabānī was sent to Turkestan at the head of a brilliant embassy, which had cost more than 10,000 dīnārs, in order that, through the mediation of Arslān-Khān, a peaceful agreement might be come to with his brother. The ambassador left Ghazna on Aug. 23, 1037, remained in Turkestan eighteen months and executed his commission with entire success; Bughrā-Khān said of him that by his skill in disputes he eclipsed Abū Ḥanīfa[2]. From this story it is evident that at that time the strained relations between the brothers, contrary to the statement of Bayhaqī quoted above, had not yet reached open enmity. On Sept. 24 of the same year, Mas'ūd received simultaneously the envoys of both brothers as well as a third from an unknown ruler[3].

In 1038 Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm[4], the son of the first īlak Naṣr, made his appearance in Transoxania. At this time he bore the
319 title of | Būrī-tagīn[5]. He had succeeded in escaping from the prison in which he was confined by the sons of 'Alī-tagīn, and apparently sought refuge at first with his brother 'Ayn ad-Dawla at Ūzgand[6], but was unable to remain there long[7]. In the

[1] Evidently it is not this Bughrā-Khān that is referred to in Ibn al-Athīr's story of how Ṭughrul was taken prisoner by Bughrā-Khān and liberated by his brother Dāwud (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 323). [2] Baihaki, pp. 656–8.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 660 (لشكر فان والىٔ سكمان). Cf. *Handbook of Semiryechye*, vol. ii, p. 97.

[4] Bayhaqī's text (p. 682) is apparently somewhat mutilated. There was never an īlak Ibrāhīm; the term īlak-i mādī was even in later times always applied to Naṣr (cf. *Texts*, p. 133). This apparently gives an account of the first appearance of the subsequently famous Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, though according to Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 211) the latter bore another kunya (Abu'l-Muẓaffar), which was probably given him later.

[5] In Bayhaqī, Gardīzī, and Minūchihrī we find Pūr-tagīn throughout, but undoubtedly Būrī (wolf) should be read; the same reading is required in Minūchihrī's verses (*Menoutchehri*, ed. Biberstein-Kazimirsky, p. 47 of the text, verse 62).

[6] Thus correctly in the Teheran edition (p. 558); in the Morley edition, p. 682, راست اوركنج; his letter to the wazīr was written from Ūzgand.

[7] Baihaki, p. 697.

summer of 1038 the Ghaznevid wazīr received a letter from him, of which he informed the Sultan; the "great name" of the prince induced the Ghaznevid Government to give him a favourable answer, although by desire of the Sultan the letter was written in such a way that it could do no harm if it should fall into the hands of 'Alī-tagīn's sons[1]. The prince retired to the country of the Kumījīs and there collected a division of 3,000 men, with which he began to lay waste Wakhsh[2] and Khuttal, in the neighbourhood of Hulbuk. He had already reached the banks of the Panj, when he received news of the Sultan's intention to undertake a campaign against him in person. Būrī-tagīn retreated and expressed his repentance, but a division of 10,000 horsemen was, nevertheless, sent against him at the end of October[3]. The news soon arrived that Būrī-tagīn had abandoned Khuttal and returned to the country of the Kumījīs. By Mas'ūd's desire the general 'Alī returned to Balkh and the Sultan renewed his plan of undertaking a campain in Transoxania in person and of finishing with Būrī-tagīn the same winter, in order to proceed against the Turkmens in the spring. Vainly did the wazīr remonstrate that campaigns were undertaken either in the spring when the fresh grass had grown, or in the autumn when the harvest had been gathered, and that it was quite sufficient to entrust the campaign against Būrī-tagīn to the ruler of Ṣaghāniyān and 'Alī-tagīn's sons, without exposing the Sultan's army to the hardships of a winter campaign[4]. The Sultan would take no advice, but, according to Gardīzī[5], was set upon taking advantage of the disorders which had supervened in Transoxania to add this country to his possessions.

By Mas'ūd's order the commander of Tirmidh, Begtagīn[6], was 320
instructed to restore the floating bridge by which Maḥmūd had crossed in 1025; the bridge connected both banks of the river with the island of Aral-Payghambar and was therefore divided into two halves (see pp. 75–6). Its restoration did not entail much difficulty as all the requirements, boats and other materials, were still on the spot. The Sultan's army crossed the river on Monday, Dec. 18th, and reached Ṣaghāniyān on Sunday 31st, without encountering the enemy, but suffering severely from the cold and snow. According to Bayhaqī, who himself took part in the campaign, none had ever been accompanied by such hard-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 684.

[2] Undoubtedly in Baihaki وخش should be read instead of رخش.

[3] Baihaki, pp. 696–9. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 702–3. [5] *Texts*, p. 17.

[6] From Bayhaqī's statement (p. 704) it may be inferred that this Begtagīn was appointed commander of Tirmidh under Sabuktagīn, that is, identical with that Begtagīn who, as we saw (p. 297), was, according to Bayhaqī himself, killed in 1034. Farther on (p. 707) the commander of Tirmidh is called Nūshtagīn.

ships for the army as this was. On Tuesday, Jan. 9th, when the army had reached the pass of Shūniyān, a letter arrived from the wazīr with news of the advance of the Saljūqids from Sarakhs in the direction of Gūzgān; it was supposed that they were intending to make for Tirmidh, destroy the bridge, and cut off the Sultan from his territories. The Sultan was forced to retreat, the more so that Būrī-tagīn had advanced from Shūniyān and held the pass; under these conditions it was impossible to face an opponent who was thoroughly acquainted with the country. The retreat began on Friday, Jan. 12th, and exactly two weeks later (on Jan. 26th) Mas'ūd arrived in Tirmidh. During all this time Būrī-tagīn pursued them and captured part of their baggage, camels, and horses[1]. Mas'ūd's unsuccessful campaign of course enhanced Būrī-tagīn's importance; from letters received by the Ghaznevid government in the autumn of 1039, it was evident that Būrī-tagīn had with the assistance of the Turkmens gained several victories over 'Alī-tagīn's sons, and had already almost wrested Transoxania[2] from them.

Our task does not include[3] an account of the gradual successes of the Saljūqids in Khurāsān and of the struggles between the
321 military forces | of Mas'ūd, who were much more numerous and better armed, but encumbered in advance by their baggage, and the light divisions of the nomads, to whom the steppe was "father and mother"[4] and who could leave their baggage 120 miles away from the main body[5]. The Saljūqids received, at their own request, the assistance of some divisions from Transoxania[6], and were quite secure from the danger of an attack from the rear, as the government of Khorezmia after the death of Hārūn (see p. 299) had passed to his brother Ismā'īl Khandān, who remained the enemy of the Ghaznevids. In order to rid himself of this enemy Mas'ūd had in 1038 sent a diploma for Khorezmia to Shāh-Malik of Jand. The latter's efforts to induce the Khorezmians to submit to him voluntarily, as the nominee of their lawful sovereign, failed of success, but he did not undertake a campaign in Khorezmia until the winter of 1040–1. In February 1041 a three days' battle was fought on the plain of Āsīb, and ended in the defeat of the Khorezmians. According to Bayhaqī the Khorezmians were capable of further resistance, but rumours of the approach of a Ghaznevid army spread terror amongst them. Fearing treachery Ismā'īl abandoned his capital (28th March) and fled to the Saljūqids. In April the capital was occupied by Shāh-Malik and the khuṭba was read in the name of Mas'ūd, although by that time the latter was already dead[7].

[1] Baihaki, p. 707.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 745.
[3] This has been done in part by Biberstein-Kazimirsky (see above, p. 24).
[4] Baihaki, p. 669.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 712–13 (30 farsakhs).
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 734.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 865–7.

The decisive victory of the Saljūqids over Mas'ūd had taken place before Shāh-Malik's campaign. The battle at Dandānqān[1] (in May 1040) ended for ever the rule of the Ghaznevids in Khurāsān; on the very site of the battle a throne[2] was erected on which Ṭughrul took his seat and was acclaimed by all as Amīr of Khurāsān. After this, letters were dispatched with news of the victory to both Khāns of Turkestan, to 'Alī-tagīn's sons, to Būrī-tagīn, and to 'Ayn ad-Dawla. The fugitives were pursued to the bank of the Amu-Darya, in order that they might flee into Transoxania and there | serve as visible confirmation of 322
the victory. On the other hand, Mas'ūd in his letter to the head of the Qarā-Khānids, which was composed by Bayhaqī, expresses his conviction that Arslān-Khān will not refuse him assistance, and will even agree to join in person a campaign for this purpose[3]. Mas'ūd himself however was convinced that it would be necessary to give up not only Balkh and its dependent provinces, but even Ghazna. In vain did the wazīr and other nobles argue that there was no occasion for such apprehension[4]; in spite of this Mas'ūd decided to retire to India, after sending Būrī-tagīn diplomas for Balkh and Ṭukhāristān[5] (in order to make trouble between him and the Saljūqids) and giving permission to those nobles remaining in Ghazna to enter the service of the Saljūqids in the event of their arrival[6].

As events proved, Mas'ūd's despair was in reality premature. After the deposition and death of the Sultan (in January 1041)[7] and the short-lived reign of his brother Muḥammad, who was again raised to the throne by the army, the throne was occupied in April 1041[8] by Mas'ūd's energetic son Mawdūd, under whom circumstances again took a more favourable turn for the Ghaznevids. Balkh and Tirmidh remained in the hands of Mawdūd, and the "King of the Turks in Transoxania" (probably Būrī-tagīn) expressed his submission to him[9]. The commander of Tirmidh was Amīrak Bayhaqī (his actual name was Abu'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Muḥammad), who, according to the account given by Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī[10], defended the town against the Saljūqids for 15 years, and only gave it up to Dāwud when all hope of the Ghaznevids was lost. Dāwud offered him the post of wazīr, but Amīrak firmly refused his offer and returned to

[1] The fortress was 40 miles from Merv: cf. Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny, &c.*, p. 38.

[2] Baihaki, p. 788. In spite of this Raverty (*Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, p. 132) categorically states, "Baihaki does not say anything about a throne."

[3] Baihaki, p 796. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 829-30.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 826. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 832.

[7] According to Gardīzī (f. 174; Camb. MS., f. 140 a) 11th Jumādā I, 432; cf. *Texts*, p. 18.

[8] Identical date (Sha'bān 432) in Baihaki (p. 867) and in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 334); in Muller (*Der Islam*, II, 77), the date is incorrectly given as 434.

[9] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 334. [10] Ta'rīkh i Bayhaq, ff. 69 b–70 a.

Ghazna, where he was appointed head of the dīwān of state documents. The historian's account of this protracted defence of Tirmidh is, however, contradicted by his own statement that
323 Amīrak had already been appointed head of the dīwān | of documents under Mawdūd, *i.e.* before 1048. Still earlier, in 1043, the Saljūqids took possession of Khorezmia; Shāh-Malik fled to Persia where he held for some time the district of Bayhaq [1], but finally he was imprisoned in Makrān and died in prison [2]. The final transfer of Balkh to Saljūqid rule and consequently the definitive severance of the ties between the Ghaznevids and Transoxania took place only in 1059 by the terms of a treaty between Dāwud and the Ghaznevid Sultan Ibrāhīm [3].

About this time Būrī-tagīn Ibrāhīm firmly established his power in Transoxania and founded an independent state. From the numismatic data [4] it may be concluded that he was already ruler of Bukhārā in 433/1041–2, perhaps as the vassal of Bughrā-Khān; on coins of 438/1046–7, probably struck in Samarqand [5], we already find Ibrāhīm's full title: "Support of the State, Crown of the Religious Community, Sword of the Viceroy of God [6], Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm." The title of Ṭamghāch-Khān [7] taken by Ibrāhīm and before him by Bughrā-Khān, points to an imitation of the Chinese Emperors, and probably explains the fact that Ibrāhīm subsequently took the title of "King of the East and of China" [8] and his son Naṣr that of "Sultan of the East and of China" [9], although both, from reliable information, ruled only in Transoxania.

Ibrāhīm's successes were, according to Ibn al-Athīr [10], facilitated by the internecine quarrels amongst the Qarā-Khānids of Turkestan of which we have spoken elsewhere [11]. Besides this a Shi'ite movement, most probably the last of such movements, broke out in Transoxania under Bughrā-Khān Hārūn in 436/1044–5; |
324 unfortunately we have but very scanty information on it. This time also the Shi'ite emissaries were successful in inducing the population to swear fealty to the Fāṭimid Caliph Mustanṣir (1036–1094). Bughrā-Khān himself pretended to accept their

[1] Ta'rīkh-i Bayhaq, ff. 28 b–29 a. Shāh-Malik is here called Abu'l-Fawāris Shāh-Malik b. 'Alī al-Barrānī, and has the title of Ḥusām ad-Dawla wa Niẓām al-Milla (Sword of the State and Order of the Religious Community).

[2] Baihaki, pp. 867–8; Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 346.

[3] Müller, *Der Islam*, ii, 77. Cf. also Raverty, *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 103, 132.

[4] A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 256. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[6] 'Imād ad-Dawla wa Tāj al-Milla Sayf Khalīfat Allāh.

[7] The spellings Ṭafghāch and Ṭanghāch are also met with; in the Orkhon inscriptions Tabgach; on the significance of this term see Radloff, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, St. Petersburg, 1895, p. 428; Hirth, *Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk*, p. 35.

[8] A Markov, *Katalog*, p. 263 et seq. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 268 et seq.

[10] Ibn al-Athīr, ix 211. [11] *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, 98.

teaching, but only with the intention of inspiring them with false confidence, and when they were unsuspicious of any danger he ordered a massacre of the Shi'ites in Bukhārā and sent corresponding orders to the other towns[1].

In the history of Transoxania the epoch of the Qarā-Khānids, the first Turkish dynasty who directly governed the whole country, is undoubtedly of great importance. Unfortunately the brevity of the information which has come down to us on this period makes it impossible for us to trace what changes had been made in the organization established by the Sāmānids, and how the situation came about in which the Mongols found the country. We know somewhat more of the changes introduced by the Saljūqids in Persia. To a considerable degree identical circumstances (the conquest by Turkish nomads of a country where the Eastern-Muslim political organization was in operation) must have had identical results; besides this, the structure of the Saljūqid empire was also of importance for Transoxania, as Khorezmia was incorporated in the former, and the Khwārazm-Shāhs who made themselves masters of Transoxania in the thirteenth century, were originally the viceroys of the Saljūqids. We shall briefly review therefore those features which distinguished the Saljūqids from their predecessors.

The personal merits of the first Saljūqid rulers, Ṭughrul, Alp-Arslān and Malik-Shāh, have long been appraised at their true value. Even A. Muller, who generally refers to the Turks more than disdainfully[2], does full justice to these rulers, especially to the latter two[3]. The contrast between the character of the Turkish people and the Turkish rulers already attracted attention in the Middle Ages, as is shown by the interesting observation of Idrīsī on the Turks[4]: "Their princes are warlike, provident, firm, just, and are distinguished by excellent | qualities; 325
the nation is cruel, wild, coarse, and ignorant." The degree of culture which the Turks had reached and the features of their existence give sufficient ground for the assumption that in their case the same psychological causes were operating as those by which the sharp difference between the mentality of the individual and that of the mass at the stage of boyhood is explained. Besides this the moral ideas of nomads are dependent to a greater degree than those of civilized peoples on religion. It is quite natural that the first Saljūqids and Qarā-Khānids were better Muslims than Maḥmūd and Mas'ūd, just as Saint Vladimir was a better Christian than the Byzantine Emperors. In the eyes of the Qarā-Khānids religion was not only a weapon for the maintenance of their rule; the precepts of their faith were recognized

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 358. [2] *Der Islam*, ii, 22. [3] *Ibid.*, ii, 95.
[4] *Géographie d'Edrisi*, trad. par Jaubert, i, 498.

as binding on the sovereigns as well, who, as we have seen (p. 283) abstained from the use of wine. It is very probable that under the influence of religion some of these rulers were imbued with a sincere desire to realize the ideal of a just king.

The leader of a nomadic people, who had scarcely been distinguished from his warriors by his dress [1], and who had shared all their labours with them [2], could not suddenly turn into a despot of the same type as Maḥmūd and Mas'ūd. It is highly characteristic that the repulsive office of ṣāḥib-ḥaras (see above p. 228) lost all importance [3] under the Saljūqids. The office of ṣāḥib-khabar also fell into disuse. A system of espionage was repugnant to the moral feeling of uncultured men; the upholder of this system, Niẓām al-Mulk [4], quotes the following answer of Alp-Arslān to the question why he did not appoint a ṣāḥib-khabar: "If I appoint a ṣāḥib-khabar those who are my sincere friends and enjoy my intimacy will not pay any attention to him nor bribe him, trusting in their fidelity, friendship, and intimacy. On the other hand my adversaries and enemies will make friends with him and give him money: it is clear that the ṣāḥib-khabar will be constantly bringing me bad reports of my friends and
326 good reports of my enemies. | Good and evil words are like arrows, if several are shot, at least one hits the target; every day my sympathy to my friends will diminish and that to my enemies increase. Within a short time my enemies will be nearer to me than my friends, and will finally take their place. No one will be in a position to repair the harm which will result from this." It cannot be denied that these words witness not only to a noble faith in men, but also to the sound judgement of a man unspoiled by civilization. Besides this a system of espionage carried the drawback that it might be used also as a weapon against the monarch; if Maḥmūd set spies on his son Mas'ūd (see p. 292), Mas'ūd also had spies in his father's chancellery [5]. On the other hand Niẓām al-Mulk was right in considering the office of ṣāḥib-khabar as one of the pillars (qā'ida, pl. qawā'id) of order in the state. The abolition of the espionage system, without being replaced by a more effective control, could only aggravate the arbitrariness of individual princes and governors.

The Persian conception of the monarch as the sole ruler of the state was also foreign to the nomads, in whose eyes the empire

[1] The dress worn by Ṭughrul at his entry into Nīshāpūr (1038) is described in detail in Baihaki (p. 691). He wore clothes of Mulḥam fabric (see p. 235), a Tavvazī turban (Tavvazī fabrics, which took their name from the small town of Tavvaz in Fārs, enjoyed great celebrity; cf. *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, III, 435), and felt shoes; drawn through his arm was a bow with three arrows.

[2] During the retreat of the Turkmens Ṭughrul took off neither shoes nor armour for several days (Baihaki, p. 760).

[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 122, trad., p. 179.

[4] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 65, trad., p. 99.

[5] Baihaki, pp. 164–5.

was the property of the whole family of the Khān. How foreign the idea of an autocratic ruler was at first to the Saljūqids is shown by the fact that in some cities of Khurāsān the khuṭba was read in the name of Ṭughrul, and in others at the same time in the name of his brother Dāwud[1]. The system of petty principalities and the internal quarrels inseparable from it were as widely developed in the kingdom of the Saljūqids as in that of the Qarā-Khānids. Equally harmful to the interests of the population must have been the system of military fiefs, *i.e.* territorial holdings distributed to the army instead of the payment of grants or as part of them[2]. In the Eastern half of the Muslim world this system only became widely developed after the Turkish conquest. Even in earlier times there were isolated cases of grants of land as a reward to soldiers who had distinguished themselves in service, but these exceptions were so rare that Nizām al-Mulk could assert | that former kings 327
had never distributed fiefs and paid their troops in money only. This system was still observed in his day in the Ghaznevid state[3]. In the Saljūqid empire the grant of a fief (iqṭāʿ) was of common occurrence, but this did not lead to the establishment of a system of serfdom. Nizām al-Mulk[4] reminds the owners of fiefs that they are only allowed to take a specified sum from the inhabitants, and have no right beyond this to the persons, property, wives, and children of the population. The distributions of fiefs, which resulted in the diminution of the territorial property of the ruler, probably explains the decreasing importance of the office of wakīl[5].

The greatest sufferers from the disorders introduced by the system of petty principalities, and probably also by the system of territorial fiefs, were, of course, the land-owning class, and this even more, as the facts show, in Transoxania than in Khurāsān. We have seen (p. 257) that the dihqāns of Transoxania were in part responsible for the fall of the Sāmānid dynasty: it was quite natural, therefore, that in the early period of the rule of the new dynasty the dihqāns acquired greater importance, as is shown by the appearance of coins issued by the dihqān of Īlāq[6]. In the account of the campaign of 1007–8 also, as we have seen (p. 273), the "dihqāns of Transoxania" are mentioned separately. But in the accounts of the Mongol invasion we no longer meet with any information pointing to the importance of this class in Transoxania, whereas in Khurāsān landowners are mentioned as formerly, living in their family

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 327, 328.
[2] Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, i, 251 sq., 285.
[3] See above, p. 238, n. 12.
[4] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 28, trad., p. 40.
[5] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 81, trad., p. 121.
[6] *Mélanges Asiatiques*, viii, 715; A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 218–19.

castles. When the Mongols collected the rural population, as they did everywhere, for labour on siege-works, they sent orders to that effect to the landowners[1]. The name of dihqāns, at least in Khurāsān, was given also to those Turks who received territorial fiefs. When in 1035 the towns of Dihistān, Nasā, and Farāwa were assigned to the Saljūqids (Ṭughrul, Dāwud, and their uncle Payghū or Yabghū), all three received the name of dihqāns and presents corresponding to the office of governor
328 (wālī): the cap with two | sharp points, a standard, and sewn garments according to the custom of the Persians, horses, harness, and a gold belt, according to the custom of the Turks, and besides this thirty pieces of uncut cloth[2]. The decline of the landowning class in Transoxania was probably due to the extreme depreciation of landed property, of which the translator of Narshakhī speaks[3]; in his time no one would accept even as a gift land, which under the Sāmānids was worth 4,000 dirhams the jift, and if a buyer was found the ground all the same remained uncultivated "in consequence of the cruelty (of the rulers) and their merciless dealings with their subjects."

The ideal of an autocratic sovereign, which prevailed in the conquered provinces, could not fail to influence the conquerors in time. The despotic tendencies of the rulers must have estranged their fellow-tribesmen, and on the other hand attracted the rulers themselves to the representatives of the Persian bureaucracy. The Saljūqids could not assimilate themselves completely to the Sāmānids and Ghaznevids, because up to the end they remained strangers to all culture. Thoroughly reliable information[4] has come down to us that the last of the powerful Saljūqid sultans, Sinjar, could neither read nor write, and we do not know that his predecessors were any better educated, though his father Malik-Shāh is sometimes represented as possessing more culture.

An illiterate sovereign certainly could not follow the intricate bureaucratic administration of his extensive possessions, and this duty lay exclusively with the wazīr; during the Saljūqid period, therefore, we find the wazīrs exercising greater authority than at any previous time. Nizām al-Mulk could with perfect justice call himself joint-ruler with his sovereign[5]. At the same time under such conditions the interference of the sovereign and the court in the course of administration might produce particularly fatal effects on affairs; Nizām al-Mulk[6] therefore made efforts

[1] *Nesawi, &c.*, Houdas, p. 53, trad. 90–91. A more correct translation in C. d'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 278). [2] Baihaki, p. 611.

[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 29–30. It is true that the author speaks of the price of land in the town of Bukhārā, but it is most probable that the case was the same in the villages.

[4] *Texts*, p 38 (from a diplomatic document written in Sinjar's own name).

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 138.

[6] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 66, trad, pp. 99–100.

that written orders from the palace should be sent as rarely as possible, since "all that occurs too often ceases to be heeded." The oral commands of the sovereign constituted a still greater danger. Nizām al-Mulk[1] thought it necessary to establish a law | that such orders should always be transmitted to the 329
Dīwān or Treasury by one and the same person, and this person would not have the right to transfer his duty to another. On receipt of such a command the Dīwān would be given the duty of drawing up a report on it, and only when the sovereign had heard the report was the order to be carried out. Needless to say such an arrangement, which was incompatible with the substance of despotic administration, was never adopted in practice, and the excessive increase of the power of the wazīr only led to conflict between him and the sovereign.

The most complicated of the questions which had to be solved by the bureaucracy was how to deal with the Turkish invaders, who had entered the country together with the sovereign, and who had no desire at all to change to a settled life and submit to the same administration as the remaining mass of the population. The representatives of the Persian bureaucracy naturally wished to regard the divisions of nomads as "guards" (ḥasham) and bring them under the same regulations as were obeyed by the guard of bought slaves and mercenaries under former rulers. In this respect the opinion of Nizām al-Mulk[2] on the Turkmens is remarkable. Their numerous divisions were a source of constant disorders, but it was not advisable to take severe measures against them on account of their relationship to the dynasty and their services to it. It was necessary to collect a division of 1,000 young Turkmens, include them in the "ghulāms of the Court," and train them like the latter, in order that they might "associate with people, become accustomed to them, do service like the ghulāms, and cease to feel that aversion (to the dynasty) with which they are naturally imbued. In case of need 5,000 or 10,000 men can be assembled who will perform service like the ghulāms. Thus the existence of the dynasty will be of advantage to them also; the king will be praised, and they will be satisfied." It was not so easy, of course, to transform the sons of the steppe into "ghulāms of the Court." Still more difficult was it to reconcile the interests of the settled population with those of the invaders, who had no wish to abandon their nomad life. In proportion to the metamorphosis of the rulers from Turkish Khāns into Persian despots, the inevitable disputes between agriculturists and nomads were necessarily decided | more and more in favour of the first, 330

[1] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 81 : in the translation (p. 120) exactly the reverse is said.
[2] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 94, trad., p. 138.

and the nomads had either to conform to a settled existence or suffer in the country they had conquered.

Under such conditions it is easy to understand how difficult it was to attain the ideal to which Niẓām al-Mulk had aspired, and what danger must have attended the slightest sign of weakening in the structure of the state. Nizām al-Mulk saw a special danger in the growing strength of the heretical Ismailites in the reign of Malik-Shāh[1], and another danger lay in the influence of the women[2], whose position amongst the nomads was different from that amongst the settled peoples. The unemployed members of the official class may also have proved to be an element of unrest; it was necessary therefore to see to it that no individual held two or more posts, as this diminished the number of people provided with posts[3]. Still more dangerous in the eyes of Nizām al-Mulk[4] was a project brought forward at the end of the reign of Malik-Shāh for the restriction of military expenditure. One of his suite succeeded in convincing the sovereign that, owing to the establishment of a general peace, there was no need to maintain 400,000 men as a standing army and to pay them grants, and that it was possible to reduce this figure to 70,000[5]. By such a measure the dynasty would secure for itself 330,000 armed enemies; in the eyes of Nizām al-Mulk it would have been much more expedient to increase the numbers of the army to 700,000 and subjugate Eastern Asia, Africa, and Greece. Nizām al-Mulk complains[6] also of Malik-Shāh's economy in not organizing, like his predecessors[7], large banquets for the army; in the eyes of the nomads of all nations, liberality appears as the first virtue of kings and heroes. The wazīr recalls the banquets of Ṭughrul, and points out the enormous importance of similar banquets in the Qarā-Khānid state, and the disappointment of the soldiers and inhabitants of Transoxania when Malik-Shāh at the time of his campaign in that country did not once show them hospitality.

331 In the Qarā-Khānid state we find yet another factor | which seems not to have attained the same importance in the kingdom of the Saljūqids, namely the conflict between the temporal power and the priesthood. We quote below a number of facts showing with what bitterness the struggle was waged, but unfortunately our sources do not enable us to explain the cause of this conflict. The first Turkish Khāns, as we have seen, were distinguished by sincere piety, though it is true that they honoured shaykhs and

[1] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, pp. 164–5, trad., pp. 242–4.
[2] *Ibid.*, texte, pp. 156 sq., trad., pp. 231 sq.
[3] Cf. above, p. 239.
[4] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 144, trad., p. 213.
[5] According to Rāwandī (*Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, pp. 131–2) the number of horsemen belonging to the Sultan's own guard in the reign of Malik-Shāh was only 46,000.
[6] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 115, trad., pp. 168–9.
[7] On the banquets of Alp-Arslān see Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 47.

other ascetics more than the representatives of dogmatic religion. Such an influential shaykh in Persia was the famous Abū Sa'īd Mayhanī, to whom, if his biographer[1] is to be believed, the Saljūqids paid their respects at the very beginning of their struggle with the Ghaznevids. From an account of 'Awfī's[2], it may be inferred that the shaykh Abū Sa'īd did not in after times lead the life of an ascetic, but on the contrary lived "like a sultan." In this respect he differed from another shaykh, Abu'l-Ḥasan Kharaqānī, who was not, however, deluded by his asceticism, and admitted that it was possible "to do God's work" in rags or in rich clothing. The shaykh Abū Sa'īd was distinguished by the same tolerance towards those who studied the practical sciences. According to Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī's[3] account he had a conversation with Avicenna, after which the shaykh remarked "That which I see, he knows," and the philosopher said of his companion: "That which I know, he sees." Such relations between a shaykh and a philosopher who was so detested by the representatives of orthodoxy[4] cannot but be looked on as remarkable. Those with whom the Qarā-Khānids came into conflict were evidently not as peaceably inclined.

Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, according to Ibn al-Athīr[5], was distinguished by a rare piety. His father Naṣr was already a hermit,[6] and Ṭamghāch-Khān himself never took money (*i. e.* did not introduce new taxation) without asking the opinion of the faqīhs. | His respect for the priesthood was so great that 332
when the preacher Abū Shujā', a descendant of 'Alī, once said to him, "Thou art not worthy to be a King," the Khān closed the doors of his palace and decided to resign his throne, but the inhabitants succeeded in persuading him that the preacher had been mistaken, and that his words were contradicted by the Khān's labours on behalf of his subjects.

In 'Awfī's narratives[7] the "great" Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm is exhibited as the ideal of a righteous king; these tales are anecdotal in character, but from them we can judge how the nation looked upon the reign of this at all events eminent ruler. 'Awfī[8] also quotes the written resolutions of the Khān. Thus the Qarā-Khānids were evidently more advanced than the Saljūqids, which is indeed quite natural, since in Eastern Turkestan they undoubtedly came under the influence of the Chinese civilization, at least through the Uighūrs. In the poem

[1] V. A. Zhukovsky, *Tainy edineniya, &c.* (Mysteries of Union with God in the Stations of the Shaykh Abū Sa'īd: Interpretations of the quatrains of Abū Sa'īd), Persian texts, St. Petersburg, 1899, p. 206.
[2] *Texts*, p. 97; cf Zhukovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 188.
[3] *Texts*, p. 153 (not in Browne's edition); cf. Zhukovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 252.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 310.
[5] *Ibid*, ix, 211–12.
[6] Compare also the anecdotes on Naṣr related by Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, pp 133–5).
[7] *Texts*, pp 84–7.
[8] *Texts*, p. 87.

"Kudatku-bilik," written in 1069 by a native of the town of Balāsāghūn, we already meet with some cultural terms in Turkish (*e.g.* the word *bitikchi* = writer, official) which were used also in the Mongol period, and were undoubtedly borrowed by both Qarā-Khānids and Mongols from the Uighūrs.

Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm's first care was the establishment of complete order and safety in his dominions; every violation of property was punished without mercy. Once some robbers wrote on the gate of the citadel of Samarqand, "We are like an onion, the more we are cut the bigger we grow." The Khān ordered to be written under these words, "I stand here like a gardener; however much you grow I will uproot you." On one occasion he said to one of his followers, "Long ago I drew the sword of severity from the scabbard of vengeance, and I slew fine youths and beautiful striplings: now I need such men, as it has become known to me that the inhabitants of two towns[1] nourish treacherous intentions and wish to bring about open rebellion. Now I need men of action, and have learnt to value them. Therefore thou must seek for me one of the leaders of the gangs, who formerly maintained themselves by robbery,
333 that I | may show him mercy and that he may collect men of action for me." There was one leader of thieves and robbers who, in the days when the Khān ruled with severity, expressed repentance and, together with his four sons, began to live by the work of his hands. He was brought before the Khān, who appointed him his chief executioner[2], and granted him and his sons robes of honour. At the king's command he collected a body of 300 men who had been engaged in theft and robbery; the king took them into his service and ordered them to be given robes of honour also. They were taken in turn to the room where the robes of honour were kept, and thence into another where they were all seized one after the other, and the chief and his sons having been arrested in like manner, they were all executed. Such an example of severity had never before been witnessed in Samarqand, and thieves and robbers were inspired with such terror that after this not a dirham was lost in the country. The details of the story lead us to suppose that it relates to the measures taken against that class of the population from which at another epoch the so-called "volunteers" were drawn.

The Khān protected the interests of the working population not only against open violation of the rights of property, but

[1] In the original Kūkar (?) and Bātik; the first name is quite unknown, the second is perhaps identical with the village of Batık (see above, p. 81).

[2] The term *jāndār* is met with fairly often, and is evidently used in the same sense as the term *sāḥib-ḥaras* (see above, p. 228).

also against covetous merchants. On one occasion the butchers presented a petition to him in which they complained of the excessively low fixed price of meat, which yielded them but scanty profits, and begged for permission to raise it, offering in return to pay 1,000 dīnārs to the Treasury. The Khān agreed, and the butchers brought the money and raised the price; then the Khān forbade the inhabitants to buy meat under penalty of death. The butchers began to suffer enormous losses; in each quarter five or six men together bought one sheep and divided the meat between them. The upshot was that the butchers had once more to pay a sum of money, this time for the re-establishment of the former price. On this occasion the Khān said, "It would not be right if I sold all my subjects for 1,000 dīnārs."

We do not know the reason why this pious Khān had already come into conflict with the priesthood and executed one of | the 334
shaykhs, the imām Abu'l-Qāsim Samarqandī[1]. Of the life of this imām we know nothing except the anecdote related in the "Kitābi Mullāzādah" (see above, p. 58); the story is transmitted in the name of Abu'l-Qāsim himself[2]. At the time of his ḥajj the imām offered up a prayer on Mount Ḥirā, in the cave of the Prophet, and amongst other things prayed to God to give him some happiness (dawlat). A voice answered, "The happiness which we bestow on men is manifested in three things: the first prophecy, the second martyrdom, the third poverty. The door of prophecy is now closed; dost thou choose therefore martyrdom or poverty?" The imām chose martyrdom. "I knew that in order to bear the burden of poverty it was necessary to possess the same character as that of Muḥammad the Messenger of God." If 'Awfī[3] is to be believed, the execution of the imām excited the ill-will of the people against the Khān; Ibn al-Athīr's account quoted above indicates rather that at the time of the conflict between the Khān and the priesthood the bulk of the nation was on the side of the sovereign.

The raids of the Saljūqid sultans into Transoxania began already in the reign of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm. The eastern part of the Saljūqid empire after the death of Dāwud was governed by his son Alp-Arslān, who in 1064 undertook a difficult campaign in Khuttal and Ṣaghāniyān. After the Ghaznevids

[1] He must not be confused with another individual who bore the same name and lived in the Sāmānid period (*Texts*, p. 50; *Zapiski*, xii, 05). There was yet a third Abu'l-Qāsim Samarqandī, namely, the imām Nāṣir ad-Dīn, who arrived at Balkh from Samarqand in 536/1141; he is mentioned by the author of the work بحر الاسرار فی مناقب الاخیار, written in Bukhārā about 1640 (India Office Library, no. 575 in the new catalogue, no. 1496 in the old, f. 329 b–330 b; the author amongst other matters gives a very detailed description of Balkh).

[2] *Texts*, p. 170.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

lost Balkh and Tirmidh these provinces also of course had to submit to the Saljūqids. Their rulers stirred up a rebellion which was pacified with great difficulty by Alp-Arslān; at the storming of almost inaccessible mountain fortresses, Alp-Arslān was compelled to set a personal example to the soldiers[1]. In the following year, 1065, an expedition from Khorezmia into Jand and Sawrān was undertaken (according to Mīrkhwānd in the winter, see above, p. 298); the ruler of these towns submitted, and was left as governor of his province[2]. Still earlier Alp-Arslān |
335 carried out an invasion of the territory of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, in consequence of which the Khān in 1061 dispatched an embassy to Baghdād to complain to the head of Islām of the actions of the Saljūqid sultan. The Caliph could only present the Khān with robes of honour and titles[3]; we know from his coinage[4] that besides the titles already mentioned (p. 304) the Khān bore the following: Glory of the Community (ʿIzz al-Ummah), Pride of the Muslims (Kaʿb al-Muslimīn), Protector of Justice (Muʾayyid al-ʿAdl).

During his lifetime Ibrāhīm abdicated in favour of his son Shams al-Mulk, against whom his brother Shuʿayth[5] immediately rose in revolt. A struggle ensued between the brothers at Samarqand, and also, according to the continuator of Narshakhī, in Bukhārā, in the same year as their father's death (1068), which ended in Shams al-Mulk's favour. In his reign the war with the Saljūqid sultans continued. In the autumn of 1072 Alp-Arslān undertook a campaign in Transoxania with a numerous army (200,000 men), but it was cut short at the outset by the death of Alp-Arslān, who perished by the dagger of the governor of a fortress, who had been taken prisoner and condemned to death by the Sultan. In the winter of the same year Shams al-Mulk took Tirmidh, and entered Balkh with his army; its ruler Ayāz (the son of Alp-Arslān) had previously abandoned the town. On the return journey a number of the inhabitants of Balkh made an attack on a Turkish division; for this Shams al-Mulk wished to burn the town, but subsequently yielded to the entreaties of the inhabitants and contented himself with contributions from the merchants. In January, 1073, Ayāz returned to Balkh, and on March 6 made an attack on Tirmidh, but without success, the greater part of his soldiers perishing in the waters of the river[6]. At the end of the same or beginning of the following year, Tirmidh, which was governed by the

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 22. [2] *Ibid.*, x, 33. Sachau, *Zur Geschichte, &c.*, ii, 29.
[3] Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 212. [4] A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 265.
[5] Judging from the coins (*ibid.*, 267–8) شعيث should be read in place of سفس, as in the printed edition of Nerchakhy (p. 49). Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 212) calls this prince Ṭughān-tagīn, which title seems to be found on one of Shuʿayth's coins.
[6] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 49–53.

brother of Shams al-Mulk, surrendered to Malik-Shāh, who gave the prince an honourable reception and dismissed him with presents. From Tirmidh Malik-Shāh moved on Samarqand. Shams al-Mulk sued for peace, and had recourse to the mediation of Nizām al-Mulk; the Sultan | consented, and returned to 336
Khurāsān[1]. Ibn al-Athīr[2] speaks also of a struggle between Shams al-Mulk and the sons of Qadir-Khān Yūsuf, Ṭughrul-Qarā-Khān Yūsuf and Bughrā-Khān Hārūn, which was ended by a treaty providing that Khojend should be the frontier between the territories of Shams al-Mulk and those of the Khāns of Turkestan. This means, apparently, that Shams al-Mulk had to renounce Farghāna and the part of Transoxania situated beyond the Syr-Darya, which is confirmed by the fact that money began to be coined at Marghīnān, Akhsīkath and Tūnkath in the names of Ṭughrul-Qarā-Khān and of his son Ṭughrul-tagīn, whereas formerly the coins of Akhsīkath and Tūnkath were struck in the name of Ibrāhīm and his sons[3].

Shams al-Mulk, like his father, enjoyed the reputation of a just sovereign. He continued to lead a nomadic existence, and passed the winter only, together with his army, in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā, where he made it a strict rule that the soldiers kept to their tents and did not oppress the inhabitants. After sundown not one soldier dared remain within the town.[4] In spite of their nomadic mode of life, the Qarā-Khānids fulfilled that duty of sovereigns which is expressed by "the adornment of towns by high and beautiful buildings, the construction of rabāṭs on high roads, &c." (cf. above, p. 227). There are no references in our sources to any buildings of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, but his namesake Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn in the twelfth century built a magnificent palace at Samarqand in the Ġurjmīn or Karjumīn quarter (see p. 90), which was to remind posterity of the fame of the Khān, as the Pharos lighthouse was the monument of Alexander of Macedon, and the palace of Ṭāq Kisrā of Khusrū Anūshirwān[5]. Of the buildings of Shams al-Mulk, the most famous was the "rabāṭ of the king" (rabāṭ-i malik) built in 471/1078–9 near the village of Kharjang (see above, p. 248, note 3). Another rabāṭ was built by Shams al-Mulk at Āq-Kutal, on the road from Samarqand to Khojend, and here, according to some accounts, the Khān himself was buried[6]. To Shams al-Mulk | also was due the construction of 337

[1] *Ibid.*, x, 63–4.
[2] *Ibid.*, ix, 212.
[3] A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 263–72.
[4] *Texts*, p. 85 ('Awfī).
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 87. This was also the aim of Alp-Arslān in his buildings (*Recueil de textes, &c.*, II, 47.
[6] *Texts*, p. 132 (Jamāl Qarshī), 168 and 172 (Kitāb-i Mullāzādah). The rabāṭ-i malik is mentioned also in the 'Abdullāh-Nāmah (MS. of the Asiat. Mus., 574 age, f. 220 a–b), one stage N. of Jīzak.

the palace of Shamsābād (near Bukhārā) and the new building of the Cathedral mosque of Bukhārā (see p. 109). The conflict between the government and the priesthood was continued under Shams al-Mulk also; at the very outset of his reign, in 461/1069, the imām Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl b. Abū Naṣr aṣ-Ṣaffār was executed at Bukhārā because, according to Sam'ānī, he exhorted the Khān to carry out the ordinances of religion and restrained him from things forbidden [1].

In 1080 Shams al-Mulk was succeeded by his brother Khiḍr, of whose reign we know hardly anything; even the year of his death is not quoted in any source. According to an author of the twelfth century, Nizāmi 'Arūḍī Samarqandī [2], the kingdom reached its highest prosperity in his reign; he ruled both Transoxania and Turkistān (?), and safeguarded himself on the Khurāsān side by durable treaties. The ruler himself was distinguished by wisdom and justice, and was a patron of poets. The author also quotes the custom of the sovereign and aristocracy in Transoxania of placing dishes with silver and gold in the halls of audience; in the hall of Khiḍr-Khān there were four such dishes with 250 dīnārs in each. On one occasion all four dishes were won by a single poet. On ceremonial processions 700 gold and silver maces were borne before the sovereign, besides other arms.

In the reign of Aḥmad [3], Khiḍr's son and successor, the hostilities between Khān and priesthood led to the intervention of the Saljūqids. At the very outset of Aḥmad's reign the wazīr Abū Naṣr b. Sulaymān al-Kāsānī, who had been chief qāḍī in the reign of Khiḍr, but was not, according to Sam'ānī,[4] distinguished by good behaviour in his office, was executed. Ibn al-Athīr [5] says that the young Khān oppressed the population, and the Shāfi'ite faqīh Abū Ṭāhir b. Ilk, in the name of the oppressed, invoked the assistance of Malik-Shāh. Malik-Shāh took Bukhārā in 1089, and beseiged Samarqand, where he met with an obstinate
338 resistance, although the local | inhabitants, if Ibn al-Athīr is to be believed, supplied the Saljūqid army with provisions during the siege of the citadel of Samarqand. The Khān charged each of

[1] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الصفّار (facs. f. 353 b, where the reading قتلة is a mistake for قتلة). Amongst the influential members of the priesthood in this reign is mentioned the preacher (wā'iẓ) of Balkh, Zayn aṣ-Ṣāliḥīn Abū 'Abdallāh Maḥammad b. 'Abdallāh ash-Shūmānī, who was the teacher of Shams al-Mulk (*ibid.*, *s v.* الشومانى, facs. f. 341 a).

[2] *The Chahār Maqāla of Niḍhāmī-i-Arūḍī-i-Samarqandī*, translated by E. G. Browne, Hertford, 1899, pp. 75-7; cf. text, pp. 46 sq., and the new translation (1921), pp. 52 sq.

[3] He is called Sulaymān in the printed edition of the *Rāḥat as Ṣudūr* of Rāwandī, p 130. The editor's suggestion that his real name was Sulaymān b. Aḥmad has no foundation whatever.

[4] Sam'ānī, *s v.* الكاسانى, facs f. 471 a–b.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 112 sq.

his amīrs with the defence of one of the towers; one of them, *a descendant of 'Alī* (*i.e.* representative of the interests of the priesthood), had a son who had been captured at Bukhārā, and Malik-Shāh threatened to kill him; hence the father defended the tower entrusted to him but languidly, and allowed the Saljūqid army to take possession of it. Samarqand was taken, and Aḥmad hid himself in a private house, where he was found, and with a cord round his neck led before the Sultan, who sent him to Iṣpahān. From Samarqand Malik-Shāh pursued his march and reached Ūzgand; at his summons the Khān of Kāshghar appeared before him with expressions of submission, and began to read the khuṭba and coin money in the name of Malik-Shāh[1]. The Sultan returned to Khurāsān, leaving a viceroy in Samarqand.

Directly after the Sultan's departure the disputes were renewed. The tribe of the Jikils,[2] who formed the nucleus of the Qarā-Khānid army, were displeased with the avarice of the Sultan, who at the time of his stay in Transoxania had not once entertained them[3] (evidently the Jikils had entered Malik-Shāh's service), and their revolt caused the viceroy to retire to Khorezmia. The Jikilī leader 'Ayn ad-Dawla called in Ya'qūb-tagīn, the governor of the town of Ātbāsh and a brother of the Khān of Kāshghar, from Semiryechye. Ya'qūb began his administration by the execution of 'Ayn ad-Dawla, which naturally roused the animosity of the Jikils against him. As soon as Malik-Shāh entered Bukhārā Ya'qūb fled through Farghāna to Ātbāsh; his army joined Malik-Shāh near Ṭawāwīs, and the latter again occupied Samarqand, left his amīr there, and once more reached Ūzgand. | The internecine conflict 339
amongst the Khāns of Turkestan[4] did away with all danger from this side, and enabled Malik-Shāh to return peacefully to Khurāsān.

The reasons which induced Malik-Shāh in course of time

[1] These events are related somewhat differently in Bundārī (Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 55), according to whom the march to Uzgand was undertaken about a year after the campaign at Samarqand; Malik-Shāh carried off the "Turkish king" as well as the Khān of Samarqand to Iṣpahān, but subsequently restored them both to the throne.

[2] Quite unfoundedly Schefer (*Siasset Nameh*, trad., p. 132) sees here the word جلكه = province, whereas this word is not Turkish but Persian; nor is it true that Ibn al-Athīr calls the Jikils the inhabitants of Samarqand; the words المعروفين بالجكلية refer only to the word عسكرهم. Undoubtedly جكلية and جكليان should be read, not جلكبة and جلكبان. On the former quarters of the Jikils see *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, p. 90. The Jikils evidently arrived in Transoxania together with the Qarā-Khānids. It is stated in the ديوان لغات الترك of Maḥmūd Kāshghaī (i, 330) that all the eastern Turks were called by the Turkmens Jikils (or Chikils).

[3] *Siasset Nameh*, texte, p. 115, trad., pp 198–9.

[4] On these see *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, p. 99.

to return the throne to Aḥmad are unknown. He did not, however, rule long, and perished at the beginning of 1095 in a conflict with the priesthood. During his stay in Persia the Khān had dealings with the heretical Daylamites, and after his return to Transoxania he was accused of heresy; the faqīhs and qāḍīs of Samarqand spread a fatwā among the army demanding his deposition and death. Aḥmad enjoyed such popularity in the capital that it was impossible to provoke a rising there; the military party persuaded the governor of the town of Kāsān, Ṭughrul-Yanāl-Beg, to revolt against the government, and when Aḥmad approached the town with the army, the leaders of the latter incited a revolt, seized the Khān and took him back to Samarqand. Here the deposed Khān was brought before a religious tribunal, and in spite of his protestations of complete innocence his guilt was established to the satisfaction of his judges: he was condemned to death, and strangled by a bow string [1]. This event must be regarded as the greatest of the successes gained by the priesthood in alliance with the military classes over the government and the mass of citizens. Of the other events of Aḥmad's reign we know only of the ruin of Shamsābād, which had been maintained under Khiḍr, and that after his return from Persia a magnificent new palace was built by him at Jūybār; the place referred to is probably that known under the name of the "jūbār (channel) of Abū Ibrāhīm" (see p. 104). This palace remained the residence of the Khāns for thirty years [2].

The traitors raised to the throne Mas'ūd-Khān, cousin of the murdered man. In 1097 the country submitted to Malik-Shāh's eldest son, the sultan Barkyāruq [3], on whose nomination Sulaymān-tagīn, Maḥmūd-tagīn, and Hārūn-tagīn [4] ruled one after the other. | 340 Of these the origin of the first only is known with certainty. He was the son of Dāwud Kūch-tagīn and grandson of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm [5]. At the very beginning of the twelfth century a fresh invasion of Transoxania was made by the Qarā-Khānids of Turkestan; Qadir-Khan [6] Jibra'īl, the grandson of Bughrā-

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 165–6; Nerchakhy, pp. 236–7.

[2] Nerchakhy, p. 28.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 181.

[4] Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 258–9; Maḥmūd-tagīn is probably identical with the Maḥmūd-Khān of Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 213), who adds that this Khān was deaf. Ibn al-Athīr here calls Maḥmūd the immediate successor of Aḥmad and grandson of one of the former rulers; he mentions Mas'ūd elsewhere (x, 166).

[5] The correct genealogy in Jamāl Qarshī, see *texts*, p. 132. The name of Dāwud Kūch-tagīn was struck on some coins during the lifetime of his father (A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 266).

[6] Elsewhere (ix, 213) Ibn al-Athīr calls him Ṭughān-Khān, and says that Abu'l-Ma'ālī Muḥammad b. Zayd al-Baghdādī, a descendant of 'Alī, ruled at Samarqand in the name of Ṭughān-Khān, but rebelled about three years later; the town was taken by Ṭughān-Khān, and al-Baghdādī was killed together with many of the people. From this it may be inferred that the inhabitants of Turkestan occupied Transoxania

Khān Muḥammad (see p. 295), not only occupied the country but in 1102 advanced into the Saljūqid territories. He succeeded in taking Tirmidh, but on June 22 he was defeated and killed in a battle with the Sultan Sinjar[1] not far from this town. The Sultan summoned from Merv the son of Sulaymān-tagīn, Muḥammad-tagīn, who had fled from Transoxania to Khurāsān at the time of Qadir-Khān's invasion[2]. Muḥammad-tagīn took the title of Arslān-Khān, and remained ruler of the province till 1130.

At the beginning of his reign Arslān-Khān had to struggle against the insubordinate amīr Sāghir-beg, who, according to Ibn al-Athīr[3], also belonged to the Qarā-Khānid dynasty. Sāghir-beg's first revolt occurred in 1103; Sinjar came to the assistance of his nominee, and by his mediation established peace between the adversaries, returning himself to Merv in December of the same year. In 503/1109 Sāghir-beg again provoked a rising, but Arslān-Khān with the help of Sinjar defeated the rebels near Nakhshab[4]. |

For a period of twenty years after this the country enjoyed 341
quiet. Arslān-Khān was noted for his buildings more than all the other Qarā-Khānids; we have already mentioned some of them, namely, the restoration of the citadel of Bukhārā (p. 100) and of the walls of the city (p. 103), the construction in 1119 of a place for the festival prayers on the site of the ruined palace of Shamsābād, the building of a magnificent cathedral mosque in 1121 (p. 109), and of two palaces, the first of which was afterwards turned into a madrasah (p. 111), and the restoration of the town of Paykand (p. 118). The minaret of the cathedral mosque near the citadel was transferred by order of the Khān to the shahristān and restored with greater magnificence. Not long before the completion of the work the building collapsed along with a third of the cathedral mosque; Arslān-Khān ordered the rebuilding of the minaret entirely at his own expense[5]. The author of the "Kitābi Mullāzādah"[6]

with the help of the priesthood, but that subsequently the priesthood came into conflict with the new rulers of the province.

[1] According to Bundārī (*Recueil, &c.*, ii, 262) he was taken prisoner while hunting.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 239–41; *Texts*, p. 84 ('Awfī). According to the Kitābi Mullāzādah (*Texts*, p. 172) Arslān-Khān was even born in the Merv village of Masūs or Maswas (cp. Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Star. Merva*, p. 43). According to 'Awfī and to the author of the "Kitābi Mullāzādah" Arslān-Khān also bore the title of Ṭamghāch-Khān.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 241, 252. The spellings هاغو and ساغو are also found in MSS. of Ibn al-Athīr; cf. Nerchakhy, p. 240.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 335. In the same year (503) the rumour spread that Sultan Sinjar had gained a victory near the Amu-Darya over a nation of unbelievers (قوم كافر): Ibn al Qalānisī, ed Amedroz, p. 168.

[5] Nerchakhy, pp. 49–50. The minaret has remained standing to the present day.

[6] *Texts*, p. 172.

refers the building of the minaret to the year 1127. The piety of Arslān-Khān is evidenced not only by his buildings and his campaigns against infidels[1] (probably against the Qipchāqs), but also by his relations with the ascetic Ḥasan b. Yūsuf al-Bukhārī as-Sāmānī, who bore the name of Namad-pūsh (clothed in felt). The shaykh lived for thirty years in his khānqāh at Bukhārā, living only on vegetables. Beside him there was only one shaykh in Bukhārā, namely, Abū Bakr Kallābādī, who abstained absolutely from meat. Arslān-Khān called Namad-pūsh "father", and thanks to the support of the Khān the anchorite was able to preserve Bukhārā from "depraved men and innovators." Every ṣūfī who drank water by day in the bazaar from the cistern was expelled by him from the town, as the observation of the precepts of decency was in his eyes the first duty of a ṣūfī. In 509/1115–6 the shaykh met his death from the arrow of one of the "depraved[2]."

In spite of all this the struggle with the priesthood did not cease in this reign either. The son of the imām Ṣaffār, executed
342 under | Shams al-Mulk (see p. 316), Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl, like his father, "avoided hypocrisy, accused the sultans, and made demands on kings"; for the sake of peace in the land, Sinjar transferred him to Merv[3]. At the end of his life Arslān-Khān was struck with paralysis, and was obliged to associate his son Naṣr with himself as co-ruler. A conspiracy was hatched against the young ruler, the chiefs of which were the faqīh and mudarris Ashraf b. Muḥammad as-Samarqandī, who was a descendant of 'Alī and head of the priesthood, and the ra'īs of the town of Samarqand. In the night, during the absence of Arslān-Khān, Naṣr was murdered[4]. His father appealed to Sinjar for help, and at the same time summoned his other son Aḥmad[5]. The

[1] According to Bundārī (Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii. 264) Arslān-Khān (whom he calls Aḥmad, see below) had 12,000 Turkish mamlūks with whom he constantly undertook campaigns against the infidel Turks, and traversed distances in their country of two months' journey. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr's account (xi, 55 sq.) of the campaigns of Arslān-Khān, quoted by Marquart, *Osttürk Dialektst.*, 164 sq. (where xii and the date A. H. 522 are given by mistake). It is said that Arslān-Khān had under his rule 16,000 tents of Khitā Turks (الاتراك الخطا), whose duty it was to guard the passes between his kingdom and China (الصين). Marquart concludes from this that it was these mercenaries of his, and not the Qarā-Khiṭāy who came from China with the Gūrkhān (see below), who must have built the town of Imil (near the present Chuguchak). This view is no doubt erroneous. It is quite inconceivable that the authority of the Khān of Samarqand should at any time have extended so far to the north.

[2] *Texts*, pp. 170, 171.

[3] Sam'ānī, *s. v.* الصفّار, facs. 353 b.

[4] In one passage (Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 54) it is stated that Naṣr himself took part the conspiracy and was killed by order of his father.

[5] The prince is not named in Ibn al-Athīr, but it is probable that to him belong the coins with the name of Qadir-Khān Aḥmad (A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 275–6);

faqīh and ra'īs went to meet him, when the young Khān promptly ordered them to be seized, and had the faqīh executed forthwith. According to one of Ibn al-Athīr's accounts[1] peace was thereby restored, so that Sinjar's help was not required, and Arslān-Khān regretted that he had applied to the Sultan. Elsewhere the same historian[2] says that Sinjar defeated the Qarluqs, who had also risen against the Khān. However this may be, a conflict broke out between the Sultan, whose army had already entered Transoxania, and the ruler of the country; when hunting, Sinjar seized twelve men, who confessed on examination that they had been suborned by the Khān to kill the Sultan. After this Sinjar besieged Samarqand. The priesthood, probably at the request of the Khān, appealed to the Sultan in a letter interceding for their sovereign. The answer, written in the name of Sinjar "to the Imāms, Qāḍīs, and Notables" of Samarqand, has come down to us. The Sultan expresses his amazement that the priesthood should "render obedience to a person deposed by God Himself, a person from whom all weapons of power have been removed, who has been deprived of the support of the Almighty, and | dethroned by the ruler of the world, the shadow of the Almighty, 343 the viceroy of the Caliph." Further on the Sultan recalls that he himself raised the Khān from obscurity, called him to the throne, transferred his rivals to Khurāsān, and for seventeen years supported him with his army, and that during this time the Khān ruled badly, offended the descendants of the prophet, destroyed ancient families, executed people on bare suspicion and confiscated their goods. The suggestion is made that the letter of the priesthood was dispatched under pressure of the temporal power. Finally, the Sultan announces that 70,000 armed soldiers "to whom even the mountain Qāf would not be an obstacle," have already been three days before the town, ready to attack, and that he is holding back only from a desire to save the town, the inhabitants of which are renowned for their piety, from inevitable plunder, and by the intercession of his wife[3] (the daughter of Arslān-Khān).

Samarqand was taken in the early spring of 1130.[4] The sick Khān was carried before the Sultan in a litter,[5] and sent to his daughter; shortly afterwards[6] he died at Balkh and was buried at Merv, in the madrasah built by himself.[7] His successor

this is confirmed by the fact that Rāwandī (*Nouveaux mélanges orientaux*, Paris, 1886, p. 32, edition of Muh. Iqbāl, p. 169) and Bundārī (Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 264) call the king of Samarqand Aḥmad, and confuse him with Arslān-Khān.

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 465–6.
[2] *Ibid.*, xi, 54–5.
[3] *Texts*, pp. 25–6 (Inshā).
[4] Rabī' I, 524 (Ibn al-Athīr).
[5] Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 264.
[6] According to the Kitābi Mullāzādah (*Texts*, p. 172) in 524 or 525, according to Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 132) in Rajab 526 (May–June, 1132).
[7] Prof. V. A. Zhukovsky (*Razvaliny Star. Merva*, pp. 27–8) mistakenly refers this

was at first declared to be his brother Abu'l-Muẓaffar Ṭamghāch-Bughrā-Khān Ibrāhīm, who had been brought up at Sinjar's court[1]; then subsequently another member of the dynasty, Qilich Ṭamghāch-Khān Abu'l-Ma'ālī Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. 'Abd-al-Mu'min, better known under the name of Ḥasan-tagīn,[2] and finally Rukn ad-Dīn (or Jalāl ad-Dīn[3]) Maḥmūd, the son of Arslān-Khān. Maḥmūd, who was a nephew of Sinjar, proved himself a faithful subject of his uncle, who was able also to call
344 the Khān of Kāshghar his nominee.[4] | Thus once again, as under Malik-Shāh, all Muslim Asia came under the sway of a single ruler. But at this time a nation was already approaching the eastern frontiers of the Muslim world who were to force the Muslims of Transoxania to submit for the first time to the rule of the infidels.

statement to Alp-Arslān the Saljūqid We know nothing of the fate of Aḥmad, except Ibn al-Athīr's statement (x, 480) that in the summer of 1132 Sinjar, at that time engaged in the West, had to return to Khurāsān, "as information reached him of the revolt of Aḥmad-Khān the ruler of Transoxania." It is possible that after the capture of Samarqand by Sinjar, Aḥmad was left ruler of some part of Transoxania.

[1] *Texts*, p. 24 (in a diplomatic document); the historians are completely silent on this Khān.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 55. [3] *Texts*, pp. 27, 33 (Inshā). [4] *Ibid.*, p 37.

CHAPTER III

THE QARĀ-KHIṬĀYS AND THE KHWĀRAZM-SHĀHS

I HAVE spoken elsewhere[1] in detail of the rise of the Qarā- 345
Khiṭāys. After the defeat inflicted on them by the Khān of Kāshghar, Aḥmad b. Ḥasan[2], the Saljūqid Government in a letter to the wazīr at Baghdād expressed the belief that all danger from the side of the infidels was at an end[3]. The Qarā-Khiṭāys, however, were able to create an extensive kingdom, to subjugate Semiryechye and Eastern Turkestan, and in Ramaḍān 531 (May–June, 1137) to defeat the army of Maḥmūd-Khān near Khojend. The defeat caused great terror amongst the inhabitants of Transoxania[4], but the Qarā-Khiṭāys were probably occupied elsewhere and did not at this time avail themselves of the fruits of their victory.

Sinjar's attention was absorbed at this period by the struggle with his rebellious vassal, the Khwārazm-shāh Atsiz[5]. Anūsh-tagīn Gharja[6], the grandfather of Atsiz, was the slave of the Saljūqid amīr Bilgā-tagīn (or Bilgā-beg), and derived his surname from the fact that | he had been purchased by Bilgā-tagīn 346
from one of the inhabitants of Gharjistān[7]. From Bilgā-tagīn he was taken to the court of Malik-Shāh, where he occupied the highest offices, and was appointed superintendent of the royal washing utensils. The revenues of Khorezmia served to cover the expenses of this part of the court organization[8], consequently Anūsh-tagīn bore also the title of governor of

[1] *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, p. 102 sq.

[2] On his origin see *Texts*, p. 133 (Jamāl Qarshī). His father, Ṭamghāch-Khān Ḥasan, ruled for some time in Ṭarāz, as is evident from his coins (A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 272). It was this same Khān for whom the Qudatku Bilik was composed; cf. *Bull. Sch. of Oriental Studies*, iii, 152.

[3] *Texts*, p. 38.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 56.

[5] On the sources for the history of the dynasty of the Khwārazm-shāhs, see p. 31. Mīrkhwānd based his work exclusively on Juwaynī; on the relation of Mīrkhwānd to his source, see above p. 58. Mīrkhwānd and Ibn al-Athīr were used by Prof. N. T. Veselovsky in his study *Ocherk istoriko-geograficheskikh svyedyenii o Khivinskom Khanstvye*, St. P., 1877. In my own further exposition I shall give my sources mainly in those cases when the information quoted by me is not found in Prof. Veselovsky's book.

[6] More correctly Gharcha (modern Ghālcha): cf. my *Istoriko-geograficheskii obzor Iranei*, p. 27, and *Zapiski*, xix, 134.

[7] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 182.

[8] Juwaynī, ed. Mīrzā Muḥ., ii. 2.

Khorezmia[1], although, judging from the accounts of both the original sources[2], he did not as yet actually rule this province. His son Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad was brought up at Merv.

In 1097 the Khwārazm-shāh Ikinchī b. Quchqār[3] was killed by rebellious amīrs. After the pacification of the rising the Sultan Barkyārūq appointed as governor of Khūrāsān the amīr Dād-Ḥabashī b. Altūntāq[4], who confided the administration of Khorezmia to Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad, the son of Anūsh-tagīn. Sinjar confirmed Muhammad in his post, and helped him to put down the revolt of Ṭughrul-tagīn, the son of Ikinchī, who had invited the Turks into the country. According to Ibn al-Athīr[5], Muḥammad ruled justly, and was a patron of learning; according to Juwaynī he remained Sinjar's faithful vassal, and during the whole of his reign he himself travelled every second year to the court of the Sultan, and sent his son Atsiz in the intervening years.

Atsiz, who succeeded his father in 1127 or 1128, was the real founder of the power of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs. With rare perseverance and skill he and his successors stopped at no measures to attain their aim, the foundation of a strong and independent kingdom. In the early years of his reign Atsiz remained a loyal subject of Sinjar, and took part in his campaigns, including the invasion of Transoxania[6], though at the
347 same time | he saw to the strengthening of his own rule by the subjugation of the neighbouring nomads. In pursuit of this aim he occupied places which were of the greatest importance in the life of the nomads, namely, Jand, *i.e.* the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya, and the peninsula of Manqishlāgh[7]. From Jand he undertook a campaign "into the depths of Turkistān," and won a victory over the "king and chief who enjoyed the greatest renown among the infidels[8]." Soon after this he revolted against Sinjar; according to Juwaynī[9], Atsiz, while taking part in

[1] Juwaynī's words (*ibid.*) are اورا باسم شحنگی خوارزم موسوم کردند.

[2] The first writer who calls him the actual ruler of Khorezmia is, so far as I know, Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī (ed. Browne, p. 486 sq, trans., 111 sq.), but cf. the translator's note on the date A. H. 491.

[3] He is mentioned not only in Ibn al-Athīr, but also in Juwaynī (ed. Mīrzā Muḥ., ii, 3, where the reading is النجی), although omitted by all subsequent compilers, beginning with Rashīd ad-Dīn (MS. As. Mus. ab 566, f. 517 a). Cf. Marquart's view (*Ostürk. Dialektst.*, pp. 48 sq., 201 sq.), who identifies this Ikinchī with a person mentioned by 'Awfī (my *Texts*, p. 99).

[4] In Juwaynī Dād-beg b. Ḥabashī Altūntāq; the printed edition (ii, 2) has Dād-beg Ḥabashī b. Altūntāq.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, x, 183.

[6] Juwaynī, ed. Mīrzā Muḥ., ii, 4; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 2.

[7] Yāqūt also speaks of the conquest of Manqishlāgh by Atsiz (iv, 670). According to Ibn al-Athīr (x, 183) Atsiz conquered Manqishlāgh during his father's lifetime.

[8] *Texts*, p. 37. Document written in July 1133 (*ibid.*, p. 35).

[9] Juwaynī, *loc. cit.*; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 3.

Sinjar's expedition to Ghazna, noticed that under the influence of envious detractors the Sultan cooled towards him. In the autumn of 1138 Sinjar undertook a campaign in Khorezmia. In the official document [1] which has come down to us it is said that Sinjar turned on Atsiz with accusations that the latter, without the permission of his suzerain, had "spilt the blood of Muslims" in Jand and Manqishlāgh, the inhabitants of which were faithful guardians of the provinces of Islām, and constantly at war with the infidels; in answer to these accusations Atsiz brought about a rising, imprisoned the Sultan's officials, confiscated their property, and closed all the roads from Khurāsān. The Sultan was then at Balkh, and from here (according to Juwaynī in Muḥarram, *i.e.* in September) set out on the campaign with a numerous army. The fortified camp of Atsiz was near Hazārasp, a strong fortress, and the country surrounding the camp for an extent of some farsakhs was flooded—a measure to which the Khwārazm-shāhs had recourse also in subsequent invasions (see p. 154). As the strip near the banks was inundated the Saljūqid army had to advance through the sand steppes, and consequently moved very slowly. In the official document this slowness is explained by the Sultan's desire to give Atsiz time to come to his senses. The battle took place only on Nov. 15. Atsiz led his army out of their trenches, and the Khorezmian army, formed partly of infidel Turks, was completely defeated, losing 10,000 men in killed, wounded, and prisoners. | Among the prisoners was the 348
son of the Khwārazm-shāh [2], who was immediately executed and his head dispatched to Transoxania. Sinjar remained a week on the battlefield, where he was joined by the remainder of the defeated army, all of whom received pardon. Atsiz fled, and the country was occupied by Sinjar apparently without further opposition. The Sultan set up his own nephew Sulaymān b. Muḥammad [3] as ruler of the province, and leaving with him a wazīr, an atābeg, and a ḥājib returned to Merv in Feb., 1139. Sulaymān did not remain ruler long. Atsiz returned to Khorezmia; the inhabitants, who were discontented with the behaviour of Sinjar's army, rallied to him, and Sulaymān was forced to fly to his uncle [4]. In 534/1139–40 Atsiz made an attack on Bukhārā, imprisoned and put to death the governor of the town, Zangī b. 'Alī, and destroyed the citadel [5]. In spite of this he found it necessary to submit to his suzerain. The text of the oath taken by Atsiz at the end of May 1141 has come down to us, and consists of the customary expressions [6].

[1] *Texts*, pp. 44-7.

[2] His name in Juwaynī (in both MSS.) ايلغ: ed. Mīrzā Muḥ., ii, 5, آتليغ: in Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, p. 4) Īl-qutlugh.

[3] Thus according to Juwaynī. [4] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 44. [5] Nerchakhy, p. 23.

[6] *Texts*, p. 40. Cf. the Sultan Mas'ūd's oath to the Caliph in Baihaki, pp. 370–74, 384–9.

This text is included in a document in which Atsiz expresses his joy that the Sultan, having manifested before all the world his justice in regard to the Khwārazm-shāh, now shows the world "the light of his mercy[1]." The oath of fealty was, however, broken by the Khwārazm-shāh in the course of a few months.

In Transoxania the customary conflict between the throne and the military class broke out in 1141[2]. Maḥmūd-Khān invoked Sinjar's help against the Qarluqs, and in July a Saljūqid army entered the country. The Qarluqs appealed for help to the gūrkhān of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and the gūrkhān, who at Balāsāghūn had appeared as the protector of the Khān against the nomad divisions[3], now took the part of the Qarluqs and
349 interceded for | them with Sinjar. The insulting reply of the Saljūq Sultan called forth a fresh invasion of Transoxania by the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and in a sanguinary battle in the Qaṭwān steppe on Sept. 9th the Saljūq army was completely defeated. Sinjar's troops were forced back to the Dargham[4] by the Qarā-Khiṭāys; the waters of this stream carried away 10,000 killed and wounded, and in all 30,000 Muslims fell in the battle[5]. Sinjar fled to Tirmidh; Maḥmūd-Khān together with him abandoned his territories; and the whole country submitted to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, who in the same year 536/1141–2 occupied Bukhārā. In Bukhārā at this time a dynasty of hereditary ra'īses of the town had already arisen, which from the name of its founder was entitled "the house of Burhān." According to the author of the "Kitāb-i Mullāzādah[6]" these ra'īses, who bore the title of Ṣadrs (supports) of the world, were descended from the "people of the turban," *i.e.* from the priesthood, but within their gates the "possessors of crowns" sought refuge. The founder of the dynasty, "the great Ṣadr," Burhān al-Milla wa'd-Dīn ("Proof of the Community and the Faith") Abd-al-'Azīz b. 'Omar Māza, "the second Nu'mān (Abū Ḥanīfa), sea of ideas," was considered a descendant of the Caliph 'Omar; he is mentioned by the historian Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī, in his account of his own father, who had died in August, 1123[7]. At the time of the invasion of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, the Ṣadr of Bukhārā was the son of 'Abd-al-'Azīz, Ḥusām-ad-Dīn 'Omar. Bukhārā

[1] *Texts*, p. 39. [2] Most detailed account in Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 56–7.
[3] *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, 103.
[4] This is probably not the channel of the same name situated to the south of Samarqand (cf. pp. 85 and 95).
[5] *Nouveaux mélanges orienteaux*, pp. 20, 35–6; *Raḥat aṣ-Sudūr*, ed. Muḥ. Iqbāl, 172 sq. [Cf. on this battle Sir E. D. Ross in *Travel and Travellers of the Middle Ages* (London, 1926), p. 174. See further Friedrich Zarncke, *Der Priester Johannes*, pp. 24–34 (= *Abh. d. phil.-hist. Classe d. kön. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, vii Band, Leipzig, 1879, pp. 850–60). G.]
[6] *Texts*, p. 169.
[7] MS. Brit. Mus. Pub. 3587, f. 60 b–61 a. The grandfather of this 'Abd-al-'Azīz is here called 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Māza; in the Kitāb-i Mullāzādah he is called 'Abdallāh.

evidently showed opposition to the infidels, as the Ṣadr was killed[1]. The Qarā-Khiṭāys appointed a certain Alptagīn as rûler of Bukhārā[2].

Sinjar's defeat was so opportune for Atsiz that the rumour inevitably spread that the Khwārazm-shāh himself had called in the Qarā-Khiṭāys[3]. According to Juwaynī[4], however, the territories of Atsiz himself | were likewise plundered by a division 350
of Qarā-Khiṭāys, and a large number of the inhabitants were killed; Atsiz was compelled to make peace, and bound himself to pay the Qara-Khiṭāys 30,000 gold dīnārs annually, exclusive of tribute in kind. The invasion of Khorezmia by the Qarā-Khiṭāys could hardly have occurred immediately after the battle of Qaṭwān, because as early as October of the same year we find Atsiz with an army in Khurāsān, where he hastened to profit by the defeat of Sinjar. Merv was plundered on the 19th of November of the same year. Atsiz reached Nīshāpūr only in May, 1142, and it is possible that this delay is to be explained by the Qarā-Khiṭāy invasion. In his proclamation to the inhabitants of Nīshāpūr, Atsiz said that the misfortunes of Sinjar were a punishment for the ingratitude with which he had repaid the loyal service of the Khwārazm-shāh. "We do not know whether repentence will avail him, as now he will find nowhere such a support and such a friend of his power as we were[5]." On the command of Atsiz the khuṭba was read in his name at Nīshāpūr on the 29th May, but by the summer of the same year Sinjar's rule was re-established in Khurāsān[6].

In 538/1143-4[7] Sinjar made an expedition into Khorezmia and compelled Atsiz to submit, and to return the treasure plundered by him at Merv[8]. In connexion with this campaign, in all probability, the Ghuzz made a successful descent on Bukhārā (March, 1144), in which the citadel was destroyed[9]. Learning that Atsiz still nourished treasonable intentions, Sinjar dispatched the poet Adīb Ṣābir to him as envoy. The latter learned that Atsiz had sent two Ismailites bought by him to

[1] Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 278. According to Faṣīḥ (*Texts*, p. 160) the Ṣadr fell in the fight and was buried at Kallābād in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā.

[2] Nerchakhy, p. 23. *Chahār Maqāla*, trans. by E. G. Browne, pp. 38, 39: printed ed., p. 24, new trans., p. 24, where the name is spelled Atmātigīn.

[3] This explains Ibn al-Athīr's account (xi, 53), quoted by Prof. Veselovsky (p. 60).

[4] Juwayni, ed. Mīrzā Muḥ., ii, 88; Mirkhond, *Vie de Djenghiz Khan*, ed. Jaubert, Paris, 1841, pp. 91-2; Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes*, S. 146. The name of the Qarā-Khiṭāy chief is given in Mīrkhwānd as اربز, in the Khanykov MS. of Juwaynī as اربوز, in the printed edition اربوز (mutilated in the Dolgoruki MS.).

[5] *Texts*, pp. 43-4.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 58.

[7] It is remarkable that in this year a dīnār of Atsiz was coined with the name of the Sultan of 'Irāq Mas'ūd (1132-1152); cf. A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 297.

[8] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 63; Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 281.

[9] Nerchakhy, p. 23.

Merv to kill the Sultan. Thanks to Adīb the Sultan was warned in time, but in return for this his envoy was thrown into the
51 Amu-Darya[1] by order of Atsiz. In | November, 1147[2] Sinjār for the third time marched into Khorezmia, besieged Hazārasp, took it after two months, and approached the capital of Atsiz. On the appeal of the Khwārazm-shāh, the anchorite Āhū-pūsh, who lived only on the flesh of does and dressed in their skins[3] (which earned him his name), undertook to mediate between the warring parties. Sinjar agreed to pardon the rebels, but required that Atsiz should appear before him in person on the banks of the Amu-Darya with expressions of submission. This interview took place at the beginning of June, 1148[4]. Atsiz, however, contrary to custom, did not kiss the ground before the sovereign, nor even dismounted from his horse, but only bowed his head and immediately rode back, before the Sultan had even turned his horse's bridle. Sinjar did not think it necessary to renew the war on account of such disrespect on the part of his vassal, and returned to Merv.

After the failure of his efforts to found an independent state and seize Khurāsān, Atsiz again turned his eyes to the banks of the Syr-Darya. One of the results of the Khwārazm-shāh's ill-success in his struggle with Sinjar was the loss of Jand, of which Kamāl ad-Dīn, the son of Arslān-Khān Maḥmūd, and probably a descendant of the Qarā-Khānid dynasty, had made himself ruler. According to Juwaynī[5], Atsiz now concluded an alliance with Kamāl ad-Dīn; it was decided in the spring of 1152 to make a combined campaign against the territories of the infidel Qipchāqs, whose centre was the town of Sighnāq or Siqnāq (*cf.* p. 179). When Atsiz arrived at Jand with his army, its size so terrified Kamāl ad-Dīn that he abandoned his territory. Atsiz sent distinguished envoys to him and by promises persuaded him to return, but not long after his arrival Kamāl ad-Dīn was arrested and spent the remainder of his life in prison. In an official document[6] which has come down to us there is no mention of an expedition to Sighnāq; Atsiz says only that at a time when his army had been diverted to another quarter on account
52 of certain difficulties | Jand was seized by rebels. At the beginning of Rabī' I (540?[7]) he was at last able to leave Kho-

[1] Thus in Juwaynī, ii, 8, and Mirkhond (*Kharezm*, pp. 5–6): inaccurately given by Prof. Veselovsky (p. 61).

[2] The month is mentioned in Juwaynī (Jumādā, ii).

[3] Juwaynī, ii, 10: زاهد آهوپوش طعام ولباس او از کوشت وپوست آهو بود.

[4] According to Juwaynī (*ibid.*) on Monday, 12th Muḥarram, 543, but this day (2 June, 1148) was a Wednesday.

[5] *Ibid.*; cf. also Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 8–9. [6] *Texts*, pp. 41–2.

[7] It is very likely that in the text of the manuscript the first figure of the date is omitted. From what is said further on it is evident that in this year 9th Rabī' I was a Friday; and from this it may be concluded that the year in question was

rezmia with his army. The steppe lying between Khorezmia and Jand was traversed in a single week; on the 8th the army reached the bank of the Syr-Darya at Ṣāgh-dara at a distance of twenty farsakhs from Jand. These twenty farsakhs were traversed in one night; on Friday the 9th, in the morning, the army made ready for battle and approached the gates of the town. Here the news was received that the leader of the rebels, who bore the title of Khān, had fled; a detachment was sent in pursuit, and the remaining leaders tendered submission and were pardoned. Thus the authority of the Khwārazm-shāh was restored in Jand without the shedding of blood. According to Juwaynī, Abu'l-Fatḥ Īl-Arslān, the eldest son of Atsiz, was appointed ruler of Jand. We shall see that in later times also Jand was governed by the eldest son of the Khwārazm-shāh, from which it is clear what importance was attached by Atsiz and his successors to the possession of this town.

In the spring of the following year, 1153[1], fresh events occurred in Khurāsān which favoured the plans of Atsiz. Sinjar's attempt to subdue the Ghuzz nomads to the rule of Persian officials and tax collectors had ruinous consequences for the Sultan himself; the leaders of the Ghuzz destroyed his army, took the Sultan prisoner, and from that time for the space of nearly three years | carried him with them, surrounding 353
him with outward pomp[2]. The Ghuzz subjected some towns of Khurāsān, Merv[3] and Nīshāpūr among them, to terrible plundering. This time Atsiz did not take advantage of the Sultan's misfortune in order to proclaim his own independence,

542/1147 but then the expedition of Atsiz to Jand would have taken place before Sinjar's third campaign. It is more probable that in agreement with Juwaynī's account it should be 547/1152. According to Wüstenfeld's tables the 9th Rabī' I, 547 (June 14, 1152) was a Saturday; but a difference of one day between the tables and historical sources is often met with. It is remarkable that, contrary to custom, the expedition from Khorezmia to Jand was undertaken during the hot season.

[1] Rāwandī (ed. Muḥ Iqbāl, p. 177) refers the revolt of the Ghuzz to the end of 548, but according to a contemporary of the event, Yūsuf b. 'Abdallāh Andkhudī, quoted by the author of the "Ta'rīkh al-Khayrāt" (MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 4898, f. 152 a) and to Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 116), it occurred at the very beginning of this year. In another account, which, judging from documents quoted further on, must be taken with the fullest reliance, Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 118–19) says that Sinjar was twice defeated by the Ghuzz, after which in Ṣafar (May) he fled to Merv. All the commanders and the Sultan himself soon abandoned the capital, after which in the month of Jumādā I (August or end of July) Merv was plundered by the Ghuzz. Immediately afterwards they took the Sultan prisoner, and in Rajab (October or end of September) plundered the town for the second time. For the chronology cf. also *Zapiski*, xx, 040 sq.

[2] According to the unknown continuator of the "Mujmil at-Tawārīkh" (see p. 27) the Ghuzz left Sinjar with the outward signs of sovereignty, but appointed his servants from amongst themselves only; f. 348: همچنان با خویشتن می آوردند بر آیین سلطنت الّا آنك خدمتکاران از آن خویش نصب کردند. According to Juwaynī (ii, 12) and Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, pp. 9, 10) the Ghuzz allowed Sinjar this ceremony only by day, and at night locked him up in an iron cage.

[3] Compare V. Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, p. 29.

but appeared in the role of protector of the lawful ruler. First of all he summoned the Governor of the fortress of Āmūy (Āmul) to surrender this important point[1]; it is evident that Atsiz realized the importance of this spot as he had previously recognized the importance of Jand and Manqishlāgh. His attempt to seize Āmul did not succeed, and the Khwārazm-shāh returned to his kingdom and renewed his campaigns against the "infidels," *i.e.* against the Qipchāqs. We know from Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī[2] that Yanāl-tagīn, the brother of Atsiz, devastated the district of Bayhāq from the end of December, 1153, to the beginning of the autumn of 1154.

That part of Sinjar's army which had not elected to join the Ghuzz chose the former ruler of Transoxania, Maḥmūd-Khan, as their leader. Maḥmūd entered into negotiations with Atsiz, who set out with his army for Khurāsān, taking Il-Arslān with him, and leaving another son Khiṭāy-Khān in Khorezmia. According to Juwaynī, Atsiz learnt while still in the town of Shahristān, where, according to official documents[3], he arrived at the end of the month of Ṣafar, *i.e.* in April, 1156, that Sinjar with the help of one of his commanders had succeeded in escaping from captivity, and had reached Tirmidh in safety. Ibn-al-Athīr[4] mistakenly refers this event to Ramaḍān 551/Oct.-Nov., 1156. After this the Khwārazm-shāh remained at Nasā where Maḥmūd's envoy, 'Izz ad-Dīn Ṭughrā'ī, came to him.

The Khan and the Amīrs now repented of having invited such a dangerous ally, but against their expectations Atsiz did
354 not make | any exorbitant demands. From Nasā he sent a letter to Sinjar[5], in which he congratulated the Sultan on his successful escape from captivity, and expressed his complete readiness to submit himself to the commands of the sovereign, *i.e.* either to go to Tirmidh to join the Sultan's army, or to return to Khorezmia, or to remain in Khurāsān. The letters of Atsiz to his allies, *i.e.* to Maḥmūd-Khān, to the ruler of Sijistān and to the ruler of the mountain province of Ghūr, were couched in the same complaisant tone. The envoy of the ruler of Sijistān met Atsiz while he was still at Shahristān. At Khabūshān, another town in Khurāsān, a friendly interview took place between Atsiz and Maḥmūd. At the end of Rabī' I (May) an officer (Withāq-bāshī, *cf.* p. 227) of Sinjar's guard, Najm al-Mulk Lawḥī, arrived there with a letter from his sovereign.[6] After Maḥmūd's arrival and in expectation of the arrival of the rulers of Sijistān and Ghūr, Atsiz ordered a letter to be written to Ṭūṭī-beg, the leader of the Ghuzz. This letter[7] is

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 12; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 10.
[2] MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 3589, f. 158 b.
[3] *Texts*, pp. 27–8.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 138.
[5] *Texts*, p. 26.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 27–8.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 28–9.

one of the best models of the style of Eastern diplomatists. Nǫt a word is said of Sinjar's imprisonment; on the contrary it is stated that when the divisions of the Ghuzz arrived in Khurāsān and the government servants left Merv, then the Sultan also could have gone, as "all the lands up to the furthest borders of Rūm have belonged and still belong to him," but "the sovereign of the world" considered the Ghuzz divisions as his property, and in his royal dignity and in his mercy to his subjects committed himself to them and "voluntarily" entered their midst. The Ghuzz failed to appreciate this graciousness, and did not fulfil the demands of "respect to the sacred court;" therefore the sovereign had been constrained to part from them and "leave them to themselves." The question arises what do they now intend to do. To march daily from one town to another is no longer possible for them, as it was given them to take possession of the towns of Khurāsān only "in consideration of the arrival amongst them of the sovereign," to unite all their forces in the province of Balkh (where land had been allotted to them before the revolt) would also be imprudent and unseemly on their part, as now, when the sovereign has returned to rule himself, no one has the right to establish himself in his dominions | without his 355
permission. It only remains to them to express submission to the Saljūqid government and to make apologies; then Maḥmūd-Khān and the rulers of Khorezmia, Sijistān, and Ghūr will use their good offices on their behalf with the sovereign in order that he may assign them a "yūrt" and the means of existence.

Whatever may have been the real intentions of the Khwārazm-shāh, they could not be realized; while still in Khabūshān he died of paralysis on July 30th, 1156, at the age of fifty-nine years[1]. Atsiz died as the vassal of the Saljūqid Sultan; none the less he must in justice be considered as the founder of the power of the Khorezmian dynasty. By adding Jand and Manqishlāgh to his possessions he brought the neighbouring nomads under subjection to Khorezmia, and by increasing his military forces by Turkish mercenary divisions he laid the foundation of a strong and actually independent kingdom. The successors of Atsiz worked on the same lines, and with the same perseverance. With the same skill and the same just understanding of the interests of their dynasty they struggled persistently towards their goal; temporarily postponing the solution of any problem under the influence of insuperable obstacles, they always returned to it at the first opportunity.

---

[1] The same date, 9th Jumādā II, 551, is given by Juwaynī (ii, 13) and Ibn al-Athīr: cf. also Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 11.

Il-Arslān, the successor of Atsiz, had to return to Khorezmia in order to secure his throne. According to Ibn al-Athīr[1], Il-Arslān "killed some of his uncles and blinded his brother, who died three days later; or, according to another account, committed suicide." Juwaynī[2] says that this prince, Sulaymān-shāh, suffered imprisonment, but his tutor (atābeg) Oghul-beg was executed The solemn enthronement of Il-Arslān took place on August 22. He inaugurated his reign by increasing the pay and territorial grants of the army. In Ramaḍān (October-November) of the same year Sinjar, who had returned
356 to Merv, sent an investiture to Il-Arslān. | In the spring of 1157[3] Sinjar died, in the seventy-first year of his age, and with him virtually ceased the supreme power of the Saljūqid sultans in the eastern part of Persia. Sinjar's successor in Khurāsān was Maḥmūd-Khān; Il-Arslān welcomed him and informed him that in Khorezmia too three days' mourning had been held on the death of Sinjar[4]. In these letters, however, the Khwārazm-shāh only calls himself "sincere friend" (mukhliṣ), as in his letters to the minor rulers of Khurāsān[5], whereas Atsiz in his letters to Sinjar called himself "slave" (bandah). The head of the Saljūqid dynasty after the death of Sinjar was Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, the ruler of 'Irāq (1153–1159), and a great grandson of Malik-Shāh. He also sent an embassy to Il-Arslān and made known to him his intention of going eastwards with his army. The realization of this intention was hindered by many factors, in the first place by the enmity between the Sultan and the Caliph, whose temporal power had been restored after the death of the Saljūqid Sultan Mas'ūd (1152). On his side Il-Arslān entirely approved the intention of the Sultan, and even came forward as mediator between him and the Baghdād government. In the Khwārazm-shāh's letter to the wazīr of the Caliph Muqtafī[6] (1136–1160) it is stated that only Sultan Muḥammad could rid Khurāsān of highway robbers and Trans-oxania of the yoke of the infidels, that the inhabitants of these provinces await his arrival with impatience, and that at such a time the Caliph's government must forget its enmity to the Sultan, for which indeed it had no serious cause, and afford him

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 138.

[2] Juwaynī, ii, 14: cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 12. Mīrkhwānd mistakenly refers Il-Arslān's accession to 552.

[3] According to Juwaynī (ii, 14) 26 Rabī' I, 552 (May 8, 1157); according to Bundārī (Houtsma, *Recueil, &c.*, ii, 255) on Monday, 14 Rabī' I, but this day (April 26th) was a Friday.

[4] *Texts*, p. 33.

[5] *Texts*, pp. 27, 33. Very probably the first letter, in which the Khwārazm-shāh complains that Maḥmūd did not write to him first on his accession to the throne, belongs to the time of Atsiz, when Sinjar was in prison, and that the words "after the death of the Sultan" were mistakenly inserted in the title by the transcriber.

[6] *Texts*, pp. 30–32 (Inshā), 70 (Khaīdat al-Qaṣr).

support. In the instructions of the person appointed to represent the Khwārazm-shāh at the court of Muḥammad[1], the latter is called "Sovereign of the World, Supreme Sultan, Commander of all the Earth[2]." |

As the Sultan's intention was not realized, Il-Arslān was 357
incontestably the most powerful ruler in the eastern part of the Muslim world, and therefore decided to take upon himself the fulfilment of the task alluded to in his letter to the wazīr at Baghdād. First of all an opportunity was presented to him of interfering in the affairs of Transoxania, where, under the supreme rule of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, the struggle between the Khāns and the Qarluq divisions still continued. After the battle at Qaṭwān, Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm, the son of Arslān-Khān Muḥammad, became ruler of Samarqand; he was killed by the Qarluqs, and his body thrown out on the steppes[3]. According to Jamāl Qarshī[4] this occurred in 551/1156 at Kallābād in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā. He was succeeded by Chaghrī-Khān[5] Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī, son of Ḥasan-tagin (see above, p. 322). According to Juwaynī[6] he killed the chief of the Qarluqs[7], Payghū-Khān[8], and persecuted his sons and other Qarluq leaders, the chief of whom was Lāchīn-beg. The fallen chiefs fled to Il-Arslān, who, although he had not long before this exchanged friendly letters[9] with the Khān of Samarqand, espoused their cause, and in July 1158 entered Transoxania with an army. The Khān of Samarqand sought the help of the nomad Turkmens in the steppes between Qaraā-kul and Jand, and addressed a prayer for assistance to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, who sent him a division of 10,000 men under the command of Ilak-Turkman.[10] The Khwārazm-shāh "pacified the inhabitants of

[1] Such are the contents of the next document (*Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des langues orientales*, iii, 154, no. 75).

[2] خدایکان عالم سلطان اعظم فرمان‌ده روی زمین.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 133) refers this to the month of Dhū'l-Ḥijja 550 (end of January and February, 1156). It is added here that the Khān proved himself a weak ruler throughout his reign. Cf. *Texts*, p 72 (al-Kātib as-Samarqandī).

[4] *Texts*, p. 132.

[5] Thus in Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 205); the reading of the other surname of this Khān is doubtful; in Juwaynī (both the Khanykov MS. and printed edition) كوك ساغر; Cf. *Texts*, p. 34.

[6] Juwaynī, ii, 14. Cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 12–13.

[7] In Mīrkhwānd قرلغان should be read instead of قراخان (in the Khanykov MS. of Juwaynī قولغان and قرلغ: in the printed edition قرلغان).

[8] Probably to be read Yabghū.

[9] *Texts*, pp. 34–5. A friendly letter was dispatched in 1157 to the ruler of Sijistān (*Texts*, p. 30).

[10] Juwaynī, ii, 15. Īlak-Turkman was perhaps the former ruler of Balāsāghūn (Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes*, S. 132); he is mentioned also in Juwaynī (ii, 88) though the printed text here has ایلك ترکان.

Bukhārā by promises," *i.e.* he attracted the population of the town to his cause; in his further progress, as we know from Sam'ānī, he destroyed the town of Rabinjan (*cf.* above p. 97).
358 The armies stood opposite each other on the banks | of the Zarafshān, but Ilak-Turkman, convinced of the superiority of the Khwārazm-shāh's forces, evaded battle and begged for peace through the mediation of the imāms and 'ulamā of Samarqand. The Khwārazm-shāh agreed to make peace on condition that the Qarluq amīrs should be restored with honour to their functions, and after this returned to Khorezmia.

We possess another account of the struggle between the Khān and the Qarluqs in Ibn al-Athīr[1], who mistakenly refers this event to 559/1164, when, judging by the numismatic data[2], Jalāl ad-Dīn's son Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd was already on the throne. The King of the Qarā-Khiṭāys requested the Khān to compel the Qarluqs to leave the provinces of Bukhārā and Samarqand for Kāshghar, where they would cease to bear arms, and would occupy themselves with agriculture or some other work. The Khān passed on this request to the Qarluqs and insisted on its fulfiment; in answer to this the Qarluqs rose in revolt, and their united forces marched on Bukhārā. The ra'īs of Bukhārā, Muḥammad, son of the 'Omar killed in 1141, sent news of this to the Khān, and begged him to meet the Qarluqs with his army before they succeeded in laying waste the province. At the same time he dispatched envoys to the Qarluqs and ordered them to be told that even the infidel Qarā-Khiṭāys on seizing a province refrained from pillage and murder[3]; all the more so for Muslims and Ghāzīs like themselves was such restraint obligatory. By such negotiations he lulled the vigilance of the Qarluqs and enabled the Khān to carry out the projected attack upon them and destroy them completely. It is very likely that this account relates to the event which evoked the campaign of Il-Arslān, although it is also possible that after Il-Arslān's withdrawal a new dispute arose between the Qarluqs and Jalāl ad-Dīn. That this struggle did not end in the complete annihilation of the Qarluqs is evident from their revolt under Jalāl ad-Dīn's successor, Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd. We know also from
359 Ibn al-Athīr[4] that in August, 1158, *i.e.* simultaneously | with Il-Arslān's campaign, the ruler of Khuttal, Abū Shujā' Farrukh-Shāh, made an unsuccessful attack on Tirmidh, which was probably undertaken at the desire of the Qarā-Khiṭāys.

In Khurāsān the Khorezmian government under Il-Arslān achieved no substantial success. In the chief towns of Khurāsān

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 205.
[2] *Mélanges asiatiques*, viii, 734; A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 278.
[3] Such a declaration in the mouth of the son of the Ṣadr murdered by the Qarā-Khiṭāys is extremely curious.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 155–6.

a struggle was going on between Maḥmūd-Khān and the chief Ghuzz leader, Mu'ayyid ad-Dawla Āy-Āba; only one of the Ghuzz leaders, Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Āytāq[1], ruler of Dihistān, acknowledged Il-Arslān as his protector. In spite of this and of his alliance with the ruler of Māzandarān, Āytāq was defeated in the struggle with his rival, Yaghmūr-Khān. At the beginning of 1161 Āytāq fled to Khorezmia; Gurgān and Dihistān were pillaged by the Ghuzz and the latter "scattered the inhabitants of Gurgān over various provinces.[2]" After the departure of the Ghuzz however, Āytāq, with the help of the Khorezmians, re-established his rule in Dihistān and Gurgān. In these towns the khuṭba continued to be read in the name of Il-Arslān and Āytāq even after the issue of the struggle between Maḥmūd and Mu'ayyid, who in 1162[3] took Maḥmūd-Khān and his son Jalāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad prisoners, and ordered them both to be blinded. Mu'ayyid ruled only Nīshāpūr, Ṭūs, and some other places; in 1163 he incorporated Bisṭām and Dāmghān in his territories, after which the Saljūqid Sultan Arslān (1161–1177) acknowledged him as his viceroy. Mu'ayyid accepted the appointment and introduced the khuṭba in the name of Arslān into his province. Merv, Balkh, and Sarakhs were in the hands of the Ghuzz, who recognized no superior authority, but mentioned the dead Sinjar in the khuṭba. Herāt was ruled by the emir Āy-tagīn[4], who was on friendly terms with the Ghuzz. In 1165 war broke out between Mu'ayyid and Il-Arslān. The Khwārazm-shāh successfully defended the town of Nasā from Mu'ayyid, and established his authority over it, but his march on Nīshāpūr ended in failure. Immediately afterwards a dispute broke out between Il-Arslān and Āytāq, who applied | to Mu'ayyid for assistance. The 360
latter succeeded in protecting the southern part of Āytāq's territories from the Khorezmians, but they captured the town of Dihistān and established their own governor in it[5].

In the reign of Il-Arslān, therefore, order was not re-established in Khurāsān. Under such conditions all thoughts, not only of expelling the Qarā-Khiṭāys from Transoxania but also of taking measures to safeguard the provinces situated to the south of the Amū-Daryā from their invasion were out of the question. The author of the Ta'rīkh-al-Khayrāt[6], quoting the Yūsuf b. 'Abdal-

[1] His full title is quoted by Abu'l-Ḥasan Bayhaqī (MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 3587, f. 166 a), who calls him "ruler of Khurāsān, king of the East" (Khusraw-i Khurāsān malik al-Mashriq).

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 172–3.

[3] The same date is given for Maḥmūd-Khān's capture in Juwaynī (ii, 16) and Ibn al-Athīr (Ramaḍān 557 = August–September, 1162).

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 180, 192–3.

[5] *Ibid.*, xi, 208. Juwaynī (f. 104) puts Il-Arslān's expedition to Nīshāpūr in 562/1166–7; the printed edition (ii, 16) has 558.

[6] MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 4898, f. 162 a.

lāh Andkhudī mentioned above (p. 329, note 1), speaks of the pillage of Balkh and Andkhud by the Qarā-Khiṭāys in 560/1165. It is very probable that this invasion was connected with the winter campaign of Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd, of which an account is given by al-Kātib as-Samarqandī. Abū'l-Muẓaffar Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd b. 'Alī, who bore also the title of Qutlugh-Bilgā-beg[1] and the laqab of "Pillar of the earthly world and of the Faith[2]" (Rukn ad-Dunyā-wa'd-Dīn) ascended the throne, judging from his coins, in 558/1163. In 560/1165 he restored the city walls of Bukhārā on a foundation of baked bricks, utilizing for this purpose the bricks from the foundations and towers of the citadel of Bukhārā which had been destroyed by the Ghuzz[3] (see above, p. 327). Al-Kātib as-Samarqandī[4] gives the following details on the reign of Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān. Under him occurred the revolt of 'Ayyār-beg, who was not descended from a noble family but had risen by his personal merit and services; amongst the divisions of the Qarluq guard there was no horseman to compare with him. He had been commander-in-chief in Transoxania for one year, but afterwards, for some unknown reason, brought about a revolt. A battle was fought between him and the Khān in the Hunger Steppe, between Zāmīn and Sābāṭ. 'Ayyār-beg had pierced the ranks of the soldiers of the Khān, and had almost reached the elevation where the Khān's umbrella stood, and where the sovereign himself and his suite were standing, when he was taken prisoner,
361 led before the Khān and executed. | Equal success attended the Khan's operations "against two sets of people consisting of the vilest creatures," namely against the murderers of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm and against the Ghuzz spoliators of Khurāsān. It was evidently in connexion with his war against the latter that the Khān made a winter crossing of the Amu-Daiya on the ice with 100,000 men. The war with the Qarluq divisions who had murdered Ibrāhīm was carried on in Nakhshab, Kish, Ṣaghāniyān, and Tirmidh; in these localities, thanks to the Khān, peace was restored.

Finally an expedition was made by the Qarā-Khiṭāys into Khorezmia, according to Juwayni[5] in 565/1169–70; according to Ibn al-Athīr[6] in 567/1171–2; judging from what follows, the latter is the more probable date.

The campaign was provoked by the failure of the Khwārazm-shāh to pay tribute at the prescribed term. The leader of the

[1] Leyden MS., no. 904, f. 3: قلغ نيكابكا.

[2] Thus on his coins and in Nerchakhy.

[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 23, 33–34.

[4] *Texts*, pp. 71–2.

[5] Juwaynī, f. 104, and also in the printed edition, ii, 16; in the Khanykov MS. 560. Cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 14.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 246.

Khorezmian advanced guard 'Ayyār-beg (who is evidently not to be identified with the Qarluq amīr mentioned above) was defeated and taken prisoner; Il-Arslān returned in ill-health to his capital (the usual measures, *i.e.* the destruction of dams, having been taken against the invasion of the Qarā-Khiṭāys), where he died in March 1172[1].

In the following reign the successes of the dynasty were somewhat impeded by civil wars amongst its members. After the death of Il-Arslān his youngest son Sulṭān-Shāh ascended the throne with the help of his mother Turkān[2]; the eldest son Takash, who was ruler of Jand at the time, refused to submit to him and fled to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, where the daughter of the first gūrkhān and her husband Fūmā[3] were then reigning. Takash applied to them for assistance and promised to pay an annual tribute. The husband of the queen with a powerful army escorted Takash back to Khorezmia; Sulṭān-Shāh and his mother | left the town without a struggle, and on Monday, 362
December 11, 1172[4], Takash solemnly ascended the throne. Sulṭān-Shāh appealed for help to Mu'ayyid. Takash awaited his enemies on the edge of the steppes, near the small town of Sūbarlī (?), which was subsequently flooded[5]. As a large army could not pass through the steppe, Mu'ayyid's army covered this march in small detachments; but the first section, which included Mu'ayyid himself, was attacked and destroyed by the Khorezmians and Mu'ayyid was taken prisoner and put to

[1] According to Juwaynī (ii, 17) on 19th Rajab of the same year 565 (April 8, 1170), or possibly even 560 according to Ḥusaynī (Cod. Stowe Or. 7, f 94 a: I am indebted for this reference to Prof. Houtsma) 9th Rajab 567 (March 7, 1172); according to Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 247) in 568/1172–3. Mīrkhwānd's date, 557/1162, is clearly erroneous, and this error has been carried over into Prof. Veselovsky's book (p. 62); in Ibn al-Athīr, notwithstanding Prof. Veselovsky's reference, this mistake is not found.

[2] The word Turkān, which frequently occurs as the name of Turkish queens, is not a proper name, but signifies "queen, lady" (cf *Texts*, p. 150, ترکانه, with the pronominal suffix). The correct spelling, as we know from the glossary of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (i, 314, 368), is Terken.

[3] On this word, meaning in Chinese "son-in-law of the king," see Défrémery's note to Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, p. 124). The printed edition of Juwaynī (ii, 17) has فرما.

[4] Thus in Juwaynī (ii, 17 sq., 22 Rabī' II, 568); Mīrkhwānd again gives 558 here.

[5] According to Juwaynī (ii, 18; for the flooding see p. 19). The name of the town is written سورلی, سورنی, and سورمی. In the printed edition of Juwaynī the reading سورلی is adopted. According to Ibn al Athīr it lay at a distance of 20 farsakhs from Khwārazm (*i. e.* Gurgānj). It is no doubt the same as the town mentioned above (p. 153) as the last town of Khorezmia on the road to Shahristān, from Yāqūt, who has سُنْرُنی and سُونَرْنی. It must have lain in a district where there is now no water at all, but which at that time was irrigated from the Amu-Darya. The inundation mentioned by Juwaynī must have been a result of the change in the main bed of the river after the Mongol invasion. Cf. my article "Āmū Daryā" in the *Encyc. of Islām*.

death[1] (July 11, 1174)[2]. Sulṭān-Shāh and his mother fled to Dihistān, but Takash pursued them and took the town. The queen Turkān was killed; Sulṭān-Shāh found refuge first with Mu'ayyid's son and successor Ṭughān-Shāh Abū Bakr and afterwards with the Ghūrid king Ghiyāth ad-Dīn.

The name of Ghūr was borne by the mountain region situated to the east and south-east of Herāt and south of Gharjistān and Gūzgān; the dialect of these mountaineers differed materially from that of Khurāsān. As late as the tenth century the population of Ghūr was for the most part heathen, although the district itself was surrounded on all sides by Muslim territories[3]. The author of the Tumansky manuscript avers that in his time the ruler of the province (Ghūr-Shāh) considered himself the vassal of the Farīghūnids of Gūzgān and that at that time the people of Ghūr had for the most part accepted Islām. According to Bayhaqī[4] the first to penetrate to the interior of the country of Ghūr were the armies of the Ghaznevid Sultan Mas'ūd, who at that period (1020) was governor of Herāt. After their conquest of Ghūr the Ghaznevids left the native dynasty here. In the middle of the twelfth century the sultans of Ghūr, like the Khwārazm-shāhs, took advantage of the decay of the power of the Saljūqids and Ghaznevids. We have seen that the rulers of Ghūr also took part in the events which occurred in Khurāsān
363 after the capture | of Sinjar. Shortly after this the brothers Ghiyāth ad-Dīn and Shihāb ad-Dīn (who subsequently received the title of Mu'izz ad-Dīn) raised their kingdom to the rank of a world power. The second brother was usually in command of the army, and during the lifetime of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn was ruler of Ghazna, which was definitively transferred to the Ghūrids in 569/1173-4. Fakhr ad-Dīn Mas'ūd, the uncle of the brothers, ruled Bāmiyān, Tukhāristān, Shughnān and other regions up to Bolor; his son Shams-ad-dīn Muḥammad, if Jūzjānī is to be believed, incorporated in his dominions some of the provinces situated north of the Amu-Darya, namely Ṣaghāniyān and Wakhsh[5]. The Ghūrids did not extend their dominions only to the east; in 571/1175-6 they occupied Herāt, after which they became rivals in Khurāsān to the Khwārazm-shāhs, over whom they undoubtedly had some advantages. The Khwārazm-shāhs were able to carry on their wars only by the aid of mercenaries; the Ghūrids had not only their Turkish guards but could depend also on the warlike mountaineers of their native

[1] Thus in Juwaynī and Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 247). The account from another source of Ibn al-Athīr's (xi, 249–53), according to which Mu'ayyid outlived Sulṭān-Shāh, is in any case unreliable, as in documents of 578 and 579 (cf. above, p. 34) Ṭughān-Shāh is already mentioned.

[2] Date in Juwaynī (ii, 19): day of the festival of Arafāt 569.

[3] *Bibl Geog. Arab*, i, 273; ii, 323, 329.

[4] Baihaki, pp. 128–35.

[5] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp 423, 426.

land. The Khwārazm-shāhs, with all their power, were vassals of the infidel Qarā-Khiṭāys; the Ghūrids were the only independent and strong sovereigns in the eastern part of Muslim Asia, and it was to them, naturally, that the Muslims of Khurāsān and Transoxania were bound to look after all hope of assistance from the West had vanished. If, none the less, the struggle ended to the advantage of the Khwārazm-shāhs, the explanation is to be found primarily in the skilful policy of the Khorezmian government and the personal abilities of the sovereigns. In any case it can scarcely have been by accident that after the decay of the Saljūqid empire it was precisely the rulers of those countries presenting peculiar geographical and ethnographical features as a whole who came into prominence. Both for the Ghūrids and for the Khwārazm-shāhs their homelands were able to serve as a firm *point d'appui* in attack and a sure refuge in misfortunes.

Though he owed his throne to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, Takash could not live in harmony with them. A motive for revolt, as often happened in the nomad empires, was supplied by the arrogance and extortion of the Qarā-Khiṭāy envoy who had arrived in Khorezmia to collect the stipulated tribute. "Out of zeal for the dignity of the throne and Faith[1]" | Takash killed 364
the envoy, who was related to the gūrkhān, and by his order the envoy's companions were killed by the Khoreznian nobles. On learning this Sulṭān-Shāh at once made his way to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and succeeded in persuading the queen, as he had formerly persuaded Mu'ayyid, that the population and army of Khorezmia would willingly take his side and forsake his brother. The same Fūmā who some years earlier had deposed Sulṭān-Shāh was now dispatched to Khorezmia to reinstate him on the throne. Takash hindered the movements of the Qarā-Khiṭāy armies by flooding the country, and their hopes of assistance from the inhabitants also proved to be unfounded. Fūmā was obliged to retreat, but at Sulṭān-Shāh's request gave him a division with which the latter entered Khurāsān, defeated the local Ghuzz ruler near Sarakhs, and occupied Merv. He was equally successful in his operations against Ṭughān-Shāh whom he completely defeated on Wednesday, May 13, 1181[2], subsequently incorporating Sarakhs and Ṭūs in his territories.

The historians give no account of the events of the following years, to which, judging from the dates of some documents, the diplomatic correspondence which has come down to us between the Khorezmian government and some contemporary rulers must be assigned. That there is no mistake in these dates may

[1] The expression is Ibn al-Athīr's (xi, 248). Cf. also Juwaynī, ii, 19; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 17 sq.

[2] The date in Juwaynī: in the Khanykov MS. and in the printed edition (ii, 21) 26th Dhu'l-Ḥijja 576; in MS. iv, 2, 34, the 23rd is given in error.

be concluded from the fact that some documents mention Ṭughān-Shāh, who died, as we shall see, a few years after this. At this time Ṭughān-Shāh ruled the town of Nasā, as the vassal of Takash[1]. It is evident from the documents that at the very end of 1181[2] the amīr Humām ad-Dīn came to Khorezmia on an embassy from the Ghūrid sultan, for negotiations regarding matters in Khurāsān. The Khwārazm-shāh promised to enter Khurāsān with an army in the spring of the following year for an interview with Ghiyāth ad-Dīn. Humām ad-Dīn was dismissed in January 1182[3] and Takash sent with him his envoy Fakhr ad-Dīn. |

365 Soon after this the Khwārazm-shāh began to prepare for his expedition to Khurāsān, but at this moment Sultān-Shāh's envoy arrived in Khorezmia. Takash demanded of his brother that he should live in peace with Ṭughān-Shāh, and the envoy expressed submission on behalf of his master. In consequence of this the campaign became superfluous, but the Khwārazm-shāh nevertheless expressed his readiness to fulfil his promise to the Ghūrid sultan at any time, adding that he could do this without difficulty as all was quiet around Khorezmia. This letter was sent in April or the beginning of May[4]. Immediately afterwards two documents are inserted in the collection which were written at the end of May[5] from Khurāsān, where the Khwārazm-shāh was at the time besieging Sarakhs; thus the campaign proved inevitable. The first letter expresses the conviction that the town will be taken in a few days and that an interview can then be arranged between the Khwārazm-shāh and the Ghūrid sultan, and states that the Khwārazm-shāh's army contains divisions from all the territories subject to him. The hope of a speedy victory was not realized, as the second letter was likewise written "at the gate of Sarakhs." It states amongst other matters that Alp-Qarā-Ūrān had appeared during the winter in Jand, with a numerous force of Qipchāqs who had not yet accepted Islām, and had made his submission, sending his eldest son Fīrān (?) and a large number of the "sons of Yūghūrs" (?) to the Khwārazm-shāh with an offer of his services. The Khwārazm-shāh sent them to the prince Malik-Shāh, then governing Jand, and instructed them to move against the infidels together with the prince. In the same winter the Khwārazm-shāh wished to go to the assistance of the Ghūrid sultan, but on receiving news of his successes in his struggle with his enemies, he put off the expedition.

[1] *Texts*, p. 74 (Kitāb at-tawassul ila't-tarassul).
[2] According to the Leyden MS., no. 285 (f 26) in the month of Sha'bān; the year is not quoted, but it is clear from what follows that 577 is intended.
[3] In the month of Ramaḍān
[4] End of the month of Dhu'l-Ḥijja.
[5] The first belongs to the middle of Muḥarram (578).

The next letter, addressed to Ghiyāth ad-Dīn, was written in January, 1183[1]. The Khwārazm-shāh makes his excuses that the proposed interview has again not taken place; urgent matters requiring his attention had obliged him to undertake a campaign in Transoxania, and on his return from this the horses were too exhausted for a fresh march[2].

The Qipchāqs are mentioned also in the letters sent | during 366
1182, in October[3] and in November[4], to the Atābeg "Pahlawān of 'Irāq."[5] In the letter of October it is stated that Fīrān, the son of Alp-Qarā, was honoured by relationship (evidently by marriage) with the house of Takash, and reference is made to a declaration by the same Alp-Qarā, expressing his readiness to render the same services this year as in the preceding one, when he had been able to liberate from the yoke of the infidel extensive districts up to Ṭarāz itself[6] (Talas) The letter of November says that new divisions of Qipchāqs are constantly coming in from Turkistān and enlisting in the Khwārazm-shāh's service[7].

The campaign in Transoxania is spoken of in a separate document, a letter written at Bukhārā in the name of Takash and dispatched to the wazīr in Khorezmia After crossing the Amu-Darya the Khwārazm-shāh sent a division to Bukhārā. The soldiers were ordered not to molest the peaceful inhabitants; but in the fortified town[8] a "mob of seditious tyrants and insolent apostates, who had remained in this province, and fallen into the net of unbelief" had collected. With the clemency peculiar to him, the Khwārazm-shāh had long restrained his soldiers and endeavoured to prevail upon the mutineers; but it appeared that "their ears were filled with the wool of delusion."

On Tuesday the 12th of the month[9] the soldiers began the assault; in one moment the walls were taken, and the victorious army was already desiring to proceed to the plundering of the town; but the Sovereign had pity on the orthodox population and withdrew the army; as he knew that in the case of a town which was taken by assault the sufferers would include also the peaceful inhabitants who against their will had submitted to the

[1] At the end of Ramaḍān.
[2] *Texts*, pp. 78–80; Leyden MS., no. 285, f. 26–8.
[3] In the middle of the month of Jumādā II.
[4] In the middle of the month of Rajab.
[5] Stanley Lane-Poole, *Mohammedan Dynasties*, p. 171. [6] *Texts*, p. 80.
[7] Leyden MS., no. 285, f. 32: مدد ایشان از اقصیٔ ترکستان منقطع نشود.
[8] The word حصن is probably used here in the sense of "city walls"; compare my *Otchet*, &c., p. 15, note 8. There was no citadel in Bukhārā at that time (Nerchakhy, p. 23).
[9] The name of the month is omitted in both MSS. (nos. 285 and 586). In 578 the 12th of Muḥarram (May 18) fell on a Tuesday, but the date referred to here is probably Tuesday, October 12 (according to Wüstenfeld's tables, 11th Jumādā II, but a similar difference of one day is, as is well known, often met with in Muslim chronology, cf. above, p. 328, note 7).

rule of the infidels. From this, it appears, the conclusion may be reached that the assault was beaten off. The Khwārazm-shāh decided to await a proposal of surrender up to the morning of
367 the following day (Wednesday); | late in the evening the commander of the town, taking advantage of the approaching darkness, made a sally and endeavoured to escape, but was overtaken by the Khwārazm-shāh's army and captured with all his troops (over 1,000 men), all of whom were taken before the Khwārazm-shāh and received a pardon[1]. In this way the city was captured. Two edicts of Takash have also been preserved addressed to the imāms of Bukhārā (it is possible that both edicts were given to one and the same individual). In the first edict, written after his return to Khorezmia, Takash thanks an imām, one of the Sayyids, for his devotion shown on many occasions, especially during the advance of the Khorezmians on Bukhārā. In the second Badr ad-Dīn, who had already been appointed to these posts by Ṣadr Burhān ad-Dīn, is confirmed in the dignity of mudarris, imām, khaṭīb, and muftī[2], and instructions are given to mention the Sultan's name after that of the Caliph in the khuṭba[3].

In the summer of 1183 the Khwārazm-shāh was again in Khurāsān with his army. Events at this period took a turn unfavourable to Ghiyāth ad-Dīn, who was being sorely pressed by rebels at Merv (probably Sulṭān-Shāh and his army). In a letter to the Ghūrid sultan, dispatched at the beginning of Rabī' II (end of July), the Khwārazm-shāh remarks with self-complacency that there is no hope left to Ghiyāth ad-Dīn except the hope of assistance from Takash, and informs him of his advance with an army of 50,000 Turks. Evidently Takash thought to take advantage of the difficult position of his rival, in order to secure his own pre-eminence in the eastern part of the Muslim world. In this letter, Ghiyāth ad-Dīn is called not "brother," as in all other documents, but "son" of the Khwārazm-shāh, whereby the latter clearly indicated his intention of making all the local rulers, the Ghūrid sultan amongst them, his vassals[4].

The historians also mention some of these events, namely the arrival of the Qipchāqs, and the expedition of Takash to Bukhārā, but they refer them to the last years of his reign, when Sulṭān-Shāh was no longer alive and Malik-Shāh was no longer |
368 in Jand. Juwaynī[5] gives us the following information concerning the Qipchāqs. In 1195[6] the Khwārazm-shāh made an expedition (ghazwa, *i.e.* expedition against infidels) to Sighnāq

[1] *Texts*, pp. 77–8.
[2] *Texts*, pp. 76–7.
[3] Leyden MS., no. 285, f. 20.
[4] *Ibid.*, f. 35–6; *Texts*, p. 80.
[5] Juwaynī, ii, 34–43; Mirkhond, *Khārezm*, pp. 34–37.
[6] The winter of 591, which began on Dec. 16, 1194.

against Qāyir-Tūqū-khān[1], who, on learning of the arrival of a Khorezmian army in Jand, took to flight and was pursued by the Khorezmians. Amongst the Khwārazm-shāh's guards was a division of Ūrāniyāns[2] (a Qipchāq tribe, apparently the very tribe to which the Khān belonged); these informed the Khān that they would desert the Khwārazm-shāh during the battle, and the former, encouraged by this information, gave battle to the Khorezmians on Friday, May 19[3]. The Ūrāniyāns left the ranks of the army and plundered the baggage train. In consequence of this the Muslims suffered defeat; many fell in battle and a still greater number perished in the steppes from heat and thirst. The Khwārazm-shāh returned to Khorezmia in eighteen days[4] and spent the remainder of the year in 'Irāq. At the very end of the year news was received of a dispute between Qāyir-Tūqū-Khān and his nephew Alp-Darak[5], who came to Jand and appealed to the Khwārazm-shāh for help. Takash gave his consent; his son Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad came from Nīshāpūr to Khorezmia and in January 1198 (Rabī' I, 594) the prince, together with Alp-Darak, carried out a campaign in the steppes. The Khān was defeated and taken prisoner with his nobles; in February (Rabī' II) all of them had already been brought to Khorezmia in chains[6]. Qāyir-Tūqū-Khān's people submitted to Alp-Darak, who was not slow in making himself as restless a neighbour to Khorezmia as his predecessor had been. Remembering the Arab proverb "Iron is shattered by iron," Takash liberated the Khān from prison, gave him a large army, concluded a treaty with him and sent him against Alp-Darak. In the following year came the "joyful news" that Alp-Darak had gained a victory over Qāyir-Tūqū-Khān[7]. This, which is the reading of the MSS. of Juwaynī, is, however, most probably a *lapsus calami* and the passage must be amended to read, as in Mīrkhwānd and the printed edition of Juwaynī[8], that news came of a victory of the Khān over Alp-Darak. Undoubtedly | the 369
Alp-Darak mentioned here is identical with the Alp-Qarā of

[1] In the printed edition فاتر توقو. It is possible that he is the ruler afterwards called Qadir-Khān (see below).

[2] The printed text has here اعجمان as well as اورانبان (ii, 35). The latter word is perhaps derived from اوران, mentioned in a list of names of Turkish tribes by Fakhr ad-Dīd Marwarrūdī, cf. Sir E. D. Ross, in *'Ajab-nāmah*, p. 407 (no. 17).

[3] According to Juwaynī (ii, 35) 6th Jumādā II.

[4] In MS. iv, 2, 34 the number is 15, but in the Khanykov MS. and the printed edition 18, and the same in Mīrkhwānd.

[5] According to Juwaynī (ii, 40) the son of a brother; according to Mīrkhwānd, the son of a sister.

[6] Juwaynī, ii, 41.

[7] خبر بشارت ظفر الب درك بر قایر توتو خان بر رسید.

[8] Juwaynī, ii, 43: خبر بشارت ظفر قاتر توقو بر سر کنار درك (*sic*) بر رسید.

the official documents, who had already arrived in Khorezmia, as we have seen, in 1181, and not in 1195; but it is difficult to say whether the other events recounted here, of which there is no mention in the documents, are also to be referred to an earlier date.

The expedition to Bukhārā and its causes are related only by Ibn al-Athīr[1]. In 1198/594 the ruler of Bāmiyān, Bahā ad-Dīn Sām, son of Muḥammad and grandson of Mas'ūd (see above, p. 338), seized Balkh, which had till then belonged to a Turkish prince, a vassal of the Qarā-Khiṭāys. Sām took advantage of the death of this ruler to occupy the town and introduced there the khuṭba in the name of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn. The latter was at this time engaged, by desire of the Caliph, in a campaign in Khurāsān against Takash. The Khwārazm-shāh appealed for help to the Qarā-Khiṭāys. During Jumādā II, in the winter[2] (?), a Qarā-Khiṭāy army under the command of the noble Ṭāyankū[3] crossed the Amu-Darya and laid waste part of Gūzgān and the neighbouring provinces. The Qarā-Khiṭāys demanded of Sām that he should either leave Balkh or pay tribute, but they received no answer. Ghiyāth ad-Dīn decided not to attack his enemies as his brother Shihāb ad-Dīn, who usually commanded the military forces of the Ghūrs, was in India, and he himself suffered from rheumatism, so that he was carried in a litter. Takash was at this time preparing to march from Ṭūs on Herāt. Three of the Ghūrid commanders, however, united their forces for a night attack on the camp of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, which was completely successful, as the Qarā-Khiṭāys, according to their custom, did not leave their tents at night, *i.e.* they did not set sentries. The next day, on learning that Ghiyāth ad-Dīn was not with the army, the Qarā-Khiṭāys renewed the battle, but a division sent by Ghiyāth ad-Dīn joined the army of the three amīrs together with a band of "Warriors for the Faith," and the Qarā-Khiṭāys were completely defeated, a considerable number of them being drowned during the return crossing of the Amu-Darya. After this, the king of the Qarā-Khiṭāys began to blame the Khwārazm-shāh for causing the loss of so many of his men,
370 and demanded | the payment of an enormous sum, 10,000 dīnārs for each of the killed, who numbered 12,000 (?) in all[4].

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 88–91.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr's statement suggests a chronological error; in A.H. 594 Jumādā II began on April 10.

[3] On this word, which must be not a proper name but a title, cf. J. Marquart, *Osttürk. Dialektst.* p. 126 Marquart spells Tājang Kōh (Ibn al-Athīr, طايڭكوه), and sees in the first two syllables the Chinese T'ai Wang. The spelling Ṭāyangū seems to be correct, cf. the vocalization in 'Awfī, *Lubāb al-Albāb*, ed. Browne, i, p. 194, 23, and the verse *ibid.*, 196, 16.

[4] It is quite improbable that the Qarā-Khiṭāys should have required the enormous contribution of 120,000,000 dīnārs from a province which only paid 30,000 dīnārs

The Khwārazm-shāh then entered into negotiations with Ghiyāth ad-Dīn, who demanded that Takash should make his submission to the Caliph and compensate the inhabitants who had suffered from the invasion of the Qarā-Khiṭāys. The negotiations were crowned with success, after which the Khwārazm-shāh sent the following answer to the Gūrkhān: "Thine army endeavoured only to seize Balkh and did not come to my assistance; I did not join it, neither did I order it to cross the river; if I had done this, I would have paid the money which I am asked to pay. But now when you are not in a position to get the better of the Ghūrs, you have applied to me with this speech and these demands. As regards myself I have concluded peace with the Ghūrs, I have made myself their subject[1] and ceased to be yours." The Qarā-Khiṭāys besieged the capital of the Khwārazm-shāh, who made sorties each night; a considerable number of "Warriors for the Faith" joined him, and finally the enemy retreated. The Khwārazm-shāh followed them and laid siege to Bukhārā. The inhabitants showed fight and remained faithful to the Qarā-Khiṭāys; it came to this that the Bukharans took a one-eyed dog, dressed it up in a caftan and high-peaked cap, and exhibited it on the walls, calling it the Khwārazm-shāh (Takash was one-eyed);[2] after this they threw it from a catapult into the enemy camp with the cry "Here is your sultan." The Khorezmians on their side called the Bukharans renegades. Finally the town was taken by assault, and notwithstanding the behaviour of the inhabitants, Takash treated them with clemency, even distributed a large sum of money amongst them, and after some time returned to Khorezmia.

As we have seen, Ibn al-Athīr's account provokes grave doubts, but unfortunately we have no means of verifying it from other sources. The expedition of Takash to Bukhārā is not mentioned either by Juwaynī or by Jūzjānī, the historian of the Ghūrids, who makes no mention either of the conquest of Balkh by Ghiyāth ad-Dīn nor of his war | with the Qarā-Khiṭāys[3]. Ibn 371
al-Athīr, as is evident from his own admission[4], had no clear idea of the events which occurred in Khurāsān in the second half of the twelfth century, and could not analyse the contradictory statements of his sources; this partly explains the doubts evoked

annual tribute. There were not, so far as is known to us, any cases of the payment of such a vast sum in the middle ages.

[1] It is very doubtful whether Takash made such a statement at the end of his reign, at the zenith of his power.

[2] We have found no confirmation of this fact in any other sources.

[3] Jūzjānī (*Ṭabakat-i Nāṣirī*, pp. 924–30) says only that the Qarā-Khiṭāys fought the Ghūrs two or three times, that the Ghūr leaders were Kharjam and Muḥammad b. Kharnāk, and that in one of these battles Kharjam was killed (according to Ibn al-Athīr the name of the leader who fell in battle with the Qarā-Khiṭāys was Ḥarrūsh).

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, XI, 253.

by his accounts, and that the date given by him contradicts those of the official documents quoted above. There is scarcely any foundation for the assumption that Takash took Bukhārā twice over.

The disturbances in Khurāsān were renewed after the death of Ṭughān-Shāh, which occurred, according to Juwaynī[1], on Monday, April 15, 1185. His young son Sinjar-Shāh was raised to the throne, but a large portion of his territories fell to Sulṭān-Shāh, whose rivals were his brother Takash and the Ghūrid Ghiyāth ad-Dīn. The struggle ended to the advantage of Takash who took Nīshāpūr in May or June 1187[2] and left his eldest son Malik-Shāh (the former governor of Jand) there. Sinjar-Shāh was sent to Khorezmia, and subsequently, when it was discovered that he was continuing to negotiate with the inhabitants of Nīshāpūr, he was deprived of his sight[3]. Merv reverted to the rule of Takash only after the death of Sulṭān-Shāh, which occurred on Wednesday September 29, 1193[4]. At the end of the same year Malik-Shāh was transferred to Merv, and his brother Muḥammad[5] was appointed governor of Nīshāpūr. |

372 Still earlier Takash had found occasion to interfere in the affairs of Western Persia, in the struggle between the Saljūqid sultan Ṭughrul and his rival the Atābeg Qutlugh-Īnānch[6]. In 1192 Takash, on receiving an appeal for help from Qutlugh-Īnānch, occupied Rayy, but subsequently retired owing to the news of Sulṭān-Shāh's expedition into Khorezmia[7]. A new campaign was undertaken in 1194; on this occasion not only Qutlugh Īnānch, but the Caliph Nāṣir himself, appealed to Takash for help. The energetic efforts of this Caliph to extend his small territory led to a collision between him and the Saljūqid government. The father of Qutlugh-Īnānch, the atābeg Muḥammad Pahlawān-jahān, persuaded the Sultan Ṭughrul to deprive the Caliph of his temporal power. According to Rāwandī[8],

[1] ii, 22 (12th Muḥarram 581). Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 249) puts this event in Muḥarram 582.

[2] According to Juwaynī (ii, 25) on Tuesday, 7th Rabī' I, 583, but that day (May 17th, 1187) was a Sunday; on the other hand, the 7th Rabī' II (June 16) of the same year was actually a Tuesday (according to MS. Petrograd Univ., no. 172 (f. 118 b) 17th Rabī' I, perhaps Tuesday, May 26). Nīshāpūr was besieged by Takash from Friday, 14th Muharram (March 27, 1187) of the same year.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 249.

[4] Date in Juwaynī (ii, 30) and in Ibn al-Athīr: the last day of Ramaḍān, 589. As far as may be ascertained from reliable information, Sulṭān-Shāh never was imprisoned by his brother, and was not deprived of his sight. Therefore the account given by Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 135) of the conversations between the brothers is wholly anecdotal in character.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 70.

[6] On him see Stanley Lane Poole, *Muhammadan Dynasties*, p. 171.

[7] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 69.

[8] *Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, ed. Muḥ. Iqbāl, p. 334. Rāwandī (p. 384) quotes his brother, who was one of the deputies from Hamadhān received by Takash, and on several occasions (pp. 344, 357) speaks of himself.

a contemporary of these events, the adherents of the Sultan and the atābeg discoursed to the people to the following effect: "If the Caliph is the imām, then his constant occupation must be the performance of namāz, as namāz is the foundation of the faith and the best of deeds; his pre-eminence in this respect and the fact that he serves as an example for the people is sufficient for him. This is the true sovereignty; the interference of the Caliph in the affairs of temporal rule is senseless; they must be entrusted to the sulṭāns."[1] Owing to such tendencies the sultan Ṭughrul did not enjoy the good will of the priesthood. On March 19, 1194[2], Ṭughrul was attacked by the Khwārazm-shāh near Rayy, and after a brave resistance fell in battle. Takash subdued Rayy and Hamadhān. The Caliph's government soon realized that the Khwārazm-shāh would be as dangerous an opponent as formerly the Saljūqid sultan had been. The claims of the Caliph were presented by his wazīr Mu'ayyid ad-Dīn | in the haughtiest manner. The wazīr announced that 373
the Khwārazm-shāh owed his throne to the "Supreme Dīwān,"[3] *i.e.* the Baghdād Government, and therefore at his interview with the wazīr he should be the first to come forward to meet him and should dismount from his horse: according to Ibn al-Athīr[4] the wazīr demanded that Takash should appear personally in the wazīr's tent to receive the robe of honour ordered for him. All these pretensions were firmly rejected by Takash, and only the hasty retreat of the wazīr prevented a collision on this occasion between the armies of the Caliph and the Khwārazm-shāh. A collision actually did take place after the death of the wazīr, in July, 1196; the Khorezmians defeated the army of Baghdād, exhumed the wazīr's body, hacked off the head and sent it to Khorezmia[5]. Even after this battle, the Caliph continued to demand that the Khwārazm-shāh should leave Western Persia and content himself with Khorezmia. Takash replied that his possessions, even including 'Irāq, were insufficient for

[1] From the Turkish text (MS. As. Mus. 590 b a, f. 116-17): خليفه چون كه امام در پس اكا كركدر كم دايم اشى نماز اولا كه دينك ركنى در وجمبع اشلرك يكركى در وآنده تقدّمى وخلق اكا اقتدا قلدوغى يتر. حقيقتده پاذشاهلغى اولدر بو مجازى پاذشاهلغه اول دخل اتمك بى معنى در بونى سلاطينه اصمرلق كرك. The Persian original is somewhat less emphatic: امامرا بخطبه وبپش نمازى كه شاهان مجازى در حمايت آنند وبهترين كارها ومعظمترين كردارهاست مشغول مى بايد بودن وپاذشاهى با سلاطين مفوّض داشتن وجهانداری بدين سلطان بگذاشتن

[2] Date in Ibn al-Athir (xii, 70), 24th Rabī' I, 590.

[3] Juwaynī, ii, 33: تشريف وعهد سلطنت از ديوان عزز مندوب كشته است.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 70.

[5] *Ibid.*, xii, 73.

the maintenance of his numerous armies, and that therefore he requested the Caliph to cede Khūzistān to him as well[1]. According to Ibn al-Athīr[2] Takash at the end of his reign, like his son Muḥammad at a later time, demanded that the khuṭba in his name should be introduced in Baghdād itself. This was the beginning of the enmity between the 'Abbāsids and the Khwārazm-shāhs, which was subsequently to prove one of the causes of the ruin of both dynasties. The constant engagements between their armies reacted ruinously on the peaceful inhabitants also; the Khorezmian divisions caused terrible devastation in the province, and, according to Rāwandī[3], Takash's general Mayāchuk showed greater cruelty than even the Ghuzz had shown in Khurāsān, or the Mongols were subsequently to display in 'Irāq. In the last year of his reign Takash at length listened to the complaints of the inhabitants, deprived Mayāchuk of his post, and after his arrival in Khorezmia ordered him to be executed. The army of Baghdād behaved no better; Rāwandī[4] says that after the retiral of Takash in 1194 the Caliph sent 5,000 horsemen to
374 'Irāq, who plundered all that the Khorezmians had left. | The claims of the wazīr Mu'ayyid ad-Dīn were directed not only against the ruling princes, but also against private landowners; he announced that all Muslim lands belonged to the Caliph, and that no one should possess *milks* (*i.e.* portions of land exempt from taxation). The historian includes this claim among the wazīr's "innovations[5]." When Takash died the Khorezmians held the predominance in 'Irāq, but on receiving news of this event the inhabitants rose in revolt and killed all the Khorezmian soldiers to be found in their province[6].

Takash died on July 3, 1200[7]. He succeeded, as we have seen, in extending the power of his dynasty to a remarkable degree, but already in his reign a beginning had been made with those features in the Khorezmian kingdom whose existence proved so disastrous for his son. As they were in a state of

[1] *Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, p. 385.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 88.

[3] *Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, p. 398. The author compares his evil deeds with those of "the unbelievers of Abkhāz (Christians of the Caucasus and Georgians), the Turks of China (Khiṭā), and the Franks of Syria."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 377.

[5] Rāwandī, MS. As. Mus. 590 b a, f. 121: جمله بدعتلرندن برسی بو ادی که مسلمانلرك النده که ملکلرن طوتردی ایدردی که جمیع درلر اراضی مملکتدر امیر المومنینك در کمسه‌نك ملکی یوفدر اثبات اتسونلر. The Persian original (*Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, p. 381 sq.) has نبالها بمی خواست ومی گفت زمین از آن امیر المؤمنین است کسی کباشد که ملك دارد

[6] *Ibid.*, f. 130; Persian original, p. 399.

[7] Thus in Juwaynī (II, 46), 12th Ramaḍān, 596; according to Ibn al-Athir (XII, 103) the 20th. This day does not correspond to June 27, as is stated in error by Prof. Veselovsky (p. 65).

open enmity to the Caliph, the Khwārazm-shāhs could not lean on the authority of the clergy; as he had accepted the services of the Qipchāq princes, and entered into relationship with them, Takash created a strong military class, who contributed to his military successes, but already in his own lifetime, as we have seen (p. 343), proved unreliable in his struggle against his enemies of the steppes. Under the leadership of so clever a woman as Turkān-Khātūn[1], the wife of Takash and mother of Muḥammad, the influence of this military aristocracy soon shook the authority of the throne; the Qipchāqs were able to lay waste the occupied lands without hindrance, although they had appeared there in the character of liberators, and were able to render the name of their sovereign an object of detestation to the population.

The eldest son of Takash, Malik-Shāh, died during his father's lifetime, in the spring of 1197[2], and his successor on the throne was his second son Muḥammad, who bore the title of Quṭb ad-Dīn in his father's lifetime, | and that of ʿAlā ad-Dīn after his 375
death. The proclamation of Muḥammad as Khwārazm-shah took place only on Thursday, August 3, 1200[3], the delay being caused by the rivalry between him and Hindū-Khān, son of Malik-Shāh. The rights of the latter were supported by the Ghūrs, who succeeded in seizing some towns in Khurāsān. The requisitions made by the Ghūrs[4] gained them the hostility of the population, of which the Khwārazm-shāh hastened to take advantage, the more readily that Ghiyāth ad-Dīn died at this juncture. Already in 1203 Muḥammad had regained his territories in Khurāsān, and in the spring of 1204 he was able to proceed to their extension, plundered Bādghīs, and levied a large contribution on Herāt, which had never been incorporated in the dominions of Takash. At this juncture Shihāb ad-Dīn returned from India to Khurāsān and marched with an army directly on Khorezmia. Muḥammad hastily withdrew from Merv, and, following the example of his predecessors, endeavoured to arrest the enemy by inundating the locality, but this only served to delay them forty days. The Khorezmians were defeated near Qaṭā-Sū[5], and Shihāb ad-Dīn followed up his victory by besieging Gurgānj. According to Juwaynī[6], the inhabitants of the capital rose like one man for the defence of the town; arms

[1] On this name see above, p. 337, n. 2.
[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 85.
[3] Date in Juwaynī (ii, 47) and in Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, p. 41) 20th Shawwāl.
[4] Juwaynī, ii, 51.
[5] According to Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 474) one of the canals from the Amu-Darya on the eastern side of the capital. Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 122) has Sū-Qarā, and gives also the meaning of this name "Black water." In consequence of the existence of the name Alp-Qarā (see above, pp. 297, 340) we cannot rule out such a singular sequence of the words as entirely impossible, but at any rate it is more probable that it should be read Qarā-Sū, as in Jūzjānī.
[6] Juwaynī, ii, 54 sq. Cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 46–7.

were distributed to all, and the imām Shihāb ad-Dīn Khīwakī, "pillar of the Faith and stronghold of the Empire[1]," exhorted them from the pulpit to fight bravely with their enemies, basing his appeal on the "authentic" ḥadīth: "Whosoever is killed in defence of his life and his property, the same is a martyr." 'Awfī[2], who was present at Gurgānj at the time, presents the same event in a totally different light. The general arming of the inhabitants was only a military stratagem on the part of the queen Turkān-Khātūn; she dispatched a courier to Khurāsān[3], 376 in order to | acquaint her son with the invasion, and at the same time published throughout the town an order to arm all the inhabitants; helmets made of paper were prepared. The sight of such a numerous army deterred the Ghūrs from an immediate attack on the town, which was in a state of complete defencelessness, as there was no army there at all. Within a week Muḥammad arrived, but with only 100 horsemen; gradually more numerous forces began to arrive from all sides, and the town was saved[4].

Juwaynī says that the army collected by the Khwārazm-shāh amounted to 70,000 men, and besides this he appealed for help to the Qarā-Khiṭāys. The Ghūr camp was on the eastern side of the river[5]; Shihāb ad-Dīn had already ordered his army to search for a ford, in order to deliver an attack on the city the following day, but at this juncture a numerous Qarā-Khiṭāy army arrived under the leadership of the General Ṭāyankū-Ṭarāz and 'Othmān, sultan of Samarqand. The Ghūrs hastily retreated; Muḥammad pursued them to Hazārasp, where he defeated them, returning afterwards to Gurgānj to celebrate his victory. The Qarā-Khiṭāys continued the pursuit and sur-

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 55: دین‌را رکنی وملك‌را حصنی بود.

[2] *Texts*, p. 88.

[3] From this it may be inferred that Muḥammad's army did not meet the Ghūrs at Qarā-Sū (Juwaynī is quite silent on this battle). It is possible that the division defeated near Qarā-Sū was dispatched by the queen, and that the measures for flooding the country were taken by her. According to Jūzjānī, Sultan Muḥammad "fell back discomfited" before his enemies, and "retired on Khwārazm" (which is refuted by 'Awfī); the hostilities on the Qarā-Sū were carried out by the "people of Khwārazm" when Shihāb ad-Dīn was already at the gates of the capital. Ibn al-Athīr speaks of the engagement at Sū-Qarā as of a great battle between the two armies.

[4] A very different account of the prowess of the inhabitants of Gurgānj is given by Zakarīyā Qazwīnī, *s. v.* الجرجانية (ii, 349). According to this account all the inhabitants of Gurgānj, even the artisans, were soldiers. Once Sultan Muḥammad was defeated by the Khiṭāys, and fled to Gurgānj with only a few followers; he entered the town by night, in order that no one should notice the small number of his forces, and on the next morning was able to go out of the town against his enemies with an army of 30,000 horsemen. The account (of course greatly exaggerated) can refer only to the war with Shihāb ad-Dīn; the Khiṭāys are mentioned by mistake.

[5] ii, 55: بر جانب شرقی شط; perhaps not the main river bed but the channel flowing near Gurgānj is intended.

rounded the Ghūr army near Andkhūd. In the last days of September or at the beginning of October[1], a two weeks' battle took place here, terminating in the defeat of the Ghūrs, after which Shihāb ad-Dīn was compelled to shut himself up in Andkhūd. His position resembled that of Napoleon at Sedan: if he was not overtaken by the same fate he had to thank 'Othmān of Samarqand, who as a Muslim did not wish the "Sultan of Islām" to be captured by infidels, and therefore proposed his mediation, which was accepted. The Qarā-Khiṭāys allowed the Ghūrs to return to their territory, and only took ransoms from them. Shihāb ad-Din at the time of his defeat killed with his own hand four elephants which he could not take into the fortress; two others were seized by the enemy, and he had now to give the Qarā-Khiṭāys one more; Juwaynī says he even gave all he had[2].

Shihāb ad-Dīn returned to Ghazna, where there had already been time for rumours of his death to spread and cause some tumults. After restoring | order he concluded peace and an 377
alliance with Muḥammad, who apparently remained in possession of all the towns of Khurāsān except Herāt, which in the year of Shihāb ad-Dīn's death was the only city of Khurāsān in the possession of the Ghūrids. In the spring of 1205 the governor of Balkh, Tāj ad-Dīn Zangī[3], made a sudden attack on the territories of the Khwārazm-shāh, but did so without the consent of his sultan, who gave him no support. The Ghūrs plundered Marwarrūd, but were defeated at Sarakhs; Zangī and ten military leaders with him were taken prisoner, sent to Khorezmia, and executed[4]. At this period Shihāb ad-Dīn was thinking only how he might take vengeance on the Qarā-Khiṭāys; at the same time upon him as "Sultan of Islām" lay the obligation of liberating Transoxania from the infidel yoke. Vainly did the Caliph Nāṣir in letters, subsequently found in Ghazna after the occupation of the town by the Khorezmians, entreat the sultan to finish with the Khwārazm-shāh first, and even to conclude an alliance with the Qarā-Khiṭāys for this purpose[5], suggesting, that is, the very plan of action which in the following year was realized by Muḥammad. The Ghūrid sultan was evidently

[1] According to Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 122) at the beginning of Ṣafar 601 (beginning Sept. 28, 1204).

[2] ii, 57: تمامت آنچه داشت; cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p 48. The Sultan's defeat is mentioned very briefly by Marwarrūdī, who speaks of his return to Barshūr (Peshawar) from Khwārazm and Andkhūy in 601 "after suffering some damage" (f. 16 b: پس از چشم زخمی; Sir E D. Ross's translation in *'Ajab-nāmah*, p. 399, "after receiving a wound in his eye," is too literal).

[3] A Ghūrid, son of Fakhr ad-Dīn Mas'ūd; cf. *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 425.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 58. According to Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 135) the prisoners were executed at Merv, and their heads hung there some days.

[5] Juwaynī, ii, 120.

inferior to his rival in political discernment. In the summer of the same year, 1205, 'Imād ad-Dīn 'Omar, governor of Balkh (evidently Zangī's successor), by order of his sultan made an assault on and captured Tirmidh, which belonged to the Qarā Khiṭāys, and was considered one of the strongest fortresses. 'Imād ad-Dīn's famous son[1] Bahrām-shāh[2] was appointed governor of Tirmidh. Further operations against the Qarā-Khiṭāys had to be postponed owing to risings in India; but Juwaynī says that Shihāb ad-Dīn's Indian campaign was evoked by the desire to put "the affairs of the treasury and the army" in order before the war with the Qarā-Khiṭāys. In the spring of 1206 Shihāb ad-Dīn returned to Ghazna and definitely began to prepare for the campaign in Transoxania. The ruler of
378 Bāmiyān, Bahā ad-Dīn[4], received orders | to see to the construction of a bridge over the Amu-Darya[5], and a castle was built on the bank of the Jayḥūn, half of it being actually in the river[6]. During these preparations, on March 13, 1206, the sultan perished unexpectedly at the hands of assassins, according to some accounts Hindus, according to others Ismailites[7].

Shihāb ad-Dīn was the last of the Muslim rulers who could compete with the Khwārazm-shāh. The new head of the dynasty, Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Maḥmūd, son of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Muḥammad, did not possess the qualities of a ruler; the leaders of Shihāb ad-Dīn's numerous Turkish Guards rose in revolt and seized Ghazna and the Indian possessions of the Ghūrids. The Khwārazm-shāh by agreement with the ruler of Herāt entered his territory with his army under the pretext that otherwise the Qarā-Khiṭāys would seize Balkh and its province[8]. 'Imād ad-Dīn 'Omar held out against the Khorezmian army for forty days, but was forced in the end to surrender (in the last days of November), and was sent to Khorezmia. Tirmidh was taken by Muḥammad in alliance with the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and given back to the latter, to the great dissatisfaction of the Muslims[9]. According to Juwaynī's account, the ruler of Tirmidh, on the advice of his father 'Imād ad-Dīn, himself surrendered the fortress

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 135.

[2] Named in Nasawī (texte, p. 39, trad., p. 66).

[3] Juwaynī, ii, 58: امور خزاین وجنود.

[4] His territories, according to Jūzjānī, extended on the east to Kashmīr, on the west to Balkh and Tirmidh, on the north to the frontiers of Kāshghar, on the south to Gharjistān and Ghūr (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 431). He was a grandson of Fakhr ad-Dīn Mas'ūd

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 138.

[6] Juwaynī, ii, 59: بر شط جیحون بارگاه بر آوردند چنانکه بك نیمه از بارگاه در آب بود

[7] Both are mentioned in Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 139–40): according to Juwaynī (ii, 59) the assassins were Hindus, but they are called Ismailites (ملاحدة) by a contemporary of the event, Ṣadr ad-Dīn Nizāmī, the author of a work Tāj al-Ma'āthir (MS. Petr Univ., no. 578, f. 204 b), as also by Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 485).

[8] Juwaynī, ii, 62.

[9] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 151–3.

to 'Othmān of Samarqand[1]. In December[2] Muḥammad made a triumphal entry into Herāt; Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Maḥmūd remained ruler of Ghūr, but here too he was compelled to own himself the vassal of the Khwārazm-shāh and read the khuṭba and | coin money in Muḥammad's name. In January 1207[3] the 379
Khwārazm-shāh returned to his capital, having at last attained the goal set by his predecessors in the dynasty.

Thus in his struggle with his last Muslim rivals Muḥammad enjoyed the assistance of the Qarā-Khiṭāys; but now, having attained his aim, *i.e.* pre-eminence among the eastern Muslim rulers, the Khwārazm-shāh could not of course remain the vassal of the infidel Qarā-Khiṭāys, and for the maintenance of his authority was obliged, like Shihāb ad-Dīn, to assume the role of liberator of the Muslims. Circumstances were favourable to him, as just at that time there occurred one of the most extensive movements in Muslim history, embracing Eastern Turkestan, Semiryechye, the country of Kulja and Transoxania.

We know nothing of the events which took place in Transoxania at the end of the twelfth century. Only from the data supplied by coins do we know that not only Samarqand, but at least at the beginning of the century Bukhārā also, was ruled by the Khān Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn, who assumed the title of "Great Sultan of sultans;" of the historians, so far as is known, 'Awfī[4] alone mentions him, without communicating any details. He was evidently the immediate successor of Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd, but in what relationship he stood to his predecessor we do not know. Coins with his name were struck first of all at Ūzgand as early as 560/1165, *i.e.* while Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān was still reigning; in Samarqand his coinage begins from 574/1178–9 and extends to 595–1199, and besides this there is a coin of Ibrāhīm's minted at Bukhārā in 597/1200–1[5]. Ibrāhīm was succeeded by his son[6] 'Othmān, who was already ruling, as we have seen, in 1204; Juwaynī[7] says that he also was called "Sultan of sultans." 'Othmān's authority evidently did not extend to Bukhārā. We have seen that already in the first half of the twelfth century a dynasty of hereditary khaṭībs and ra'īses, bearing the title of "Pillar of the world" (Ṣadr-Jahān), had arisen in Bukhārā, | but our information on the genealogy of the 380
ṣadrs is unfortunately somewhat contradictory. Their influence

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 64. In Mīrkhwānd (*Khārezm*, pp. 51–2) the Khwārazm-shāh is mentioned instead of 'Othmān.

[2] In the middle of Jumādā I (according to Juwaynī (*ibid.*)).

[3] In Jumādā II (Juwaynī, ii, 65–6).

[4] *Texts*, p. 84.

[5] A. Markov, *Katalog*, pp. 282–9. We know from 'Awfī's *Lubāb al-Albāb* (i, 44) that he was alive in Rajab 597 (April 7–May 6, 1201), when 'Awfī came to Bukhārā.

[6] Thus according to 'Awfī and the coinage (*Kat.*, p. 294). According to the *Lubāb* (*loc. cit.*) he was 14 or 15 years old in 597/1201.

[7] Juwaynī, ii, 122: اورا در ما ورا النهر سلطان سلاطین کفتندی.

in temporal matters must indubitably have led to disputes between them and the Khāns of Samarqand, and there must also have been collisions with the popular elements and with the Qarā-Khiṭāys. This explains the epithet of "martyr"[1] (shahīd) bestowed on all the ṣadrs beginning with 'Omar, the ṣadr put to death by the Qarā-Khiṭāys (see pp. 326–7). After killing 'Omar, however, the Qarā-Khiṭāys acknowledged the religious authority of his successor, who according to Nizāmī-'Arūḍī[2] was the imām Aḥmad b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz (the brother of the murdered man?); the Qarā-Khiṭāy viceroy Alp-tagīn (or Atmā-tagīn, see p. 327), if Nizāmī-'Arūḍī is to be believed, was compelled to conform in everything to the instructions of the imām. In his account of the destruction of the Qarluqs, Ibn al-Athīr, as we have seen (p. 334), calls the faqīh Muḥammad, son of the murdered 'Omar, ra'īs of Bukhārā, and makes him act in alliance with the Khān of Samarqand and praise the moderation of the Qarā-Khiṭāys. In 560/1165, as is evident from the account in Narshakhi[3], the ascendency in Bukhārā was held by Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd, who in this year restored the city walls. The author of the abridged edition of Narshakhī's history, Muḥammad b. Ẓufar, in 574/1178–9 dedicated his work to the ṣadr Burhān ad-Dīn 'Abd-al-'Azīz[4], who is, in all probability, the person spoken of in the above-mentioned document of the Khwārazm-shāh Takash (see above, p. 342)[5]. During the long reign of the Khān Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn the authority of the Khāns of Samarqand was restored in Bukhārā[6]; but after him we again find the ṣadr in the role of ruler. In 1207, according to Ibn al-Athīr's[7] account, the ra'īs of the Ḥanafites of Bukhārā, Burhān ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz, probably the son of the imām Aḥmad b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz mentioned in Nizāmī 'Arūḍī, arrived in Baghdād to perform the ḥajj; he was the real "ruler" of the town, collected the tribute for the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and ruled in their name. In Baghdād he was at first received
381 with great honour, but by his | behaviour in Mecca he roused such general ill-will that his surname of "Pillar of the world" (Ṣadr-Jahān) was changed to "Pillar of Hell" (Ṣadr-Jahannam). To this pilgrimage probably refers the anecdote recounted in 'Awfī[8], of the conversation of the ṣadr of Bukhārā with a darwīsh near the mountain of 'Araiāt. The ṣadr performed the ḥajj with the

[1] *Texts*, p. 169 (Kitāb-i Mullāzādah); cf. now my article "Burhān" in *Encyc. of Islām*.

[2] *Chahār Maqāla*, p. 22 sq; new trans., p. 24 sq.

[3] Nerchakhy, pp. 23, 33–4.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 2–3.

[5] He is mentioned in the *Lubāb* (i. 211) as 'Abd-al-'Azīz b. 'Omar. Schefer's edition has 'Abd-al-'Azīz b 'Abd-al-'Azīz, but between the two names "b. 'Omar" is omitted by mistake (the Bukhara edition has the correct reading).

[6] Verses in his praise composed by the ṣadr 'Omar b. Mas'ūd (grandson of Aḥmad b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz) are quoted by 'Awfī, *Lubāb*, i, 169 sq.

[7] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 170–71.

[8] *Texts*, p. 88.

greatest pomp, sitting in a litter; he had more than a hundred camels with his baggage, and "great 'ulamā" went with him. A poor man met him, hungry, in rags and barefoot, and asked if it were possible that God should bestow the same reward on the hajj of the poor man, undertaken with such difficulty, as on the ḥajj of the ṣadr, undertaken with such pomp. The ṣadr answered that the reward would certainly not be identical; "I fulfil the command of God, but thou art acting in defiance of it. To me He hath said: 'If thou art able, perform the ḥajj'; to thee He hath said: 'Destroy not yourselves with your own hands.' He hath therefore invited me, and exempted thee from the visit. I am a guest, thou art a parasite; a parasite never enjoys as much honour as a guest." The stories of 'Awfi and Ibn al-Athīr show that the ṣadr by no means led the life of a hermit, and possessed vast financial means. This is confirmed by Nasawī's account[1] of the same ṣadr, who held the office of khaṭīb together with that of ra'īs, but for wealth could be compared only with ruling princes; 6,000 faqīhs were maintained at his expense. The democratic movement which broke out in Bukhārā not long before the Khwārazm-shāh's campaign was directed against the ṣadrs also; the leader of the movement, Sinjar, the son of a seller of shields, made himself master of the town, and held "honourable persons" in utter contempt[2]. We are told by 'Awfī[3] that after the death of 'Abd-al-'Azīz, the ṣadrs went to the court (ordū) of the Qarā-Khiṭāy and complained of Malik Sinjar. They obtained the necessary documents duly sealed, but they were of no use to them, as at this juncture the power of the Qarā-Khiṭāy vanished; their villages were left waterless, and their wealth was destroyed.

We find in Juwaynī two versions of the course of the struggle between Muḥammad and the Qarā-Khiṭāys. According to one version[4] (the chapters "On the conquest of Transoxania" and "On the second return of the Sultan for the war with the Gūrkhān") the sultan paid tribute to the Qarā-Khiṭāys for a long time, but finally in 607/1210 ordered the Qarā-Khiṭāy envoy[5] to be thrown into the river. | The envoy had come to 382
Gurgānj for the tribute, and had offended the sultan by sitting beside him on the throne. After this the sultan occupied Bukhārā, and thence advanced on Samarqand, having previously dispatched envoys to the Sultan 'Othmān. Some time before this the latter had requested the daughter of the Qarā-Khiṭāy

[1] Nesawi, texte, pp. 23–4, trad., p. 41.
[2] Juwaynī, ii, 74; cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 54.
[3] *Lubāb*, ii, 385. The author quotes verses of Shamsī A'raj Bukhārī composed in derision of the ṣadrs.
[4] Juwaynī, ii, 74–84; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 54–60.
[5] His name in MS. iv, 2, 34, is نوشی; in the Khanykov MS. نولشی; the printed edition (ii, 75) has نوسی.

gūrkhān[1] in marriage, and been refused; angered at this, he now concluded an alliance with Muḥammad, and introduced the khuṭba and the coinage of money in his name. The sultan ordered Samarqand to be fortified, and appointed the amīr Burtana, a relation of Turkān-Khātūn[2], as his representative at the court of 'Othmān. He then continued his advance, crossed the Syr-Darya, and in the month of Rabī' I, 607[3] (end of August and September) met the Qarā-Khiṭāy army under the command of Ṭāyankū in the plain of Īlāmish[4]. The latter were defeated, and Ṭāyankū himself was taken prisoner and dispatched to Khorezmia. On the return journey the sultan took Utrār, the ruler of which made some resistance[5], returned to Samarqand, and thence to Khorezmia. Ṭāyankū was put to death by his order and thrown into the river. During the sultan's absence "the remnants of the people of Qādir-Khān"[6] laid waste the neighbourhood of Jand; in consequence of this Muḥammad did not stay long in Khorezmia, and set out with an army for Jand. 'Othmān, who had come to Gurgānj along with Muḥammad, remained there for the celebration of his marriage with the daughter of the Khwārazm-shah. After gaining a victory over the Qipchāqs, Muḥammad learned that the Qarā-Khiṭāy army had again besieged Samarqand and hastened thither. At the time of his arrival the inhabitants of Samarqand had already borne seventy attacks from the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and in all cases save one, when they were driven back into their town, they remained the victors. The news of the arrival of the sultan's army and of the rising of Kūchluk, who belonged to the Nāimān tribe, in the eastern part of their kingdom, induced the Qarā-Khiṭāys to conclude an armistice with the inhabitants of Samarqand and to withdraw. Muḥammad on reaching Samarqand pursued them. The governor of the town of Ughnāq (?)[7] |
383 although he also was a Muslim, refused to submit to the Khwārazm-shāh; a division was sent to take the town, and successfully carried out its task, and the rebellious ruler was taken in chains to the sultan[8]. Immediately after this ambassadors from Kūchluk arrived in Muḥammad's camp, and a treaty was concluded between Kūchluk and the Khwārazm-shāh on the conditions that Turkestan should become the property of the first one to defeat the gūrkhān; if the sultan succeeded in this

[1] Mīrkhwānd omits this detail here.
[2] Mīrkhwānd does not mention Burtana's appointment here. The printed edition of Juwaynī (II, 76) has ترتبه.
[3] Mīrkhwānd (p. 55) refers this event to 606.
[4] Battlefield not mentioned in Mīrkhwānd.
[5] Juwaynī, ii, 80.
[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 82: جماعتی از بقایای اصحاب قادر خان.
[7] Perhaps the same as the Yūghank mentioned above, p. 133.
[8] Juwaynī, ii, 83.

all the provinces as far as Kāshghar and Khotan would belong to him; if Kūchluk was successful he would be accepted as ruler of all the country east of the Syr-Darya. It was Kūchluk who actually did succeed in accomplishing this object, while the sultan was unsuccessful in his battle with the gūrkhān's army. Before the battle Burtana, the representative of the Khwārazm-shāh in Samarqand, and one of the princes of Māzandarān, the ispahbad of the province of Kabūdjāmah, entered into negotiations with the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and undertook to betray the Khwārazm-shāh if the gūrkhān promised to give Khorezmia to Burtana and Khurāsān to the ispahbad. The gūrkhān promised to give them an even more liberal reward. At the beginning of the battle Burtana and the ispahbad fled according to their agreement; the left wing of the Qarā-Khiṭāys overcame the Muslim right wing and the left wing of the Muslims the right of the Qarā-Khitāys; the centre of both armies fell into disorder. The battle ended indecisively; in both armies there were victors who had plundered the enemy's camp, and refugees who had sought safety in flight. The sultan was in the habit of wearing clothes like the enemy's during a battle; in the confusion he suddenly found himself with his followers (wearing similar clothes) amongst the ranks of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, where he passed several days, and later made use of an opportunity to abandon the enemy unnoticed and join his army on the bank of the Syr-Darya. The soldiers were very pleased at his return, as there had been sufficient time for a rumour of the disappearance and even of the death of the sultan to gain ground.

The same events are quite differently related in the chapter "On the Qarā-Khiṭāy Khāns, on the circumstances of their rise and destruction."[1] | The sultan, elated by his victories, neglected 384
the payment of the stipulated tribute to the Qarā-Khiṭāys for two or three years, until at last the gūrkhān sent his wazīr Mahmūd-bāy to him as his envoy to demand the payment of the money. Muḥammad was at this time preparing to march against the Qipchāqs and therefore considered the moment inopportune for a quarrel with the Qarā-Khiṭāys, but at the same time he did not wish the disgrace of admitting himself to be a tributary of the infidels. For this reason he entirely evaded receiving the embassy, set out on his campaign and confided the conduct of the negotiations with the Qarā-Khiṭāys to his mother. Turkān-Khātūn received the embassy with ceremony, paid the money in full and on her side dispatched envoys to the Qarā-Khiṭāys with instructions to make excuses to the gūrkhān for

[1] Juwaynī, II, 86–93. In an abbreviated form this chapter is included by Mīrkhwānd in the history of Chingiz-Khān (Mirkhond *Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, ed. Jaubert, Paris, 1841, pp. 90–95).

the delay which had occurred, and express to him (in Muḥammad's name) complete submission [1].

Nevertheless, Maḥmūd-bāy reported to his sovereign that the Khwārazm-shāh prided himself on his power, and was no loyal vassal; on this account the Khorezmian envoys were not honoured by the gūrkhān with any marks of consideration. Having defeated the Qipchāqs, Muḥammad returned to Khorezmia, and determined to conquer Transoxania. He led his army to Bukhārā and entered secretly into relations both with 'Othmān of Samarqand and with other rulers. All the princes promised him assistance, as they were angered at the behaviour of the Qarā-Khiṭāy officials, who "in contrast to former days [2]" oppressed the population in all possible ways. The sultan, however, returned from Bukhārā to Khorezmia with the intention of renewing the campaign in the following year [3]. At this time the eastern vassals of the gūrkhān also rose in revolt, and the Nāimān prince Kūchluk, taking advantage of this, received permission from the gūrkhān to collect the scattered hordes of his nation. As the traitorous intentions of Kūchluk were soon unmasked, the gūrkhān regretted that he had let him go, and demanded the assistance of his vassals, 'Othmān of Samarqand amongst others, in making war against him. 'Othmān was offended that the gūrkhān had refused to give him his daughter in marriage, and therefore refused his suzerain's request, openly
385 took the side of the Khwārazm-shāh, dispatched | an envoy to him and introduced the khuṭba and coinage in his name. The gūrkhān sent a division of 30,000 men to Samarqand who succeeded in taking the town, but refrained from laying waste the province by order of their sovereign, "who considered Samarqand as his treasury." The tidings of Kūchluk's successes caused the gūrkhān to recall his army from Samarqand, whereupon the town was occupied by Muḥammad; 'Othmān went out to meet him, handed over the province to him and joined his army. The allies marched to Ṭarāz and encountered a strong Qarā-Khiṭāy army under the command of Ṭāyankū. The battle was indecisive, the right wing on either side being defeated, but Ṭāyankū was taken prisoner by the Muslims. Both armies retreated [4], and the Qarā-Khiṭāys plundered their own territories as they marched back. The inhabitants of Balāsāghūn, hoping that Semiryechye also would soon be conquered by Muḥammad, closed their gates to them. Maḥmūd-bāy and the gūrkhān's amīrs pressed them to submit, but without success; finally, after a sixteen days' siege, the town was taken and sacked for three

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 90.

[2] *Ibid.*: بر خلاف ایّام ماضیه.

[3] *Ibid.*: وسلطان بر قرار آنکه در سال آینده بر قصد او باز آید از بخارا باز گشت.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 91–2.

days, when up to 47,000 inhabitants perished. All these military operations exhausted the resources of the gūrkhān. Maḥmūd-bāy, fearing for his own wealth, "of which he possessed more than Qārūn" (Korah)[1], gave his sovereign the ruinous advice, to demand from the soldiers the return of the moneys from the State treasury which had been plundered by Kūchluk and on his defeat taken by the army. The adoption of this measure led to a mutiny, of which Kūchluk hastened to take advantage in order to attract the mutineers to his cause. Abandoned by all, the gūrkhān appeared before Kūchluk and wished to do obeisance, but Kūchluk would not permit this and received his sovereign with honour and treated him as though he were his father. All the power, of course, passed into the hands of Kūchluk, who married the former bride of the gūrkhān; the latter died a year or two later.

Mīrkhwānd gave his preference to the first version and excluded from the second all that disagreed with it (the payment of tribute to the Qarā-Khiṭāys by the queen's arrangement, the sultan's withdrawal from Bukhārā, the capture of Samarqand by the Qarā-Khiṭāys, the taking prisoner of Ṭāyankū and some other less essential details). With the same object in view he had also to alter Juwaynī's text in some places. According to the latter[2] | the revolts of the ruler of Herāt, 'Izz ad-Dīn Ḥusayn 386
b. Kharmīl, and of the Turk Kazlī, a relative of the queen, governor of Nīshāpūr, were caused by the rumours of the disappearance of the sultan during the war with the Qarā-Khiṭāys. The revolt was put down after the sultan's return to Khorezmia and his arrival in Nīshāpūr on the 11th Ramaḍān 604 (March 30, 1208). Mīrkhwānd[3], in opposition to Juwaynī, inserts the account of this revolt after his account of both the sultan's campaigns against the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and omits the date inconsistent with it. Our information from other sources however speaks in favour of this date. Ibn al-Athīr[4] also puts Muḥammad's first campaign against the Qarā-Khiṭāys in 604 and also relates that it ended unsuccessfully for the sultan; and according to the continuator of Narshakhī[5] the capture of Bukhārā by the sultan occurred in 604. In consequence of this, and notwithstanding the opinion of one of the latest investigators[6], there is no reason to be surprised that d'Ohsson[7] preferred Ibn al-Athīr's account to Juwaynī's first version, accepted by Mīrkhwānd. Evidently the second version is nearer the truth, although it also contains some statements which evoke grave doubt.

[1] Qur'ān, xxviii, 76.
[2] Juwaynī, ii, 66–70.
[3] Mirkhond, *Khaṛezm*, pp. 60–64.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 171–5.
[5] Nerchakhy, pp. 23, 34 (in the second passage the text is mutilated).
[6] Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes*, p. 156.
[7] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 181–2.

First of all, it is scarcely possible that the sultan paid no tribute to the Qarā-Khiṭāys for some years before the war. Until his final victory over the Ghūrdis the sultan could not but value the favour of the gūrkhān, as is indicated by the fact noted above (p. 352) of the restoration of Tirmidh to the Qarā-Khiṭāys at the very end of 1206. The expedition to Bukhārā must be put in the autumn of 1207. According to Juwaynī's account (in the first version) the sultan took the side of the aristocratic party at Bukhārā: "the son of the vendor of shields received the reward of his conduct." This statement must not be taken to mean that Sinjar was executed; from Nasawī's[1] account it is evident that he continued to live for many years at the sultan's court, and like other imprisoned rulers was compelled
387 to | take part in Court ceremonies[2]. How long Sinjar's government of Bukhārā lasted is not known; if his rise to kingship has any connexion with the pilgrimage of the ṣadr already mentioned (p. 354) it may be conjectured that he reigned for some months, but the existence of the "palace of Sinjar-Malik" points to a longer period. As the palace is still mentioned in the account of Tārābī's revolt[3] (636/1238–9), it evidently remained intact during the devastation and fire of 1220.

We know from the continuator of Narshakhī that the sultan restored the citadel and walls of Bukhārā. On this occasion Muḥammad's successes were limited to the capture of Bukhārā and the conclusion of an alliance with the Qarā-Khānids, particularly with the sultan 'Othmān; from Bukhārā he returned to Khorezmia. The rumours of the sultan's disappearance, which called out the rebellion in Khurāsān, show that this withdrawal was not voluntary, and confirm Ibn al-Athīr's account of the defeat of the Khwārazm-shāh and his ally of Samarqand in the battle with the Qarā-Khiṭāys. On the other hand the anecdote recounted by the same historian of how Muḥammad was taken prisoner along with his companion, and escaped, thanks to the cleverness of the latter, who passed the sultan off as his slave, is scarcely worthy of credence. As is well known, the same anecdote is related of Malik-shāh and Nizām al-Mulk[4].

However this may have been, Muḥammad returned to Khorezmia and in the spring of 1208 restored order in Khurāsān by appearing in person. According to Ibn al-Athīr[5] the revolt in Herāt was caused by the behaviour of the Khorezmians. When rumours of the sultan's disappearance were spread abroad the ruler of Herāt renewed the alliance with the Ghūrid Ghiyāth ad-

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 21, trad., p. 38.

[2] We are told by 'Awfī (*Lubāb*, ii, 393) that Sinjar was sent to Āmūy (Charjui): 'Awfī quotes some satirical verses on him by Shihābī Ghazāl Khujandī.

[3] Schefer, *Chresth. pers.*, ii, 128; *Journ As*, 4, xx, 393; Juwaynī, i, 87, 5.

[4] *Journ. As.*, 4, xi, 448, 449; *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīdah*, ed. Browne, p. 445, trans, p. 97.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 172.

Dīn[1], but after the arrival of the Khwārazm-shāh he again took his side. The Khwārazm-shāh's advisers persuaded their sovereign that a man who had so frequently betrayed his oath was not to be trusted, and the ruler of Herāt was put to death; but the city itself, in which the wazīr of the former ruler had fortified himself, was taken only after a prolonged siege. As regards the rising of Kazlī (in Ibn al-Athīr[2] Kazlik), the | governor of 388
Nīshāpūr, after the sultan's entry into Nīshāpūr (March 30, 1208), Kazlī's son fled to Transoxania to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, but was overtaken on the bank of the Amu-Darya by a Khorezmian force and killed, together with all his companions. Kazlī himself fled to Khorezmia, where the queen Turkān-Khātūn advised him to seek refuge at the tomb of Sultan Takash[3], but later, when he had followed this advice, she ordered him to be killed and sent his head to her son[4]. From this it may be inferred that at this time the queen did not dare to give assistance to her rebellious relative.

Of the events of the following years we have information only on the earthquake which afflicted Khorezmia in 605/1208–9. The extent of the disaster was somewhat lessened by the fact that it occurred in the daytime and the inhabitants were able to fly from the town, leaving their possessions. Nevertheless, about 2,000 people perished in the capital, and the number of those who perished in the villages was considerably greater; two villages were swallowed up with all their inhabitants[5].

The autumn of 1209 should probably be put down for Maḥmūd-bāy's embassy and the expedition against the Qipchāqs, if the sultan had really paid no tribute to the Qarā-Khiṭāys for two years before this. The sultan's action shows that the renewal of the struggle with the Qarā-Khiṭāys seemed to him at that time to be premature; but already in the following year he found it possible to take more decisive action. The eastern provinces of the Qarā-Khiṭāy empire had at this period been exposed to an invasion of nomads expelled from Mongolia by Chingiz-Khān. In 1208 Chingiz-Khān inflicted a severe defeat on the bank of the Irtysh on the remnants of the Nāimāns, under the leadership of Kūchluk, and the Mergīts, led by Tūqtā-bīkī[6]. Kūchluk fled to the Qarā-Khiṭāy country, the sons of Tūqtā-

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 66; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 63. In Ibn al-Athīr the death of the ruler of Herāt is related somewhat differently, nor is there mention of his temporary adherence to Ghiyāth ad-Dīn.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 172 sq.

[3] According to Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 103) Takash himself constructed his grave in the great madrasah, also built by him.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 72.

[5] *Ibid*, 72–3 The towns of Khurāsān, especially Nīshāpūr, also suffered from the earthquake (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 187).

[6] *Trudy*, xv, 10, 113; Pers. text, pp. 14, 168.

bīkī, who had himself fallen in battle, to the territories of the Uighūr īdīqut, a vassal of the gūrkhān. Connected with this, probably, is the revolt of the īdīqut against the gūrkhān and his
389 conclusion of an alliance with Chingiz Khān. In 1209 Shāwkam, the gūrkhān's representative in Uighuria, who lived in the village of Qarā-Khoja, was killed; Juwaynī says[1] "he was surrounded in a house, which they pulled down on top of him," from which it may be concluded that elements of the populace, provoked by the extortions of the Qurā-Khiṭāy tax-collectors, took part in the rising. The īdīqut succeeded in defeating the Mergīts[2], the remnants of whom fled to the territories under the direct rule of the gūrkhān[3], where, according to Juwaynī[4], they united with Kūchluk. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the provinces with a preponderatingly Muslim population[5] began to the west of Uighuria. The appearance of bands of nomads in these provinces could only intensify the ferment which had begun there considerably earlier. As we have said elsewhere[6] this ferment was induced not only by religious causes, but mainly by the decline of the Qarā-Khiṭāy empire, the weakening of the authority of the throne, the increase in power of individual nobles, and the arbitrariness of the tax collectors. The movement began apparently in Eastern Turkestan. As is shown by Juwaynī's characteristic account[7] of the behaviour of the gūrkhān towards the ruler of the Qarluqs, the gūrkhān foresaw even then that the rising would embrace all the Muslim provinces of the

[1] Juwaynī, i, 32: شاوکم‌را در حادثهٔ بسجیدند وخانه برو انباشتند.

[2] The battle took place at the river Ch'am. De Groot's opinion (accepted by Marquart, *Osttürk-Dialektst.*, p. 118) that the Ch'am is to be identified with the Chu, is quite erroneous. It is more probable that it was the river from which the town Jambalik or Janbalik in the western part of Uighuria had received its name. On this town cf. *Mediaeval Researches*, index. According to Bretschneider (*ibid.*) the river was near the Irtysh.

[3] *Trudy*, xv, 11; Pers. text, p. 17.

[4] Juwaynī, i, 47. From some remarks in Juwaynī (i, 46 sq.) and the corresponding passage in Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 11, 34–5: Pers text, pp. 17, 55) it might be inferred that Kūchluk took part in the expedition to Uighuria, and thence fled westwards through Kucha along with the Mergīts, but on the same page Juwaynī himself says that the Mergīt princes joined Kūchluk in the district of Īmīl and Qobuq (the printed edition has قبالغ Qayālīgh) when Kūchluk had already the gūrkhān's permission to collect an army. Juwaynī's statements show that he confused Kūchluk with the Kerait prince Sengūn, who also had fled to Eastern Turkestan (cf *Trudy*, xiii, 148; Pers. text, p. 237). This Kerait prince is chiefly known by the Chinese title of Sengūn, and I have stated in a review (*Zapiski*, xi, 350) that his personal name is entirely unknown. It is, however, mentioned by Naṣīr ad-Dīn Ṭūsī in his *Zīj-i Īlkhānī* (MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 7464, f. 1 b) as Īlāqā, and in the Yüan-shi (chap. 1, f. 5 v) as Yi-la-ha (P. Pelliot in *Journ. As.*, ii, xv, 176 and 180, where Nilkha is supposed to be the correct form, which, however, is not corroborated by the Persian spelling). Rashīd ad-Dīn has Īlqah (*Trudy*, v, 98; vii, 125 (text), xiii, 115 and 282; Pers. text, p. 186 sq.).

[5] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 303; Bretschneider, *Med. Res.*, i, 68.

[6] *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, p. 106 sq.

[7] Juwaynī, i, 56; compare *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, pp. 107–8.

Qarā-Khiṭāys. Until the nomad hordes appeared the Muslims had no success. "The son of the Khān of Kāshghar" was imprisoned by the gūrkhān and only liberated by Kūchluk[1]; from this statement it may be concluded that the rising occurred during the reign of this Khān, Arslān-Khān Abu'l-Muẓaffar Yūsuf, who died, according to Jamāl Qarshī[2], in Rajab 601 (February- | March, 1205). In Transoxania also, as is shown by 390
the defeat of Muḥammad and the capture of Samarqand by the Qarā-Khiṭāys, the rising was at first crushed. The gūrkhān used the fruits of his victories over 'Othmān (won in all probability in the first half of 1210), with great moderation, contented himself with the payment of a small tribute, and left his representative in Samarqand. It is very likely that the marriage between 'Othmān and the Qarā-Khiṭāy princess whom he had vainly demanded earlier was concluded at the same time. Juwaynī[3] refers this marriage to the period of the second reconciliation between 'Othmān and the Qarā-Khiṭāys and his revolt against Muḥammad, but the historian's statement that Muḥammad on receiving the news of this reconciliation and marriage hesitated to move against his unsubmissive son-in-law is scarcely to be believed.

The successes gained by Kūchluk in 1210 with the help of the Qarluqs of the northern part of Semiryechye and his plundering of the gūrkhān's treasury, which was kept at Ūzgand, caused the gūrkhān to abandon Samarqand and devote himself to the defence of his own territories. In consequence of this the revolt in Transoxania was renewed; Muḥammad after his victory over the Qipchāqs left Jand[4] and arrived in Bukhārā, and 'Othmān again took his side. To this campaign belongs, in all probability, the account of the siege and surrender of Ughnāq. In Semiryechye, not far from Balāsāghūn, the gūrkhān gained a victory over Kūchluk, but his general Ṭāyankū was taken prisoner near the Talas by the Muslims. As the victory of the latter was not decisive the sultan did not decide to pursue the enemy and give assistance to his co-religionists of Semiryechye; nevertheless, this battle and the dispatch of the captured Qarā-Khiṭāy general to Khorezmia excited the enthusiasm of Muḥammad's subjects, and considerably increased their respect for the sovereign. In Muhammad's official documents he begins to be spoken of as "a second Alexander" and the Khwārazm-shāh more willingly allowed himself to be called "Sultan Sinjar"[5] in view of the

[1] Juwaynī, i, 48; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 170.
[2] *Texts*, p. 132. [3] Juwaynī, ii, 124.
[4] Nasawī's account of the Sultan's stay in Jand, and of the complaints brought by the population against the local wazīr, should very probably be referred to this time (Nesawi, texte, pp. 102–3, trad., p 170).
[5] Cf. both titles in 'Awfī (*Texts*, p. 84). The title of "Sulṭān Sikandar" and the battles near Ṭarāz are also mentioned in the *Lubāb al-Albāb* (i, 112, in the interesting

lengthy reign of the Saljūqid sultan; from the same period the sultan's seal was engraved with the title "Shadow of God on
391 Earth." | According to Juwayni's account[1] Ṭāyankū was thrown into the Amu-Darya by order of the sultan; but according to Jūzjānī[2], the captured general accepted Islām and continued to live in Khorezmia, where he enjoyed great honour. It is possible that the author confuses the fate of Ṭāyankū with that of two other Qarā-Khiṭāys, Burāq and his brother, also taken prisoner in this battle, who were taken into the Khwārazm-shāh's service and rose to the dignity of amīr and ḥājib[3].

The rejoicings of the Muslims did not last long. The former vassals of the Qarā-Khiṭāys were soon convinced that the transfer of power from the infidel gūrkhān to the orthodox Khwārazm-shāh brought them no advantages. As early as 1210, according to Juwaynī, and even before his return to Khorezmia, Muhammad had been obliged to pacify a revolt by the ruler of Utrār; finally the rebel made submission and was dispatched to Nasā[4]. Nasawī[5] says that the ruler of Utrār Tāj ad-Dīn Bilgā-Khān was the cousin[6] of 'Othmān of Samarqand; Bilgā-Khān was the first of the Qarā-Khiṭāys (*i.e.* of the vassals of the gūrkhān) who took the side of the Khwārazm-shāh, and appeared before him hoping that he would reward him for former services (as he had taken part in the battle near Andkhud). Nasawī says nothing at all of his revolt and calls his exile only a precautionary measure taken by the sultan prior to his campaign in 'Irāq (1217). Bilgā-Khān spent one year at Nasā and during this time attracted the population to his side by his liberality: then the sultan sent his executioner to Nasā, who killed Bilgā-Khān and brought his head to Khorezmia. Nasawī, of course, knew better than the other historians what occurred in his native town of Nasā; but it is scarcely to be supposed that Bilgā-Khān remained ruler of Utrār till 1217 and was not deposed simultaneously with the other representatives of the Qarā-Khānid dynasty.

'Othmān of Samarqand[7] had come with Muhammad to Gurgānj, where he was to marry the Khwārazm-shāh's daughter. The festivities went on for a very long time, and when 'Othmān
392 wished to return | to Samarqand, Turkān-Khātūn demanded that, in accordance with Turkish custom, he should remain a full

biography of the wazīr Abū Bakr Ahmad al-Jāmijī, who had previously made a journey to the country of the Khiṭā and to Balāsāghūn, *ibid*, i, 111). Cf. also *ibid.*, i, 202; ii, 341 (سلطان سكندر).

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 81; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 56–7.
[2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 261–2, 934.
[3] Juwaynī, ii, 211.
[4] *Ibid*, ii. 81; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 57.
[5] Nesawi, text, pp. 22–3; trad. pp. 38–41.
[6] There is a mistake in the translation.
[7] On his fate see the accounts of Juwaynī (ii, 122) and Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 177–8).

year in his father-in-law's house, and he was obliged to acquiesce. When, in the spring of 1211, the campaign against the Qarā-Khiṭāys was resumed, Muhammad arrived alone in Samarqand and soon observed that the absence of the Khān had already succeeded in alarming the population and evoking their hostility towards the Khwārazm-shāh. Submitting to circumstances, Muḥammad ordered 'Othmān and his young wife to be sent to Samarqand; 'Othmān received everything to which he was entitled by his rank; his younger brother was left in Khorezmia. Muhammad returned to his capital. According to Ibn al-Athīr a representative of the Khwārazm-shāh was sent to Samarqand together with 'Othmān, and was to enjoy the same rights as formerly the representative of the gūrkhān.

Juwaynī in this passage makes no mention of military operations this year, so that it is hard to decide whether there is any particle of truth in the account given in the first version of the treachery of Burtana the governor of Samarqand. Jūzjānī[1] alone credits Muḥammad with gaining, with the assistance of an army of 400,000 men (?), another victory over Qarā-Khiṭāys in 1211 or 1212.

On his return to Samarqand, 'Othmān was so exasperated by the behaviour of his Khorezmian liberators that he renewed his connexion with the Qarā-Khitāys. This was the more remarkable in that the year 1211 had not on the whole been favourable for the gūrkhān; in the northern part of Semiryechye a Mongol division appeared, under the command of Qūbilāy-noyon, in consequence of which the prince of this country definitely renounced the suzerainty of the gūrkhān and killed the Qarā-Khiṭāy governor[2]. Nevertheless 'Othmān determined to exchange the yoke of his Muslim liberators for the former yoke of the infidels, and moreover, as the course of events shows, he was acting in complete accord with his subjects. News soon reached Muhammad that 'Othmān was behaving badly to the Khwārazm-shāh's daughter and clearly showing his preference for the Qarā-Khiṭāy princess; Muḥammad's daughter was even obliged to wait on her rival. Finally, in 1212, it became known that the inhabitants of Samarqand had risen in revolt on 'Othmān's order and killed all the Khorezmians residing in the town. | The 393
Khwārazm-shāh's daughter shut herself up in the citadel and 'Othmān with difficulty consented to spare her. Ibn al-Athīr says that the bodies of the Khorezmians were cut in halves and pieces of them hung up in the bazaars, as butchers hang meat; from this may be seen how great was the hatred of the population towards their oppressors. The news of the catastrophe of course

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 262–4, 934.
[2] *Trudy*, v, 132; xv, 14, 113–14; *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 130–31; Juwaynī, i, 57.

caused the sultan to march on Samarqand. According to Ibn al-Athīr Muḥammad at first wished to kill all strangers living in Khorezmia, and afterwards all Samarqandians, but was dissuaded by Turkān-Khātūn. Samarqand was soon forced to surrender. Juwaynī says that 'Othmān appeared before the Khwārazm-shāh with a sword and a piece of cloth (for a shroud) i.e. with a declaration of complete submission. According to Ibn al-Athīr, on the other hand, he shut himself up in the citadel, which was still besieged by the Khorezmians after the town had been plundered; his plea for pardon was refused and after the surrender of the fortress he was brought before the Khwārazm-shāh. The town was given over to a three days' sack, from which the only quarter saved was that inhabited by foreigners. Ibn al-Athīr puts the number of those who perished at 200,000; according to the more probable account of Juwaynī 10,000 men in all were killed, after which Muḥammad listened to the intercession of the sayyids, imāms and 'ulamā and ordered the massacre to cease. The Khwārazm-shāh even wished to spare 'Othmān, but his daughter Khān-sulṭān would not consent to forgive her husband and the Khān was executed on the following night. Muhammad sent envoys to the "Amīrs of Faighāna and Turkistān" with a demand for submission, and a division was dispatched to Isfījāb in order to observe the movements of the Qarā-Khiṭāys and not allow them to recover. Samarqand became practically the capital of the Khwārazm-shāh, who built a new cathedral mosque there and began the construction of a "lofty edifice," probably a palace.

From the statements of Ibn al-Athīr[1] and Jūzjānī[2] it is evident that 'Othmān and his cousin were not the only members of the Qarā-Khānid dynasty killed by Muhammad's order; other members of the dynasty met the same fate. From the numismatic data[3] it appears that the ruler of Ūzgand at this period was Jalāl ad-Dīn Qadir-Khān, who, like 'Othmān's father, bore the title of "Great Sultan" (ulugh sulṭān); in all probability | 394 the same fate overtook him[4]. The dispatch of the division to Isfījāb was due to the news of Kūchluk's rise to power. The latter, having imprisoned the gūrkhān, liberated the son of the Kāshghar Khān, who had been imprisoned by the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and sent him to Kāshghar, where he was killed by rebellious amīrs before even he had time to enter the town[5]. According to Jamāl Qarshī[6], this prince (Arslān-Khān Abu'l-Fatḥ Muḥammad) was killed in 607/1210–11, from which it may be inferred

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 178. [2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 265.
[3] A. Markov, *Katalog*, p. 292–3.
[4] He is perhaps identical with Kuch-tagīn, the husband of 'Othmān's sister, who is mentioned in *Lubāb al-Albāb*, i, 45. The title Kuch-tagīn is also found on coins.
[5] Juwaynī, i, 48; D'Ohsson, i, 170. [6] *Texts*, p, 132–3.

that the imprisonment of the gūrkhān also occurred not later than the first half of 1211. This agrees with Juwaynī's account, which, as we have seen, mentions this event immediately after the account of the withdrawal of the Qarā-Khiṭāy army from the banks of the Talas and their capture of Balāsāghūn. During the life-time of the gūrkhān Kūchluk contented himself with the real power and left to his sovereign all outward marks of imperial dignity; at ceremonial receptions the gūrkhān sat on the throne and Kūchluk stood amongst his ḥājibs[1]. We have no completely reliable information as to whether any negotiations took place between Muḥammad and Kūchluk prior to the imprisonment of the gūrkhān. The fantastic agreement related by Juwaynī (see above p. 356) was certainly never made. There is greater probability in Ibn al-Athīr's account[2], that at the time of the struggle between the gūrkhān and Kūchluk both sides appealed to the Khwārazm-shāh for help, that the latter advanced with an army (probably in 1211) but until the issue was decided helped neither the one nor the other, and both sides considered him their ally. Only after the defeat and imprisonment of the gūrkhān did the Khwārazm-shāh take part in the destruction of the Qarā-Khiṭāys, while a section of their military forces entered Muhammad's service. In consequence of this the Khwārazm-shāh endeavoured to demonstrate to Kūchluk that he (Kūchluk) was indebted for his victory to the help given by Muḥammad and should now cede a part of the gūrkhān's territories to him. Kūchluk categorically rejected this request. These diplomatic relations are related most accurately by Nasawī[3], who had the opportunity of talking to Muḥammad b. Qarā-Qāsim Nasawī, the last of the envoys sent by the Khwārazm-shāh to Kūchluk. Muḥammad | upbraided Kūchluk 39.
for depriving him of the fruits of his victory, and claimed that the gūrkhān, defeated by the Khwārazm-shāh, had already proposed peace to his enemy, promising to give him his daughter Ṭafghāch-Khātūn in marriage and as dowry all his treasure, retaining for himself only the most distant of his provinces; but at this moment Kūchluk, taking advantage of the gūrkhān's weakness, seized the sovereignty. Therefore the sultan demanded that Kūchluk should now send him the gūrkhān himself, his daughter, and his treasurer. To this threatening request Kūchluk at first replied in mild terms, and sent generous gifts to Muḥammad, but refused to give up the gūrkhān, who himself, apprehensive, and not without cause, of the fate which would have awaited him in Khorezmia, begged Kūchluk not to grant the Khwārazm-shāh's request. The matter, as explained by the gūrkhān, was not exactly on the footing recounted by Muḥammad's envoys;

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 7, trad., p. 13.
[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 178–9.
[3] Nesawi, texte, pp. 7–9, trad., pp. 13–16.

wishing to save some remnants of his possessions, the gūrkhān was really desirous of concluding peace with the Khwārazm-shāh and of giving him his daughter in marriage, but Muhammad refused all his proposals. As Kūchluk was dilatory in complying with the desire of the sultan, the latter renewed his demand in still more categorical terms; his envoy, acting in conformity with his instructions, informed Kūchluk in the harshest terms of his sovereign's anger, and for this was put in chains but afterwards succeeded in escaping during one of the skirmishes between Kūchluk and Muḥammad's divisions which occurred "in Kāshghar and other places."

Ibn al-Athīr's account is that the Khwārazm-shāh contented himself with dispatching small forces for a guerilla warfare, and thus challenged the reproach on Kūchluk's part that such a form of activity was more worthy of a highway robber than of a king. Kūchluk could hardly have made any complaint on this score as he himself employed the same method of waging war, and that with complete success, and thanks to it emerged victoriously from his struggle with the Khwārazm-shāh, although at first he possessed only Semiryechye and the eastern part of the Syr-Darya province. But his first task was to crush the last remnants of the Muslim movement, *i.e.* to conquer Būzār or Ōzār[1], a former horse thief and robber, who had created at the time of this movement an independent kingdom in the Kulja region, and also the leaders of the Kāshghar rebels who had killed their
396 Khān. Without undertaking | a campaign of conquest in Eastern Turkestan, Kūchluk, for three or four years in succession (*i.e.* from 1211 to 1213 or 1214), raided the country at the harvest time and laid it waste. As we have seen from Nasawī, Muḥammad sent forces at this time to the same region, as is indicated also by Juwaynī's statement[2] that Muhammad's army reached Bīshbāliq. Kūchluk's raids fully achieved their object; a famine broke out in the country, which forced the inhabitants to submit to him. If one may judge by the behaviour of the Khorezmians in other places, there is ground for the reflection that the presence in the country of divisions of Muḥammad's army, simultaneously with the armies of Kūchluk, could only contribute to the inhabitants' acceptance of this decision. As little could the Khwārazm-shāh stop the cruel persecution which Islām underwent in Eastern Turkestan after Kūchluk's victory[3]. Muḥammad not only gave no help to his co-religionists in Kāshghar and Khotan, but was even unable to protect the northern provinces of Transoxania from Kūchluk. According to Ibn al-Athīr[4], the sultan, at least

[1] Juwaynī, i, 57 sq.; *Texts*, pp. 135–6 (Jamāl Qarshī). [2] *Ibid.*, ii, 126.
[3] On this see *Zapiski*, viii, 29; *Handbook of Semiryechye*, ii, p. 111 (from Juwaynī, i, 52 sq.).
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 199.

till 1214, spent the summer in Samarqand, fearing an invasion of Transoxania by Kūchluk; finally the inhabitants of Isfījāb, Shāsh, Farghāna, and Kāsān received orders to emigrate to the south-west, and those provinces were devastated in order that they should not fall a prey to Kūchluk[1]. The mention of Kāsān in conjunction with Farghāna should, it seems, be interpreted in the sense that the order referred only to the parts of Farghāna situated beyond the Syr-Darya. As regards Isfījāb and Shāsh, Ibn al-Athīr's statement is fully corroborated by Yāqūt[2], who quotes the very same reason for this measure; the Khwārazm-shāh laid waste these regions because he was not in a position to retain them in his own possesion. Such was the issue of the struggle between the most powerful of the Muslim kings and the leader of the nomads, who was disposed of without difficulty by a Mongol general in 1218.

Muḥammad's operations against another enemy in the Steppes, the Qipchāqs, were more successful. The province of Sighnāq was united to the Khwārazm-shāh's kingdom, as two sons of the | ruler of Sighnāq are mentioned among the princes held in 397
captivity in Khorezmia[3]. From Jand, Muḥammad made expeditions to the north against the Qipchāqs living in the Kirghiz steppes. On one of these campaigns occurred his first, but entirely accidental, collision with the armies of Chingiz Khān. Of this engagement four accounts have come down to us from different historians, each independent of the other, Ibn al-Athīr[4], Nasawī[5], Jūzjānī[6], and Juwaynī[7], but all four authors had a very confused idea of the Khwārazm-shāh's campaigns in Central Asia. Ibn al-Athīr says that the campaign was undertaken by the sultan against the Mongols after the catastrophe at Utrār (1218); Nasawī deliberately corrects the chronological error of his predecessor, and refers the campaign to the year 612 (1215–16), but like Ibn al-Athīr makes the Mongols fight the sultan's armies after their victory over Kūchluk, which, as is well known, did not take place till 1218. Moreover, Kūchluk was in Eastern Turkestan, whence he fled to Sārykūl, whereas the collision between Mongols and Khorezmians occurred, as we shall see, in the Turgai province. Jūzjānī refers the event to 615/1218; according to his version the sultan was at the time in pursuit of Qadir-Khān, the son of the Tatar (?) Yūsuf[8], and went as far

[1] *Ibid.*, XII, 179.
[2] Yāqūt, I, 249–50; III, 234.
[3] Nesawī, texte, p. 39, trad., p. 67.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 238; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, I, 7.
[5] Nesawī, texte, pp 9–11, trad., pp 16–19.
[6] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 267–70, 1096–7
[7] Juwaynī, I, 51 sq.; II, 100 sq.; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 74–7; Mirkhond, *Djenghiz Khān*, p. 99; D'Ohsson, I, 208–10.
[8] In another passage (p. 1097) the same author calls him the "son of Thafaqtān the Yimek" (the Yimek were a tribe of the Kimāk related to the Qipchāq).

north as the town of Yūghūr in Turkestan; the only explanation given of the appearance of the Mongols in this place is that they were pursuing the Tatars. As regards the place Yūghūr[1], there is also a notice in Chinese history that the place in the Qipchāq country where Sūbuday defeated the Mergīts bore the name of Yu-ku; elsewhere the name Yu-ku is given to the leader of the Mergīts[2]. That the word Yūghūr was used in the Qipchāq country as a title also is evident from the expression of the official document quoted above (p. 340) regarding the "Sons of Yūghūrs." Juwaynī's account is that after the catastrophe at Utrār, Muhammad was at Bukhārā[3], where he stayed from
398 8th Sha'bān to 10th Shawwāl (probably in 615, | *i.e.* from October 30th to December 30th, 1218). As it was spring-time (?) the sultan spent the time gaily, and later on left for Samarqand with the intention of making an expedition against Kūchluk.

At this point news arrived that the Mergīts, driven out of Mongolia by Chingiz Khān, had appeared in the country of the Qanghlī (Qipchāqs) under the leadership of Tūq-tughān (in Rashīd ad-Dīn Qūl-tughān)[4]; whereupon the sultan moved against them through Bukhārā to Jand. Here he learned that not only the Mergīts had arrived but also the armies of Chingiz Khān in their pursuit. Elsewhere Juwaynī notes that Tūq-tughān had before this quarrelled with Kūchluk, and gone "to the confines of the Kem-Kemchik" (the Kem-Kemjiyūt of Rashīd ad-Dīn), *i.e.* the Kirghiz country, where Jūchī was sent against him. The Khwārazm-shāh prudently returned to Samarqand, took thence the remainder of his army, and advanced to Jand with much stronger forces, hoping to "kill two hares at one blow[5]." By this time, however, the Mergīts had been annihi-

Marquart's opinion (*Osttürk. Dial*, p. 130) that Jūzjānī has confused Qadır with Qudū, the prince of the Mergīts, can only be explained on the supposition that Marquart was not acquainted with the section of Juwaynī's work dealing with the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs.

[1] Raverty spells Yighur (*Tab. Nas.*, p. 267).

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 233. In Marquart's view (*loc. cit.*), the Chinese Yu-ku as a geographical name refers to the Irghiz. This would be the case only if the Chinese had been misled by an erroneous transcription in Arabic (يغر or ايغر for ارغز). Cf. Prof. Pelliot's remark in *J. A.*, II, xv, p. 154.

[3] In MS iv, 2, 34, there is a mistake here.

[4] Marquart (*Osttürk. Dial.*, p. 134, n. 1) takes strong exception to this identification, but his own theory, that توق تغان is an erroneous transcription (falsche Umschreibung) of the Mongol Tūqtā-Khān, and that the latter (whom he identifies with Tūqtā bīkī) has been confused with his son Qudū-Khān, is hardly probable. In Rashīd al-Dīn, as Marquart himself states (*ibid.*, p. 131), both Qudū and Qūl-tughān are mentioned as the sons of Tūqtā-bīkī, both fled to the country of the Qipchāqs, where Qudū was killed; Qūl-tughān was taken prisoner in the battle with Jūchī and killed by order of Chingiz-Khān. We see therefore that it was not Qudū, but Qūl-tughān alone who fought the Mongols in the country of the Qipchāqs. The name Ho(k)-tu in the Chinese history (Marquart, p. 120) may be a transcription of the name Qūl-tughān also.

[5] Juwaynī, ii, 102: می پنداشت که بیك تبر دو نخچیر خواهد انداخت.

lated by the Mongols, and the sultan could only engage the armies of Chingiz-Khān, that too without decisive success, although he obliged the enemy to retire. There is no doubt that the Mongol army with which the Khwārazm-shāh had to do was really pursuing the Mergīts. The Mongol and Chinese sources[1] also speak of the flight of the Mergīts to the Qipchāq country under the command of the prince Qūltughān-Markān. Rashīd ad-Dīn[2] puts the destruction of the Mergīts in the year of the bull (1217); the Mongol army was under the command of the generals Sūbuday and Toquchar, but Chingiz-Khan's eldest son Jūchī, whom Juwaynī, Nasawī, and Jūzjānī (and, following them, Mīrkhwānd also) call the leader of the Mongols, also took part in the campaign. It is said that Qūl-tughān was taken before Jūchī, but elsewhere[3] that he fled to the Qipchāqs; "Jūchī-Khān sent an army in pursuit of him which seized him," where two manuscripts have the word "led"[4] instead of "sent." As regards the date given | by Rashīd ad-Dīn, this historian's 399
chronology for the events of 1215–25 is on the whole extremely inaccurate. In the text of his history Rashīd ad-Dīn omits the year of the pig (1215), in his chronological review the year of the mouse (1216); consequently the year of the Hijra is erroneously stated in the first case for the years of the mouse and the bull, in the second for the year of the bull[5]; with 1218 the dates by both eras again coincide, for which it was necessary to omit the year A. H. 613. Both in the text of the history and in the chronological survey the conquest of Transoxania is referred to the year of the serpent[6] (1221) when, according to all trustworthy sources, it had already been accomplished in the year 1220. From Juwaynī's account it may be inferred that he connects the extermination of the Mergīts with Jūchī's campaign against the Kirghiz, which is mentioned also by Rashīd ad-Dīn, who puts it in 1218[7], but no information whatever confirms the account of the flight of the Mergīts to the Kirghiz. It cannot be denied that Nasawī was well acquainted with the events of the last years of the Khwārazm-shāh's reign, and he would hardly have referred a campaign which was carried out in 1218 to an earlier period. Until we have more accurate data, it must be taken as most probable that the sultan's campaign in the Turgai province was begun in the winter of 1215–16, and that his collision with the Mongols took place in the summer of 1216[8].

[1] Compare the extracts from the *Yuan-shi* quoted in *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 233, 248.

[2] *Trudy*, xv, 31, 115. [3] *Ibid.*, v, 73.

[4] Thus according to the translator; in his edition of the Persian text (*ibid.*, vii, 94). Prof. Berezin does not quote corresponding variants.

[5] *Trudy*, xv, 29–31, 115. [6] *Ibid.*, xv, 73–4, 116.

[7] *Ibid.*, v, 131; vii, 169; xv, 115.

[8] This season of the year is indicated by Jūzjānī's account that the daylight

According to Nasawī's account the sultan reached the bank of the Irghiz with an army of 60,000 men, but could not cross the river at once as it was covered with ice; evidently then his advance was being made in early spring and the ice was no longer strong enough to bear cavalry. When the river was clear of ice Muhammad made the crossing and reached the field of battle, where the Mergīts had been annihilated; Juwaynī places this field between the rivers Qaylī[1] and Qīmach (?). From one of the wounded the Muslims learned that the battle had taken place that very day; the sultan at once determined to pursue the victors, and overtook them at dawn the following day. Jūchī and the other Mongol leaders were unwilling to fight the Muslims, and declared that Chingiz-Khān had sent them only against the Mergīts; the sultan replied that he regarded all infidels as his enemies, and forced the Mongols into a battle, which resulted indecisively. In both armies the right wing overpowered the enemy's left wing; the Muslim right wing was commanded by the eldest son of the Khwārazm-shāh, Jalāl ad-Dīn, whose bravery saved the Muslims from defeat[2]. It was intended to renew the battle on the following day, but the Mongols retired under cover of night, and by setting fire to piles of wood deceived the Muslims, who learned only at break of day that the Mongols had abandoned their camp. The bravery of the Mongols produced a strong impression on the sultan, and was one of the reasons for his subsequent refusal to meet them in the open field.

Among Muslim rulers the sultan had no rivals. Towards 1215 he definitely annexed to his kingdom all the former territories of the Ghūrids, and put his son Jalāl ad-Dīn at their head. As is well known, the Bāmiyān branch of the Ghūrids included in their possessions some provinces situated to the north of the Amu-Darya, and amongst the rulers kept in captivity in Khorezmia is mentioned Jamāl ad-Din 'Omar of Wakhsh[3], who was probably the successor of the Malik-Shāh mentioned in Jūzjānī[4]. While the sultan was lingering in Transoxania under the threat of a nomad invasion, his generals subdued nearly all

continued all night. Marquart (*Ostturk. Dialekt.*, 133) puts this battle in 1219, which can hardly be brought into agreement with the most trustworthy information. The ground of his opinion is Ibn al-Athīr's declaration that Chingiz-Khān appeared before Bukhārā (in Feb. 1220) five months after Muhammad's return to that city, but it cannot be proved that Ibn al-Athīr was well acquainted with these events. Marquart himself (p. 135) admits a gap of three years. On the "fantastic" chronology of the Chinese accounts see Pelliot, *J.A.*, II, xv, 162 sq

[1] ii, 102. Marquart (*Osttürk. Dial.*, p. 133) identifies this river with the Hui-li of a Chinese account in the *Yuan-shi*, where this battle is confused with the Khwārazm-shāh's flight in 1220 and dated 1222.

[2] This detail which is contributed by Juwaynī (in both versions: i, 52; ii, 103) is somewhat dubious; it is strange that Nasawī, the biographer of Jalāl ad-Dīn, says nothing of the role of his hero in this battle.

[3] Nesawi, texte, p. 39, trad., pp. 66–7.

[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 436, 490.

Persia to his rule; even in distant 'Omān the khuṭba was recited in Muḥammad's name[1]. The first and only considerable failure Muḥammad suffered in the west was when he demanded of the Caliph that in Baghdād itself the khuṭba should be introduced in his name, *i.e.* that the Caliph should renounce his temporal power in favour of the Khwārazm-shāh, as formerly in favour of the Būyids and Saljūqids. A similar desire, as we have seen, had already been manifested by Takash, but Muḥammad presented his claim in a more categorical form, and with this aim sent as his envoy to Baghdād the Khorezmian qāḍī, Mujīr ad-Dīn 'Omar b. Sa'd (from whom | the historian Nasawī received 401
his information). The Baghdād government returned an uncompromising refusal, and in its turn dispatched the shaykh Shihāb ad-Dīn Suhrawardī to the Khwārazm-shāh. According to Juwaynī[2] and Nasawī[3] the shaykh was received at the sultan's court with far less honour than was due to his learning and personal qualities, although Nasawī puts somewhat more respectful expressions into the mouth of the sultan. Muḥammad kept the shaykh waiting at the court for some time[4], and when he entered did not even ask him to be seated, if Juwaynī is to be believed. The shaykh asked permission to recite a Ḥadīth of the Prophet; the sultan granted it, and as required by custom went on his knees to listen to it. The sense of the Ḥadīth was that the Prophet warned the faithful against causing harm to the family of 'Abbās. The sultan answered, "Although I am a Turk and know the Arabic language badly, yet I have understood the sense of the Ḥadīth repeated by thee; but I have not caused harm to a single one of the descendants of 'Abbās, nor have I endeavoured to do them evil. Meanwhile I have heard that a number of them are always to be found in the prison of the Commander of the Faithful, and even multiply and increase there; if the shaykh were to repeat this same Ḥadīth in the presence of the Commander of the Faithful, it would be better and more to the point." The shaykh endeavoured to prove that the Caliph in his capacity as a mujtahid (interpreter of the ordinances of religion) has a right to imprison single persons for

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 198.

[2] Cf Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp 69-70; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 192-3. The printed edition of Juwaynī has two accounts (II, 96 sq.; 120 sq.) on the enmity between the sultan and the Caliph, but neither mentions the embassy of the shaykh. On the latter cf Brockelmann, *Geschichte d. Arab. Lit.*, i, 440.

[3] Nesawi, texte, pp. 12-13, trad., pp. 21-3. Fuller details of this embassy are given by Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad b. al-Athīr (see Brockelmann, *Ges. d. Arab. Lit.*. i, 341) in عبرة اولى الابصار, MS. Brit. Mus. 7914, fol. 37 a. He states that the army numbered 400,000 (a manifest exaggeration) and that there were three tents, one of which contained the kings of Persia, the second the kings of Khurāsān, and the third the kings of Transoxania.

[4] The Arabic text must apparently be taken in this sense, and not as in the French translation.

the good of the whole Muslim community. The shaykh's embassy failed to achieve its ends, and the hostility between both rulers only increased.

The sultan's answer, for all its sharp wit, could not, of course, shake the respect felt by the community at that time for the Head of Islām. In entire accordance with the spirit of the Ḥadīth quoted by the shaykh, Ibn al-Athīr[1] refers to "the pre-eminence of the noble house of the 'Abbāsids," that any one who sought to bring evil upon it was punished for his action, or for his evil intention. According to Juwaynī, the sultan had no desire to be spoken of as having "for the sake of his ambitious
402 projects made an attack on the Imām, the oath to whom | constitutes one of the foundations of Islām, and thrown his faith to the winds[2]," and was obliged therefore to contrive a more plausible pretext for war than the question of the khutba. Of such pretexts there was no lack; the Caliph Nāṣir, desirous of strengthening his throne, was as unscrupulous in his methods as Muḥammad himself. The Caliph made overtures to the chief of the Ismailites, Jalāl ad-Dīn Ḥasan, received some "fidā'īs"[3] from him, and used them to remove his enemies. Such a fate overtook both Oghulmish, the Khwārazm-shāh's viceroy in 'Irāq, and the amīr of Mecca, the latter of whom was assassinated in the sacred territory during the pilgrimage on the day of the festival of 'Arafāt. Finally, the Khwārazm-shāh made public that documents had been found in Ghazna at its capture (in 1215) from which it was evident that the Caliph was constantly inciting the Ghūrids to attack Muḥammad. The sultan succeeded in obtaining from the "imāms of his territories" a fatwā that an imām who committed such acts was unworthy of his office, and that a sultan who proved himself a supporter of Islām and devoted all his time to war for the Faith, pursued by the intrigues of the imām, has the right to depose such an imām and to appoint another; finally, that the 'Abbāsids had forcibly seized the Caliphate, belonging by right to the 'Alids, the descendants of Ḥusayn[4]. On the basis of this decision of the spiritual

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 207; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 194.

[2] Juwaynī, ii, 121: بر هوس ملك قصد امام كه ركن اسلام به بيعت او تمام شود كرده ايمان خود بر باد داد

[3] On these see Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'islamisme*, p. 303; Browne, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, ii, 206 sq.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 121 sq.: هر امام كه بر امثال اين حركات كه ذكر رفت اقدام نمايد امامت او حق نباشد وسلطانی‌را كه مدد اسلام نمايد وزوزكار بجهاد صرف كرده باشد قصد كند آن سلطان‌را رسد كه دفع چنين امام كند وامام ديكر نصب كردند و وجه ديكر آنك خلافت‌را سادات حسينی مستحق اند ودر خاندان عبّاس غمبست

authorities the sultan declared Nāṣir deposed, omitted the mention of his name in the khuṭba and on the coinage, and proclaimed as Caliph the Sayyid 'Alā al-Mulk Tirmidhī [1]. By these means a legal character was given to the Khwārazm-shāh's march on Baghdād. In 1217 he restored his authority in Persia, but in the winter of the same year a division sent by him from Hamadhān to Baghdād was overtaken by snowstorms | in the 403
mountains of Kurdistan and sustained heavy losses; its remnants were almost exterminated by the Kurds, and only a small portion returned to Muḥammad [2].

A cruel blow was thus dealt at the Khwārazm-shāh's prestige, the more so that the people saw in this catastrophe the punishment from above for his sacrilegious campaign. If Ibn al-Athīr [3] is to be believed, the cause of Muḥammad's return to the East was his fear of a nomad invasion of Transoxania, but he did not in the least renounce his feud with the Caliph; on the contrary, on his arrival in Nīshāpūr in February 1218 (Dhu'l-Qa'da 614) he immediately ordered Nāṣir's name to be omitted from the khuṭba and announced that the Caliph was dead. The same measure was carried out in other towns, Merv, Balkh, Bukhārā, and Sarakhs, but did not extend to Khwārazm, Samarqand, or Herāt, as these towns were not in such close dependence on the government, and enjoyed the right of introducing and abolishing the khuṭba among themselves at their own discretion(?). On the other hand, 'Awfī [4] and Nasawī [5] aver that Muḥammad himself after his misfortune expressed his repentance and endeavoured, outwardly at least, to make peace with Baghdād [6]. It is very likely that the Khwārazm-shāh did, in fact, consider it necessary to make this concession to public opinion, and that the omission of Nāṣir's name from the khuṭba was made before the expedition to Baghdād. The fact that in some towns, including even Khwārazm itself, the khuṭba was not altered, has probably some connexion with the struggle between the sultan and his mother, in which the military class and the priesthood were on the side of the latter.

As early as 1216 the Khwārazm-shāh by ordering the execution of the shaykh Majd ad-Dīn Baghdādī had offended

[1] *Ibid.*, ii, 12c–2; on 'Alā al-Mulk, *ibid.*, ii, 9 f.; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 66–8. He is called 'Imād ad-Dīn by Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī, facs Browne, p. 496, trans., p. 114.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 207.

[3] *Ibid.* In the report of a contemporary, Jacob de Vitry, Bishop of Acca, it is said that the Caliph by agreement with the Nestorian patriarch dispatched envoys to "king David," who had conquered the "Khān of Khāns," and to whom Muhammad in face of this had abandoned all the country beyond the Syr-Darya, i. e. to Küchluk. Under the influence of the Caliph's envoys "king David" began a war against the Khwārazm-shāh, in consequence of which the latter returned to his territories (*Abh. der phil. hist. Classe der Kön. Sächs. Ges. der Wiss.*, B. viii, S. 48, 50–2).

[4] *Texts*, p. 84.

[5] Nesawī, texte, pp. 20–21, trad, p. 36.

[6] On the fate of the Caliph created by Muḥammad there is no information whatever.

both his mother and the priesthood. The young shaykh was a pupil of shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā, the founder of the Kubrawī order of Ṣūfīs, which is still in existence at the present day. Like other important shaykhs of the twelfth and thirteenth
404 centuries | shaykh Najm ad-Dīn belonged to the school founded in Transoxania by an emigrant from the West, shaykh Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf al-Buzandjirdī al-Hamadānī[1] (d. 1140). Both the founder and the adherents of the school are rarely mentioned in historical works, but they undoubtedly had great influence over the population; among its active members were saints who are highly revered by the people down to the present day, such as Ḥakīm-atā and Aḥmad Yasawī[2]. The influence of the shaykhs over the people might have aroused the apprehension of the temporal rulers, and therefore from the very first the shaykhs took measures to prevent collisions of this sort. Already the founder of the school had counselled his successor to give his murīds and adherents the same advice that was written in the memorial presented to Sultan Sinjar[3], *i.e.* that in their conversations with the people as loyal feeling should be shown as in their relations with the rulers. If we may credit 'Awfī[4], the same tact was displayed by Majd ad-Dīn Baghdādī. The imām Shihāb ad-Dīn Khīwakī, whose name frequently occurs in Juwaynī and Nasawī, and who at this time held the office of wakīl at the Khorezmian court, wrote a letter to the shaykh in which he expressed the hope that with his assistance he might "find a way from the gloom of worldly affairs to the light of obedience, and defeat the legions of care with the sword of repentance and zeal." The shaykh gave the wakīl to understand that it was no sin to be in the king's service, that he had the opportunity of helping the wronged and of consoling the afflicted, and of attaining in these ways to both earthly happiness and heavenly blessing more certainly than by means of fasting and prayers. It is therefore all the more difficult to explain the causes of the collision between the shaykh and the Khorezmian government. The authors of the thirteenth century completely ignore this event, while the later sources, beginning with Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī[5], all maintain that the shaykh was put to death on suspicion of a love affair with the sultan's mother[6]. This is scarcely possible, as the queen had already a great grandson at

[1] *Texts*, p. 154 (from مرآة الجنان by Yāfa'ī: cf. Brock. II, 176 sq.). On shaykh al-Hamadānī see Zhukovsky, *Raz. Star. Merva*, pp. 169-72 (from Qandīya, Russ. trans. in *Ref. Book of Samarkand Prov*, VIII).

[2] Cf. the articles "Aḥmad Yesewī" and "Ḥakīm Atā" in *Encyc. of Islām.*

[3] *Texts*, p. 51 (Qandīya). [4] *Ibid.*, 97.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 153; *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda*, ed. Browne, p. 788 sq.; trans., p. 215 (on p. 496 نجم الدين بغدادى by mistake; cf. trans., p. 114).

[6] Most detailed account in *Texts*, p. 156.

the time[1], and the accounts of the close relations between the queen and the shaykh must probably | be understood to mean 405
that in this as in other cases the military class in its struggle with the throne had the priesthood on their side.

The murder of Majd ad-Dīn, according to the account of the historians, was only due to a momentary outburst of anger on the part of the Khwārazm-shāh, of which he immediately repented. Needing his Turkish guard, Muhammad was reluctantly obliged to make every effort to live in peace with them. Mercenary armies constituted the sole military forces of the Khwārazm-shāhs; in the twelfth century the mass of the people were looked upon, to an even greater degree than formerly, as a body of labourers to be kept in complete subjection. Al-Kātib as-Samarqandī[2] relates a characteristic anecdote of Sultan Sinjar, who is quoted as saying that to protect the strong from injury on the part of the weak was still more indispensable than to protect the weak from the arbitrary actions of the strong; the insulting of the weak by the strong was only injustice, whereas the insulting of the strong by the weak was both injustice and dishonour. If the masses were to emerge from subjection the result would be complete disorder; "the lesser will perform the duties of the great, but the great cannot carry out the duties of the lesser," *i.e.* the common people will desire to live like the aristocracy, and none will do the work which falls to the lot of the common people. An even more characteristic pronouncement on the class of "artisans and agriculturists" is to be found in one of the official documents of the time of Sinjar[3]: "They do not know the language of kings, and any idea either of agreeing with their rulers or of revolting against them is beyond them; all their efforts are devoted to one aim, to acquire the means of existence and maintain wife and children; obviously they are not to be blamed for this, and for enjoying constant peace."

Thus the mercenary army constituted the sole support of the throne, and in his own interests the sovereign had to give it the preference over the civilian elements. So far as we can judge from the official documents which have come down to us, the highest offices in the kingdom of the Khwārazm-shāh were the same as those in the Saljūqid empire, namely, wazīr, qāḍī, and nustawfī. The use of the terms wakīl | and mushrif seems to 406
have changed somewhat by the twelfth century. Besides the "wakīl of the court"[4] there is mention of a "wakīl of the personal dīwān[5]," corresponding probably to the "wakīl of

[1] On the age of Jalāl ad-Dīn's son see Nesawi, texte, p. 84, trad., p. 140.
[2] *Texts*, p. 71.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 97 ('Awfī).
[5] *Ibid*, p. 23.

tribute" (wakīl-i kharjī) of the Mongol period[1]. The wakīl controlled the receipts of large sums of money, as well as those earmarked for the maintenance of the army; in the provinces the same duty was performed by the mushrifs[2]. The head of a department filled the corresponding posts in the provinces according to his own judgement[3]; only the provincial wazīrs were appointed by the crown, especially in those provinces where the viceroy was a prince[4]. Among the military posts that of executioner (jāndār), in contrast to the practice of the Saljūqid kingdom, was of great importance. In a document written on behalf of Takash[5] the jāndār is included among the "notables of the guard;" in Muḥammad's reign, Ayāz, who was responsible for carrying out the sultan's death sentences, bore the title of Jahān-Pahlawān ("Knight of the world"), and commanded a division of 10,000 cavalry[6]. We know less about the gradations of authority amongst the heads of the bureaucracy. Muḥammad's wazīr, Nizām al-Mulk Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd al-Harawī[7], was probably the son of the wazīr of Takash[8], so that here as in former dynasties we meet with hereditary wazīrs. The system of military fiefs, which was extended under the Saljūqids, continued in operation. A general who was appointed governor of Bārchinlighkant in the reign of Takash was given at the same time "as a grant through the dīwān-i arḍ" (*i.e.* through the military department) one of the chief villages in this district, Rabāṭ-Ṭughānīn[9]. In the same reign the prince Yaghān-Dughdū received as a *milk* (domain exempt from taxation) the
407 village of Nūkhās, | which was on legal grounds declared escheated property[10].

In spite of the execution of the queen's favourite, the sultan carried out on the whole all his mother's wishes up to the march on Baghdād. After the deposition of Nizām al-Mulk Muhammad Harawī, the sultan, at Turkān-Khātūn's desire, appointed as wazīr Muḥammad b. Ṣālih, a former ghulām of the queen's, who received the titles of Nizām al-Mulk and Nāṣir ad-Dīn[11]. In the same way the sultan, to please the queen, nominated as heir to the throne his youngest son Quṭb ad-Dīn Ūzlāgh-shāh, whose mother belonged to the same tribe as Turkān-Khātūn. His eldest son, Jalāl ad-Dīn Mangubirtī, received the former territories of the Ghūrids, except Herāt, while the young heir to

[1] Juwaynī, ii. 239.
[2] Nasawī evidently makes use of the term mushrif in this sense (Nesawi, texte, p. 195, trad., p. 325).
[3] See above, p 232.
[4] *Texts*, pp. 75, 76; Nesawi, texte, p. 102, trad., p. 170.
[5] *Ibid*, p. 78.
[6] Nesawi, texte, p 23, trad., p. 40.
[7] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 28, trad., p. 50.
[8] On him see Zhukovsky, *Raz. Star. Merva*, p 33.
[9] *Texts*, p. 74.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 75.
[11] Nesawi, texte, p. 28, trad., pp. 48–50.

the throne was appointed ruler of Khorezmia, Khurāsān, and Māzandarān[1], but the actual government of these provinces remained of course in the hands of Turkān-Khātūn. Similarly no new measures were taken against the Khorezmian priesthood; only from Bukhārā and Samarqand those who appeared dangerous to the throne were exiled. The ṣadr of Bukhārā Burhān ad-Dīn was deposed and sent to Khorezmia, and his place filled by Majd ad-Dīn Mas'ūd b. Ṣāliḥ al-Farāwī, a brother of the wazīr (although the relations between the brothers were inimical), who retained this post until the Mongol invasion. The "shaykh-i Islām" of Samarqand, Jalāl ad-Dīn by name, was sent to Nasā together with his son Shams ad-Dīn and his brother Awḥad ad-Dīn[2]. The bitter dispute between the sultan and his mother broke out only after the sultan's return from 'Irāq, at the time of his stay in Nīshāpūr (in February and March[3], 1218). The sultan accused the wazīr Nizām al-Mulk of incapacity and extortion, deposed him, and sent him to Khwārazm with the words: "Return to the gate of your teacher." In these words a hostile allusion to the queen may already be detected. The conduct of the latter still further embittered the dispute; Turkān-Khātūn organized a brilliant reception for the deposed wazīr in the capital of Khorezmia, and appointed him wazīr | of 408
the heir to the throne. The sultan heard of this in Transoxania and sent one of his suite, 'Izz ad-Dīn Ṭughrul, to Khorezmia with orders to behead the wazīr. Turkān-Khātūn arrested Ṭughrul, and not only prevented him from carrying out the sultan's order, but even obliged him to state publicly in the presence of the whole council that the sultan confirmed Nizām al-Mulk[4]. As the sultan was forced to reconcile himself even to this, it is evident that in the provinces under the government of Turkān-Khātūn Muḥammad's authority was in practice not recognized.

In his own territories the Khwārazm-shāh did not restore the bureaucracy to its former importance after the deposition of Nizām al-Mulk, but transferred the duties of the Imperial wazīr to a college of six wakīls of the court, whose unanimous decisions alone were to be carried out; one of these was at the same time head of the dīwān of documents[5]. It is difficult to say what led Muḥammad to adopt this bold reform, which was in direct contradiction to the traditions of the bureaucracy; in any case the substitution for personal administration of administration by a committee could not in this form achieve its aims.

[1] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 28, trad., pp. 44–5.
[2] *Ibid.*, texte, pp. 23–5; trad., pp. 41–3.
[3] In April the sultan was already at Merv (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 207).
[4] Nesawi, texte, pp. 28–31, trad., pp. 49–55. In the translation (p. 55) 'Izz ad-Dīn is in one passage called Karīm ad-Dīn; this mistake is not found in the original.
[5] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 32, trad., p. 56.

According to Nasawī the people now regretted the times of Niẓām al-Mulk, in spite of all the arbitrary acts of that wazīr, as "to satisfy one is in any case easier than to satisfy six."

Thus the Eastern Muslim political structure, which had been created by the 'Abbāsids and received its further development under the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids, was now completely broken up. The bureaucracy was deprived of all importance; the military caste, at the head of which stood the sultan's mother, was in open enmity with the bearer of the supreme power; the priesthood could hardly forgive the Khwārazm-shāh for the murder of Majd ad-Dīn and the fatwā extorted against the Caliph; the people liberated by Muḥammad from the yoke of the infidel rose against their liberators, and were put down by streams of blood. Muḥammad therefore could not depend on a single element of the administrative system, nor on a single class of the population. The issue of the struggle between such a power and the fresh forces of the nomads, united at this time under one of the most talented organizers of all ages, is comprehensible.

CHAPTER IV

CHINGIZ-KHĀN AND THE MONGOLS

ELSEWHERE[1] we have endeavoured to elucidate the process 409
by which the nomad empire of Chingiz-Khān was built up and the fundamental features of its organization. Up to the present we have no cause to retract the conclusions there set forth, though we consider it highly desirable that the Mongol national traditions, which constitute up to the present almost our only source for the history of Mongolia in the twelfth century, should be verified by the written testimony of contemporaries to a greater degree than is now possible for those who are not sinologues. If some fantastic details springing unavoidably from the oral transmission of historical accounts be excluded, the Mongol tradition has in itself nothing improbable. Especially is there an air of truth in the portrayal of the relations between the nomads and the Chinese government, which was constantly inciting one group of nomads against another which appeared to it to be dangerous, but no sooner was the struggle ended than it had to adopt the same measures against its former allies. In the middle of the twelfth century the Manchu dynasty of Kin, which ruled in Northern China, declared war on the Mongku-tata tribe, *i. e.* on the Mongols. In 1147 the Kin Emperor concluded peace with the Mongol sovereign Aolo-botzile[2]. Prof. Vassilyev[3] and Prof. Berezin[4] wished to see in this name the Turco-Persian title of ulugh wazīr (grand wazīr), but we | know of no instances 410
of the assumption of such a title by nomad rulers. It is very probable that in the first part of the name we have a Chinese mutilation of the name Qutula-Qaghan, of whom the Mongol legends speak. The rule of this Mongol dynasty extended at least down to 1161, when the Kin emperor published a manifesto that he was setting out against the Mongku-tata[5]. This was followed shortly, in all probability, by the destruction of the

[1] *Zapiski*, x, 105 sq. Summarized in English by E. D. Ross, *Heart of Asia*, p. 151 sq.; in German by R. Stube in his paper "Tschingiz-Chan, seine Staatsbildung und seine Persönlichkeit" (*Neue Jahrbucher fur das klass. Altertum*, 1908, p. 532 sq.). M. Hartmann (*Der islamische Orient*, Bd. II, p. 598) ascribes the views developed in this paper to Stübe himself, although the latter plainly states that his object is only to set out in their main lines the results of my researches.

[2] *Trudy*, IV, 79; Pelliot in *J.A.*, II, XV, 146.

[3] *Trudy*, IV, 52, 79.

[4] *Ibid.*, XIII, 185.

[5] *Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 173.

Mongols at the hands of the Tatars of Buir-Nor; but at the end of the same century the Chinese government already found it necessary to incite the Keraits (Karāyits) and Mongols against these Tatars. It was in these wars that Tamuchin first came to the fore with a troop recruited by him from among the aristocrats of the Steppes. After the victory over the Tatars, when the Khān of the Keraits had made himself the chief personage in Eastern Mongolia, this troop proclaimed its leader Kagan; with the consent of the Kerait, Wang-Khān, Tamuchin accepted this title, and revived the family name of Mongol, which had disappeared in Mongolia proper after Qutula-Qaghan. According to the testimony of Meng-Hung[1] the word Mongol was under Chingiz-Khān an official term only, and entirely unknown to the nation itself. Still, in official documents of the Yüan dynasty, the Mongols and the peoples amalgamated with them are called in China Mongols, in Mongolia tata[2] (Tatars). By adopting the term Mongols for his tribe Tamuchin declared himself the successor of Qutula-Qaghan, and also asserted a claim, in all probability unfounded, to relationship with him. According to the epic tradition of the Mongols (known under the name of *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi*, *i.e.* "secret history of the Yuan dynasty") Tamuchin then founded ten court offices; in the Mongol text the names of the offices, with the exception of that of cherbi, are not cited, and only the duties of the officials are indicated. These officials were the following[3]:—

(1) Four men whose duty it was "to carry the bow and arrows;" in later times the office of korchi (archers).

(2) Three "overseers of food and drink;" the Mongol text
411 distinguishes morning and evening overseers; | in later times the office of bukawul[4] or bawurchi.

(3) One "overseer of sheep pasturage;" in Rashīd ad-Dīn[5] the same official is called equerry (akhtachi) of the Court stud.

(4) One "overseer of the preparation of carts" (tergen); in later times the office of yurtchi; according to Rashīd ad-Dīn also this man was appointed captain of a thousand and looked after the mares[6]; at the end of his life he became bukawul and bawurchi[7].

(5) One cherbi[8], "overseer of the domestic staff."

[1] *Trudy*, iv, 219–20.

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 172.

[3] *Ibid.*, iv, 62. Prof. Berezin's explanation (*Trudy*, xiii, 255–7). I am indebted for my information on the Mongol original to the kindness of Prof. A. O. Ivanovsky.

[4] Among the Naimans and some other peoples the term for bukawul was qunsat, pronounced qunjat in Eastern Mongolia (*Trudy*, v, 176; vii, 234; xiii, 130, Persian text, p. 210).

[5] *Trudy*, v, 213; vii, 283.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, v, 175; vii, 234.

[8] Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 979) translates the word cherbi (jazbi by mistake in Raverty) as ḥājib.

(6) Four men whose duty it was to "carry the swords in one place;" the head of these was Tamuchin's brother, Jūchī-Qasar.

(7) Two "overseers of training horses" (akhta, in later times the office of akhtachi); one of these was Tamuchin's brother Bilgutay.

(8) Three "overseers of horse pasturage."

(9) Four "far and near arrows" (in Chinese Yüan-tsien and Kin-tsien, in Mongolian Khola and Oira); in all probability these refer to the persons who carried out the personal behests of the Khāns, chiefly as envoys. The custom of sending "messenger arrows" existed in the Kin empire[1], and in later times there was a special term in the Mongol empire to designate the arrows in which secret letters[2] were enclosed.

(10) Of two nobles it is said that they were made elders, or, according to the Mongol text, "guardians" of the assembly, without any more detailed explanation of their duties. Very likely, as the chief advisers of the Khān, the duty of maintaining order in the meetings devolved upon them. Both of the persons who | are mentioned here always occupied one of the most 412
honourable posts at Chingiz-Khān's court; Bughurji-noyon sat on his right, above the military leaders[3]; the other, Jelme, was one of the captains of the guard (keshik), and we are told that "not more than two or three were senior to him".[4]

Tamuchin's guard was more definitely organized[5] in 1203, after the victory over the Keraits, when Tamuchin became the chief personage in Eastern Mongolia; in this case we already meet with Mongolian terms. 70 men were selected for the day-guard and 80 for the night-guard; the first were called turgewuts, the second kebtewuts (singular kebtewur)[6]. These and others together constituted the protective guard (keshikten, singular keshik[7] = turn, relief). Included in this guard also were archers (korchi), table deckers (bawurchi), door-keepers (indistinct in the text, perhaps egudenchi from the Mongol eguden or uden = door) and grooms (akhtachi)[8]. The household department was managed

[1] *Works of the Pekin Mission*, iv, 191.
[2] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, iii, 434.
[3] *Trudy*, v, 161; vii, 271.
[4] *Ibid.*, v, 143; vii, 190.
[5] *Works of the Pekin Mission*, iv, 102–3.
[6] We have undoubtedly the same word in Rashīd ad-Dīn in the form of كبتاول (*Trudy*, v, 38; vii, 48). Prof. Berezin mistakenly read كيتاول and derived this word from the verb كبتمك (to go away), see *ibid.*, v, 230. Elsewhere (*Trudy*, xv, 137; in the Persian text, p. 204) the same word appears in the form كايتاول (kāytāwul) instead of كابتاول (kābtāwul).
[7] Usually كزيك in Rashīd ad-Dīn. Prof. Berezin attributes the meaning "blessed" to the word keshikten (*Trudy*, xiii, 185). Examples of the use of the word كشيك have been collected by Quatremère (*Histoire des Mongols*, pp. 309–11).
[8] The term "akhtachi" occurs in the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi* even in the history of Sengūn, cf. text in Pelliot, *J.A.*, 11, xv, 180 note.

by the cherbi, whose number was raised to six. Besides this "1,000 braves" (bahādurs) were organized as the Khān's personal guard; these formed the advance guard in battle and part of the court guard in peace. The watches of the guard were changed every three days.

A further reorganization of the guard[1] was carried out in 1206, when Tamuchin defeated the Naimans, executed Jamuqa, united under his rule all the people of Mongolia, "set up a standard with nine white tails[2], and took his seat as King," at the same time, according to the official sources, assuming the
413 title of Chingiz-|Khān. The force of kebtewuts was raised first to 800 men, later to 1,000; the number of korchi was at first brought up to 400, later to 1,000 men; in the same way 1,000 turgewuts were formed; on the model of the "thousand bahādurs" yet another 6,000 were formed and included in the guard; and by this means the latter now contained up to 10,000 men. The watch (qarawul) was divided into four reliefs, each of which remained on duty as before for three days and nights. On the method by which the guard was recruited we are told that each son of a leader of a thousand (evidently from the earlier formation) had to bring with him one kinsman and ten companions, the son of a leader of ten and free men in general one kinsman and three companions. A proclamation was made that "whosoever wishes to enter the guard, him must no man hinder." Specially strict regulations were made with regard to the night watch on the Khān's tent; after the approach of dusk the guard arrested any one who walked to and fro near the tent. and none could enter the Khān's tent except escorted by the guard; when any one entered unexpectedly, the guard used his weapons against him. No one dared make inquiries about the number of the guards on any particular day; the punishment for this was a fine of a saddled horse and clothing.

The guard was subject to severe discipline; any one who failed to appear on the day of his turn received thirty strokes on the first occasion, seventy on the second occasion, and the third time after receiving thirty-seven strokes was expelled. The same punishment was meted out to captains who had forgotten to remind their subordinates of the day of the relief. On the other hand the guardsmen enjoyed great privileges; a combatant private of the guard stood higher in rank than the chief of 1,000 men in the army, non-combatants in the guard higher than a chief of 100. The commanders of the guard had not the right of punishing their subordinates on their own authority, and were obliged to report all their actions to the Khān; a rule existed that

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 125, 130.

[2] According to Meng Hung (*Trudy*, iv, 231) a black moon was represented in the centre of this standard.

"Whosoever punishes his subordinates with rods on his own authority shall himself be punished with rods; whosoever beats with fists shall himself be beaten with fists". This privilege the guard, in their capacity of close associates with the Khān, retained also on distant campaigns. On dispatching Sūbuday-bahādur on a campaign Chingiz-Khān gave him instructions to this effect: "Whosoever disobeys orders, if he is known to me bring him here, if not then | execute him on the 414
spot".[1] The guard took part in a war only when the Khān himself joined the expedition; in camp the original "thousand bahādurs" were placed in front of the Khān's tent, the korchi and turgewuts on the right, the remaining 7,000 on the left. The thousand bahādurs and the soldiers who had formed part of the original guard enjoyed greater honour than the remainder.

The majority of Chingiz-Khān's generals came from the guard, and thus, thanks to this institution, the leadership of his military forces throughout the whole extent of the empire was in the hands of men who had been personally tested by the Khān; the result of the activities of these generals shows with what art and with what knowledge of men Chingiz-Khān chose his assistants. The mass of the people were to be only an instrument in the hands of those chosen by Chingiz-Khān, who even in the apophthegms ascribed to him nowhere refers to the people as a whole, nor does he speak of his services to them, but enumerates only what the Khān has done for his successors and his aristocratic adherents. The princes, "noyon," formed the highest aristocracy in the empire. The title of "great noyon" was borne by Tūluy[2], Chingiz-Khān's youngest son, who was his father's chief assistant in military matters[3], and Tamuchin's younger brothers, Temuga and Bilgutay[4], were also called noyons. In general, of the posterity of Chingiz-Khān's brothers, only the descendants of Jūchī-Qasar received the rights of imperial princes, the remainder being incorporated in the aristocracy. The military aristocracy[5], as among the Turks, bore the title of tarkhans; their privileges, according to Juwaynī[6], were as follows: they were exempted from all taxation; all booty seized by them either in war or on the chase became their full personal property[7]; they could enter the palace at all times without special permission; they were called to answer only after the ninth crime[8] committed by them, | but this rule was observed 415
only in the case of such crimes as involved the death penalty[9].

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 111.
[2] *Trudy*, xiii, 77.
[3] Juwaynī, i, 29.
[4] *Trudy*, xiii, 60, 62.
[5] *Ibid*, xiii, 55.
[6] Juwaynī, i, 27.
[7] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 98, 124.
[8] Compare *ibid.*, iv, 115, 116, 120, 122, 124.
[9] *Ibid.*, iv, 223.

At feasts the tarkhans occupied a place of honour and received a goblet of wine each[1].

At the head of the army, as in all nomad nations long before Chingiz-Khān, stood captains of ten, centurions, leaders of a thousand, and commanders of a tümen or division of ten thousand. Under Chingiz-Khān there were three chief commanders of a tümen. One, Muquli, commanded the left or eastern wing (among the Mongols the south was regarded as the most honourable side)[2]; the second, Bughurji, commanded the right or western wing; the third, Naya, commanded the "central troops."[3] In Rashīd ad-Dīn Naya is mentioned only as Muquli's assistant; Bughurji-noyon likewise had an assistant but the corresponding title, so far as is known, is not met with in Mongol sources, and its pronunciation is doubtful[4]. The soldier guilty of transferring of his own free will from one general to another suffered execution in the presence of the army, and the general who had received him was severely punished[5]. Precise regulations were also established for the royal hunt, which in Mongol states was not only a pastime but in the first place a means of supply, besides serving as manœuvres for the army[6]. The infringement of the rules of the hunt sometimes even brought with it the death penalty[7]. Subsequently Chingiz-Khān confided the administration of hunting to his eldest son Jūchī[8]. |

416 The organization of the civil administration was a matter of greater difficulty. The Mongols of Chingiz-Khān were undoubtedly on a very low cultural plane even as compared to their fellow-tribes, the Keraits and Naimans. Consequently, immediately after the unification of Mongolia, and before the subjugation of the cultured provinces, the necessity of borrowing from the subject people became manifest. The first representatives of civilization at the court of Chingiz-Khān (even before 1203) of whom any account has come down to us were Muslim merchants[9]; of the degree of their influence on Chingiz-Khān

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, VI, 98, 123.

[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 83, 203. Cf. also Plano Carpini's account of the worshipping of Chingiz-Khān's spirit by bowing to the South (*Sobranie puteshestvii k tataram*, St. P., 1825, ed. D. Yazykov, p. 84; Latin edition (*Recueil de voyages, &c.*, IV, 1839), p. 621: not in Rockhill's trans. for the Hakluyt Soc.).

[3] *Ibid*, IV, 116–17, 124.

[4] In one case Prof. Berezin accepts the reading سوتوكرسون and interprets it as the Mongol sutukersen = exquisite, clever (*Trudy*, V, 195, 297; VII, 260); in other places (*ibid.*, XV; Persian text, p. 198, 199, 205, 209) he reads سونكوسون and connects this word with the Turkish سونك = after (*ibid.*, XV, 177).

[5] Juwaynī, I, 24.

[6] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, I, 404–6.

[7] Juwaynī, I, 20.

[8] *Ibid*, I. 29.

[9] *Texts*, p. 159 (Kitāb Mu'izz al-Ansāb fī shajarat Salāṭīn Mughal): *Zapiski*, X, 112

we know nothing, but it is possible that they took some part in working out the organization of the guard. The transaction of business in writing started in the kingdom of Chingiz-Khān after the subjugation of the Naimans (1206); the Uighūr Tashatun, keeper of the seal of the Naiman Khān, occupied the same office at the court of Chingiz-Khān, and was also commissioned to teach the Khān's sons reading and writing, in the Uighūr script[1]. Juwaynī[2] says that the Tatars had no alphabet; therefore the Mongol youths had to learn reading and writing from the Uighūrs, in order subsequently to draw up the code of the Yāsā, *i.e.* the Mongolian customary law. As regards the Khān's seal, our historical information indicates that it was of two kinds, to designate which the Turkish terms al-ṭamgha (red seal) and kok-ṭamgha (blue seal) were used. The first term is met with very often[3]; the blue seal was apparently used only on the most solemn occasions, mainly on documents addressed to members of the Khān's family[4].

Thus the first teachers of the Mongols and the first state officials in the Mongol empire were Uighūrs; subsequently Uighūr officials entered the civilized countries along with the Mongol conquerors and both in China and in the Muslim lands competed with success against the much more highly educated natives. There can be no doubt that civilization began to percolate very early into the country on the slopes of the T'ien-shan, and that from various sides, from China, India (Buddhism), and Turkestan (Manichaeans[5] | and 417
Nestorians); but the absence of security from external attacks did not allow the Uighūrs to profit by the lessons of their teachers and develop a durable national culture. The course of the external history of the Uighūrs, and in particular the growth of the Uighūr culture, have as yet been little elucidated; recent archaeological discoveries[6] have shed some light, but a definite understanding of their significance will only be possible after

[1] Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, ii, 61.

[2] Juwaynī, i, 17.

[3] Amongst others already in Jūzjānī (*Ṭabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1158).

[4] For an instance of the use of the blue seal see *Trudy*, v, 40; vii, 51. Apparently the person spoken of in this case brought the document from the Great Khān addressed to the Īlkhān Abāghā and according to the instructions contained in it received an appointment at the court.

[5] It is well known that the Uighūrs on the Orkhon met Manichaean teachers in Lo-yang in China in 762: see Chavannes and Pelliot, *J.A.*, 11, i, p. 177 sq. (= *Un Traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine*, p 201).

[6] *Nachrichten über die von der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgerustete Expedition nach Turfan*, Heft 1. St. P. 1899. For later discoveries, cf. my paper "Stand und Aufgaben der Geschichte-wissenschaft in Turkestan" (*Die Geisteswissenschaften*, 1914, pp. 1075–80) where several reference works are quoted. A fuller list of the literature of the subject may be found in Sir Aurel Stein's *Serindia*, introd., pp. xxv sq., where, however, Le Coq's works have been omitted. So far as I know, the scattered information on the Uighūrs which may be gleaned from the newest discoveries have not yet been made the subject of an exhaustive monograph.

a thorough investigation of the written sources, mainly Chinese. We shall confine ourselves therefore to setting forth what we know of the condition of the country in the thirteenth century. According to 'Awfī[1] the Qarā-Khiṭāys and Uighūrs in part worshipped the sun, and in part were Christians; in general all religions except the Jewish were to be found among them, but the Uighūrs for the most part were Christians. The organization of the Uighūr kingdom was so well known to 'Awfī's contemporaries that to discuss it in detail seemed superfluous. The same author[2] in one of the anecdotes related by him speaks of the Uighūrs as a peaceful nation, possessing no warlike virtues. The prevalence of Christianity among them is vouched for by Plano Carpini[3] as well as 'Awfī; but it is doubtful whether Christians were more numerous than Buddhists among the Uighūrs. The word *bakhshi* (Sanskrit original *bhikshu*), which was originally applied only to Buddhist hermits, assumed in the Mongol states the meaning of "writer, official"[4] as well, from which it may be inferred that the representatives of the Uighūr cultured class in the service of the Mongols belonged for the most part to the Buddhist priesthood. Some details on the Uighūr Buddhists are given by Rubruk[5], according to whom they formed "as it were a special sect" amidst idolators (*quasi secta divisa ab aliis*). In praying, the Uighūrs turned their faces to the north, folded their hands, knelt down and bowed their foreheads to their hands; there were figures of dead persons in their temples, and bells were used in divine service. |

418 Rubruk quotes the Buddhist prayer Om Mani Padme hum. According to Ch'ang-Ch'un[6] the Buddhist monks in Uighuria wore red clothing, and the same traveller also saw Taoists in Uighuria, which to the Archimandrite Palladius seems very improbable[7]. The Manichaeans, who in the ninth and tenth centuries are mentioned in Uighuria together with the Buddhists both in Muslim[8] and in Chinese[9] sources, had probably ceased

[1] *Texts*, p. 99. [2] *Ibid*, p. 95.

[3] *Sobranie puteshestvii*, p. 128; Hakluyt Society, Extra Series, vol. I (1903), pp. 69, 103, and 144.

[4] Compare Budagov's dictionary, *s.v.* بخشي.

[5] *Recueil de voyages et de mémoires publié par la Société de Géographie*, T. IV, Paris, 1839, pp. 283–7.

[6] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 300 · not in Bretschneider's *Mediaeval Researches*, i. Cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, *J.A.*, II, I, 317 (= *Tr. Man.*, 279), where the text is translated "habit brun".

[7] *Ibid*, iv. 406: Chavannes and Pelliot suggest (*loc. cit.*) that the alleged Taoists were in fact Manichaeans.

[8] *Zapiski*, VIII, 18, especially the text in Yāqūt, I, 840. On the Buddhists also Bīrūnī (*Chronology*, trans. Sachau, p. 189).

[9] Especially in the journey of Wang-yen-té (W. Radloff, *Das Kudatku Bilik*, Theil I, p. lxix; *ibid.*, *K voprosu ob uigurakh*, St. P., 1893, p. 100. Radloff mistakenly refers this information to the Christians). The same text in Chavannes and Pelliot, *J.A.*, II, I. 308 (= *Tr. Man.*, 270).

to exist by the thirteenth century, but traces of their teaching were preserved both in the Buddhist and in the Christian creeds. Rubruk had a dispute with a representative of Buddhism, who had arrived from China, in which this Buddhist specially insisted on the doctrine of two principles, a good and an evil, and on the transmigration of souls; on this occasion Rubruk notes that they all hold the Manichaean heresy on the two principles and on the transmigration of the souls of animals. Even one of the more educated Nestorian priests asked Rubruk whether another world existed for animals, where they would be free from enforced labour[1]. The latter idea, it is true, may have been borrowed by the Nestorians from the Buddhists, independently of the Manichaeans; we find more definite signs of Manichaean influence in the cosmogony of the Armenian Sergius (who had given himself out as a hermit at the Mongol court), who asked Rubruk if it was not true "that the devil on the first day brought earth from the four quarters of the world and moulded man's body from clay but God breathed spirit into him?"[2] Sergius, who was devoid of all book-learning, undoubtedly heard this doctrine in Central Asia. The Uighūr Buddhists, like the Mongolian Buddhists of the present day, called their holy books *noms*[3] | and 419
there is no doubt that this Greek word (borrowed by the Syrians) was brought into Uighuria by the Manichaeans.

There was not, so far as is known, any religious antagonism between the Uighūr Buddhists and Christians, although the Nestorians took measures to prevent their being confused with the Buddhists: with this aim in view they did not use bells, nor fold their hands in prayer, but stretched them in front of them on a level with the chest[4]. In any case the national feeling was stronger than the religious, and the Uighūr Christian Chingay protected the Buddhist Kurkuz because he was an Uighūr[5].

[1] *Recueil des voyages*, IV, 356–8.

[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 332.

[3] Radloff, *Das Kudatku Bilik*, p. XLVII; *ibid.*, *K voprosu ob uigurakh*, p. 60; Juwaynī, I, 44. The term "nomists" (نومبان) has never existed; the readings of the manuscript show that the word thus rendered is توينان "toyins", the name which, as is well known, is still given to the Buddhist priesthood of noble birth in Mongolia at the present day. In the thirteenth century this term was used over a wide area (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1157). The reading توبنان has also been adopted in the printed ed. of Juwaynī, *loc. cit* 'Awfī (*Texts*, p. 83) relates from Shaqīq b. Ibrāhīm Balkhī, who lived at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries, an account of Shaqīq's meeting in Turkestan with a Buddhist priest who wore a red dress, and in this account it is stated that these priests were called toyins in the Khiṭāy language (probably the language of the Qarā-Khiṭāys), and in India were known as sthavira. (For the explanation of this word I am indebted to S. F. Oldenburg.)

[4] *Recueil de voyages*, IV, 283–4.

[5] Juwaynī, II, 228. Prof. Pelliot (*T'oung Pao*, 2me S, XV, p. 634) thinks that Kurkuz was probably a Christian because of his name, which appears to be a mutilation of George, but we have the testimony of Juwaynī (II, 242), whose father had been

The degree of religious toleration of the Uighūr Christians is also evident from the fact that their head went out to meet the Taoist hermit Ch'ang-Ch'un[1]. On the other hand, both Buddhists[2] and Christians[3] were implacable enemies of the Muslims although, if Rubruk[4] is to be believed, the Nestorians imitated some Muslim customs; they held Friday as a holiday, and performed ablutions on entering church. It is very likely that this enmity is to be explained not so much by religious motives as by rivalry at first for commercial advantages, and subsequently for those of the state service.

On the whole religion had no great influence on the Uighūrs and hardly contributed to the raising of their moral and intellectual level. The custom of marrying the father's widow[5] was still maintained among the Uighūrs, but has now under the influence of Buddhism disappeared among the Mongols[6]. The custom of killing the aged by giving them too greasy food was observed not only by the heathen but also by "impious Christians."[7] The Christian Chingay, who was subsequently
420 at the head | of the civil administration of the empire, in his conversation with Ch'ang-Ch'un gave evidence of gross superstition which evoked nothing but disdainful silence[8] from the Taoist hermit. The decline of their martial spirit is fully accounted for by the conversion of the Uighūrs into a commercial nation, although, it is true, some influence may have been exerted in this direction by the development of Buddhist and Christian asceticism, which had, everywhere and always, greater success amongst the masses of the people than the dogmatic side of religion.

We have little knowledge of the character of the teaching of the Uighūr pedagogues. The Nestorian pedagogues acquainted their pupils with the outlines of Christianity, with the Gospels, and with the symbols of the faith;[9] it is very probable that the Buddhist pedagogues also explained the principles of their religion. Chingiz-Khān and his immediate successors, however,

personally acquainted with Kurkuz, that he was an idolater (بت پرست) and became a Muslim towards the end of his life.

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 301, 407; Bretschneider, *Med. Res.* i, 66.

[2] Radloff, *Das Kudatku Bilik*, Theil i, p. xlviii; *ibid.*, *K voprosu ob uigurakh*, p. 61; Juwaynī, i, 44.

[3] Juwaynī, i, 214.

[4] *Recueil de voyages*, iv, 293; Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes*, S. 142.

[5] Juwaynī, ii, 226. [6] *Trudy*, iv, 246.

[7] *Sobranie Puteshestvii*, pp. 98-100; cf. *Trudy*, iv, 254.

[8] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 296; *Med Res.*, i, 61. Ch'ang-Ch'un shortly afterwards expressed his opinion on the dread of "goblins" as follows: "Unclean goblins and demons, when they meet a good man, flee far from him. Thus it is written in the books, and who is ignorant of it? It behoves not a Taoist to entertain such thoughts." (*Works*, pp. 298-9; *Med. Res.*, i, 64).

[9] *Recueil de voyages*, iv, 293; Patkanov, *Istoriya mongolov po armyanskim istochnikam*, i, 11.

did not wholly submit to the influence of their intellectual advisers, but saw in them no more than tools for the realization of their aims. The first result of the adoption of the Uighūr script was the codification of the Mongol customary law (Yāsā), which together with the sayings of Chingiz-Khān (bilik) long remained the highest authority for Mongol sovereigns (cf. above, pp. 41–2). Of the intimates of Chingiz-Khān the earliest to avail himself of Uighūr education was apparently Shiki-Qutuqu-noyon, a Tatar by extraction, who had been adopted as a boy by the wife of Chingiz-Khān[1]. The latter entrusted him with giving decisions on legal matters, giving him, according to the heroic cycle, the following instructions: "I commission thee to judge and punish in matters of theft and fraud; whosoever deserves death, him punish with death; whosoever deserves punishment, punish him; thou wilt decide matters touching the division of property amongst the people. Inscribe the decisions on black boards so that in later time others may not alter them."[2] The term to denote a judge | (yarghuchi) is not found in the heroic 421
cycle (*i.e.* in the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi*). Subsequently the custodian of the yāsā was Jaghatāy[3], the second son of Chingiz-Khān.

The office of "Great Bakhshi," *i.e.* head of the civil administration in any particular district, was designated by the Chinese term taishi[4]. In the lifetime of Chingiz-Khān the title of taishi was borne by the head of the Mongol civil authority in in China, a Jurchit[5] by birth. The commanders of the Qarā-Khiṭāy and Jurchit[5] auxiliaries bore the title of daishi, which, according to Rashīd ad-Dīn[6], meant "Commander of a tümen" (division of 10,000 men), but there is no doubt that in this case we have the same word taishi.

In spite of his acquaintance with men of culture, Chingiz-Khān remained a firm Shamanist, and on organizing his military and civil administration he also appointed a man to the office of biki. The name biki existed long before the time of Chingiz-Khān and probably designated the chief priest, the highest religious authority. The oldest member of the Barin tribe, who was appointed to this office, received instructions to this effect: "Ride on a white horse, dress in white raiment, and in public sit in the highest place; choose good year and moon, and according to the deliberation let them respect and pay heed,"

[1] *Trudy*, v, 58; vii, 74; xv, 136.

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 115. According to Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, v, 59; vii, 75) he faithfully fulfilled this duty, was distinguished by impartiality in examinations and attributed no importance to confessions made under the influence of fear; his judgements remained as models for subsequent times.

[3] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, ii, 100; Juwaynī, i, 29.

[4] *Trudy*, v, 143; vii, 190; xv, 138, Persian text, p. 207.

[5] *Ibid.*, iv, 223.

[6] *Ibid.*, xv, 143, Persian text, p. 214.

i.e. according to the interpretation of the Archimandrite Palladius, "As thou decidest, let this decision be respected and heeded."[1] The same word biki is met with in the titles of some sovereigns, *e.g.* those of the Mergīts[2] and the Oirats[3].

Beside such a personality as Chingiz-Khān, his relatives of course enjoyed no sort of authority and could be no more than agents for carrying out the will of the gifted head of the Empire; nevertheless Chingiz-Khān followed the national custom, and during his lifetime endowed his sons and other relations with appanages. The first to receive his portion was Jūchī, the eldest
422 son of Chingiz-Khān, when | in 1207[4] and 1208[5] the "forest nations" were subdued, who occupied the country between the Selenga and the Yenisei and the basin of the latter. Jūchī made himself master of "all the peoples living in the forests from the race of Shibir to the south" and his father gave these peoples to him[6]. Rashīd ad-Dīn[7] locates the Ibir-Shibir country to the N.E. of the Kirghiz country, from which it was separated by the Angara. Mongol custom probably required not only that the original possessions of the father should pass to the youngest son, but also that the remoteness of each son's appanage should correspond to his age. Jūchī, as the eldest son, received the most distant appanage; after the extension of the Empire he and his descendants were given possession of all the Mongol conquests in the extreme north-west "as far as the hoofs of the Tatar horses had reached[8]." Rashīd ad-Dīn[9] locates Jūchī's ordu (yurt) "in the neighbourhood of the Irtysh." According to the testimony of Plano Carpini[10] it was precisely this part of Jūchī's territories which, contrary to the custom, passed to his eldest son Ordū. The modern tradition according to which Jūchī's grave is situated in the basin of the Sary-Su, near the river Saraili, somewhat north of the Ters-Kenderlik stream[11], hardly deserves credence.

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 122–3, 228–9. The same person is probably mentioned in Rashīd ad-Dīn, who erroneously takes the word biki as a proper name (*Trudy*, v, 198).

[2] *Trudy*, v, 72; vii, 92.

[3] *Ibid*, v, 79; vii, 101; *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 131; the word biki is probably not synonymous with the title bige or bigi given to princesses (*Trudy*, v, 100–101; vii, 127 sq.; *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 228).

[4] The heroic cycle (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 141–2) and Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 9, 112–13) refer the subjugation of the Kirghiz to this year.

[5] In this year the Oirats were subdued (*Trudy*, xv, 10).

[6] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 132.

[7] *Trudy*, v, 130; vii, 168. The term Ibir-Shibir (from which the name Siberia is derived) is met with also in Chinese history (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 235; *Med. Res.*, ii, 37).

[8] Juwaynī, i, 31.

[9] MS. Publ. Lib. v, 3, 1, f. 187: درحدود اردیش. In MS. As. Mus. a 566 (f. 202 b) the words وکوههای التان are added. In Blochet's ed. (p. 131) التای.

[10] *Sobranie puteshestvii*, p. 28; Hakluyt Soc. ed., pp, 123, 167.

[11] *Trudy*, x, 307–8 (text from the 'Abdullāh-nāmah of Ḥāfiẓ-Tānish).

We have no information as to when Chingiz-Khān's two other sons, Jaghatāy and Uguday, received their appanages. The oldest information about their appanages is found in Ch'ang-Ch'un, who travelled through this district in 1221, and on his return journey in 1223. Jaghatāy's ordu was at this time south of the Ili[1]; nothing is said of Uguday's ordu, but the account of the road which he had made through the southern Altai[2] shows that he also made his authority felt | in the district 423
forming his appanage. Juwaynī[3] states that in his father's life-time Uguday's yurt was situated within the confines of Emil and Qobuq, and it was from the same locality[4] that Uguday arrived at the qurultay in 1229. Rashīd ad-Dīn's statement[5] regarding the place of Uguday's burial shows that the basin of the Upper Irtysh was also incorporated in his yurt.

We have seen (p. 365) that in 1211 Mongol forces had already reached Semiryechye on the west, and had united the northern part of this province to the Mongol empire; but in the same year the war with China began, which compelled Chingiz-Khān to direct all his forces to that side, and to leave the Naimans and Mergīts who had fled westwards in peace for the time being. The victories which Chingiz-Khān won in China, crowned by the capture of Peking in 1215[6], enhanced his reputation more than the union of the Mongolian tribes. The wealth of China had always attracted the Muslims, and it was natural that, after the victory over the gūrkhān, the Khwārazm-shāh, like Ḥajjāj and his governors in early times (see above, p. 185), should begin to dream of the conquest of China (of course after the end of the struggle with Kūchluk). At this period rumours reached him that the Mongol conqueror had forestalled him. His desire to verify this rumour and to receive accurate information on the active forces of the conqueror was, according to Jūzjānī[7], the reason for the dispatch of a Khorezmian embassy to Chingiz-Khān. The leader of the embassy was Bahā ad-Dīn Rāzī, from whom the historian obtained his information. The envoys reached Chingiz-Khān

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 337; *Med. Res.*, I, 99.
[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 296; *Med. Res.*, I, 62.
[3] Juwaynī, i, 31, where the reading قوباق has been adopted, instead of قوباق.
[4] *Ibid.*, f. 63: از ایمیل وقوباق (the printed edition, I, 145, has again قوناق). In the Chinese history Hobogo (Iakinth, *Istoriyah chetyrekh khanov*, p. 148) and Ho-bo (*Med. Res.*, I, 161, from the Yuan-shi). Prof. Veselovsky's statement (*Zapiski*, VIII, 162) that Uguday received Uighuria is not confirmed in our sources.
[5] *Texts*, p. 122; not in Blochet's edition.
[6] Thus according to the Chinese sources (*Trudy*, IV, 153); Rashīd ad-Dīn (*ibid.*, XV, 27, 114) dates it as early as the year of the hen (1213).
[7] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 270–2, 963–6.

when Peking had already fallen, but they found him still in China (Chingiz-Khān returned to Mongolia in 1216)[1]. The son of Altan-Khān, *i.e.* the emperor of the Kin dynasty, was at that
424 time a prisoner in the hands of the Mongols; | signs of terrible devastation were everywhere visible; the bones of the slaughtered formed whole mountains; the soil was greasy with human fat; and the rotting of the bodies brought on an illness from which some of Bahā ad-Dīn's companions died. At the gate of Peking lay a vast heap of bones, and the envoys were told that on the capture of the town 60,000 (?) girls threw themselves from the walls to avoid falling into the hands of the Mongols.

Chingiz-Khān received the envoys graciously, and ordered them to inform the Khwārazm-Shāh that he considered him the ruler of the West, as he himself was the ruler of the East, and desired that there should be peace and friendship between them, and that merchants should be free to travel from one country to another. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of these words; Chingiz-Khān hardly dreamed of world-wide dominion in those days. The union of the nomadic tribes living in Mongolia always had as a result their invasion of China, but prior to the Mongol period only two nomad empires, those of the Huns and of the sixth-century Turks, had embraced both the eastern and western parts of Central Asia. In all the other cases the nomads made their appearance in the western countries only after they had been squeezed out of Mongolia. On the other hand, trade with the settled peoples had always been of great importance to the nomads, mainly for articles of clothing, while in the reign of Chingiz-Khān, probably in consequence of the military operations in Northern China and the devastation of this country, even grain was imported into Mongolia "from beyond the northern mountains," perhaps from the banks of the Yenisei, where according to Ch'ang-Ch un wheat[2] was sown, and according to Rashīd ad-Dīn there were "many towns and villages."[3] The middlemen in this trade were the "trading barbarians of the Western countries[4];" as is well known even the trade between China and Mongolia[5] was in the hands of Uighūrs and Muslims. In this case the interests of Chingiz-Khān fully coincided with those of the Muslim capitalists.

There was not the same harmony between Muḥammad's political ambitions and the interests of the merchants of his kingdom. In dispatching an embassy to Chingiz-Khān the Khwārazm-shāh only desired to obtain trustworthy information

[1] *Trudy*, iv, 30; Iakinth, *Ist. chet. Khanov*, pp. 83–4.
[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 339; *Med. Res.*, i, 101.
[3] *Trudy*, v, 130, vii, 168.
[4] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 291–2; *Med. Res.*, i, 58.
[5] *Zapiski*, x, 108 (from Meng-hung).

about this conqueror, in whom he saw | a dangerous rival, and 425
had no view to the commercial interests of his subjects, although these were very considerable. Trade with distant countries like Russia and China brought enormous profits to the merchants, but was attended with considerable risk, as goods in the East were always taken on credit; hence a temporary suspension of trade caused the merchants heavy losses. During the expedition of one of the Saljūqid sultans against Trebizond the suspension of trade with Greece and Russia greatly injured the Muslim merchants[1]. When in the year of the battle on the Kalka river "the route of communication was stopped" with Southern Russia, and for a short time the import of "the skins of foxes[2], wolves, beavers, and other merchandise" ceased, this fact was of such importance to the Muslims that it is specially noted by Ibn al-Athīr[3]. The armistice between the Khwārazm-shāh and the Qarā-Khiṭāys (probably in 1209[4], see above p. 361) was immediately followed by the dispatch of a trading caravan to Eastern Turkestan; with this caravan the poet Sa'dī[5] visited Kāshghar. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the overland trade with China was of still greater importance than formerly, as the sea trade was rendered precarious by the accident of a dispute between the rulers of two ports in the Persian Gulf, Ormuz and Kīsh, each of whom in every possible way prevented merchants from setting out from the port belonging to the other[6]. On the other hand, after Muhammad's campaigns against the Qipchāqs and the inclusion of the northern part of Semiryechye in the Mongol Empire, the Khwārazm-shāh's kingdom marched with that of Chingiz-Khān, while both conquerors, especially the latter, were solicitous for the maintenance of security in their territories. Under these conditions the merchants of Muhammad's dominions were naturally led to make an effort to penetrate into Mongolia by the northern route, avoiding Eastern Turkestan, which belonged to Kūchluk.

Detailed accounts of this caravan are given by Juwaynī[7]. | It 426
was led by three merchants, Aḥmad Khujandī, the "son of the amīr Ḥusayn" (or Ḥasan)[8], and Aḥmad Bālchīch (?), who took with them fabrics (probably silken) embroidered with gold,

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 160.

[2] On the word burtasi see Jacob, *Welche Handelsartikel bezogen die Araber des Mittelalters aus den Nordisch-Baltischen Landern*, Berlin, 1891, S. 24–5.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 254; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 28.

[4] According to E. G. Browne (*Lit. Hist. Pers.*, II, 527) about 1210.

[5] *Gulistān*, V, 16 (edition of Platts, p. 111).

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 199.

[7] I, 58 sqq. This account is included in Schefer's *Chrestomathie persane* (II. 106 sq.). Cf. also D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, I, 204 sq.

[8] Ibn 'Arabshāh (ماكهة الخلفاء, p. 186) says "'Abdallāh, son of the amīr Ḥasan al-Jandī."

cottons and pieces of Zandanchī cloth (cf. above p. 227). It is not known whether they found Chingiz-Khān in Mongolia or in China; it is very probable that the merchants took advantage of Bahā ad-Dīn's embassy to accompany him. Chingiz-Khān was at first moved to anger by Bālchīch's impudence in asking three golden bālishes[1] for fabrics which had cost him from ten to twenty dīnārs, and ordered him to be shown fabrics kept in his ordu so that he should understand that such things were no novelty to the Mongols, after which Bālchīch's wares were given up to plunder. Taught by this experience his companions refused to name a price for their goods, and stated that they had brought them as a present to the Khān. Chingiz-Khān, mollified by this speech, ordered the merchants to be paid at the rate of one gold bālish for each piece of gold embroidered stuff, and one silver bālish for each two pieces of cotton and zandanchi, and the same price was paid to Bālchīch for his goods. Juwaynī observes that at this period the Mongols showed honour to the Muslims, and with this object put up tents of white felt for them; it was only subsequently that the Muslims, by their own fault, were deprived of this consideration.

In reply to the Khwārazm-shāh's embassy Chingiz-Khān also dispatched envoys and a trading caravan to the West. According to Nasawī's account[2] the Khorezmian Mahmūd, 'Alī-Khwājah of Bukhārā and Yūsuf Kankā of Utrār[3] were at
427 the head of the embassy. Amongst the gifts | intended for the sultan was a nugget of gold[4] from the mountains of China as large as a camel's hump, which was carried in a cart, together with other ingots of precious metals, pieces of jade, and horns of the khutuww (see above, p. 272), musk, and finally fabrics which, according to Nasawī, were called targhū[5], and prepared from the hair of white camels (?); each piece of this stuff cost fifty dīnārs and more. In the spring of 1218 the Khwārazm-shāh received this embassy in Transoxania[6]. The envoys told

[1] On the value of the bālish there are contradictory references; cf. Quatremère, *Histoire des Mongols*, pp. 320–21; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1110. According to Juwaynī (cited in Quatremère) the bālish was worth 75 dīnārs of that period.

[2] Nesawi, texte, pp. 33–4, trad, pp. 57–9.

[3] The same persons are mentioned in Abu'l-Ghāzī (trad. par Desmaisons, p 105), who however speaks of the embassy of Mahmūd-Yalavāch separately and ascribes to the latter the conversation during the night with the Sultan, and the conclusion of a treaty. As the word Yalavāch signifies "envoy" in Turkish, it is most probable that Mahmūd-Yalavāch is identical with the Khorezmian Mahmūd of Nasawī (thus in Mirkhond, *Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, p. 99), and that the statement in the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi* (*Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 149) that Yalavāch entered Chingiz-Khān's service after the fall of Gurgānj is erroneous.

[4] For this see Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 966).

[5] Among the historians, especially Rashīd ad-Dīn, the word targhū means pieces of cloth generally, especially those presented to a sovereign.

[6] According to D'Ohsson (I, 201) in Bukhārā, which is quite probable, but there is no definite mention of this town in our sources.

him that Chingiz-Khān, having heard of his victories and his power, offered to make a treaty of peace with him, and to place him "on a level with the dearest of his sons;" he was sure that the Khwārazm-shāh also had heard of the Mongol victories, especially of the conquest of China, and of the riches of the provinces subject to him; therefore the establishment of peace and of safe trade relations between both kingdoms would be advantageous for both sides. The historian does not relate Muḥammad's answer in the public audience. On the following night the Khwārazm-shāh ordered the Khorezmian Maḥmūd to be summoned apart from the other envoys, and had a conversation with him, but we do not know whether others were present at the interview, and from whom Nasawī learned the tenour of the conversation. The Khwārazm-shāh first of all intimated to Maḥmūd that he, as a Khorezmian, must serve the interests of his native country, tell him the whole truth about Chingiz-Khān, and subsequently remain as the Khwārazm-shāh's spy at the court of the Khān. For this he was promised a reward, and as a pledge of the fulfilment of the promise the sultan then gave him a precious stone. Maḥmūd expressed his assent from fear of the sultan. After this the Khwārazm-shāh asked if it were true that Chingiz-Khān had conquered China and the "city of Ṭamghāch," and the envoy replied confirming the rumour. The Khwārazm-shāh observed that not even these conquests gave an infidel the right to call him, the Khwārazm-shāh, the master of a great empire, his son, *i.e.* vassal. Fearing the anger of the sultan the envoy hastened to reply that the armies of Chingiz-Khān could not compare in numbers with the armed forces of the Khwārazm-shāh. Muḥammad was satisfied with this, and consented to make a treaty of peace with Chingiz-Khān. |

There is no mention here of trade relations; from Nasawī's 428
further statements[1] it may be concluded that the envoys returned to Chingiz-Khān, who was very pleased with the treaty, and that only after this was a trading caravan dispatched, when the latter was given a document with the signature of the sultan (evidently brought by the envoys). There was scarcely time for this, as the Utrār catastrophe also occurred in 1218, and it is more probable that, as in Jūzjānī's account, the caravan left Mongolia simultaneously with the embassy, and arrived at Utrār, the frontier town of Muḥammad's dominions, soon after the envoys' departure from the country. Nasawī gives the names of the four merchants who led the caravan; 'Omar-Khwājah Utrārī, Ḥammāl Marāghī, Fakhr ad-Dīn Dīzakī Bukhārī, and Amīn ad-Dīn Harawī. According to Juwaynī

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 34, trad., pp. 59, 60.

there were in all 450 men in the caravan, all of them Muslims; with them, as Jūzjānī relates, were about 500 camels, laden with merchandise, consisting of gold, silver, Chinese silk, targhū stuffs, beaver-skins, sables, and other articles. All these merchants were detained in Utrār as spies by order of the governor Īnālchik, who bore the title of Qāyir-Khān[1] (Nasawī calls him Īnāl-Khān), a relative of Turkān-Khātūn (according to Nasawī the son of the sultan's maternal uncle). Our authorities contradict one another on the degree of responsibility borne by Muḥammad for this. According to Nasawī the governor acted solely from cupidity in his desire to seize the merchants' wares; when he informed the sultan that the merchants were behaving like spies, Muḥammad only sent him an order to detain them. It was the governor who determined on the massacre on his own initiative, and all the treasures of the murdered men were transferred to him; it was not till afterwards that the sultan was obliged to condone his governor's action, as he could not enter on a struggle with the military party. Ibn al-Athīr's account[2] is that the governor only acquainted the sultan with the arrival of the merchants and the amount of their merchandise. The sultan immediately ordered them to be killed, and their property to be sent to him; the merchandise was sold to the merchants of Bukhārā and Samarqand, and the money realized was appropriated by the sultan. According to Juwaynī, Īnālchik was
429 infuriated by the conduct of one of the merchants, a Hindu by extraction, who had known the governor in former times, and now began to call him familiarly by his name, without giving him the title of Khān. Personal irritation and the desire to seize the merchants' property induced the governor to detain them, and call them spies in a letter to the sultan sent to 'Irāq (?)[3], and it was the latter who ordered their execution and the pillage of their property. Jūzjānī[4] speaks of the Utrār massacre in two places, and in both cases explains it by the cupidity of the viceroy, but remarks that the latter received permission from the sultan; in one case he adds that the treasures were sent to Muḥammad. As may be seen, not one of our sources says that the merchants by their conduct gave any ground for complaint. The action of the Hindu retailed by Juwaynī certainly plays no part; in all probability the merchants fell victims to the governor's cupidity and the sultan's suspicion.

[1] In Jūzjānī (pp. 272 and 966) Qadir-Khān.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 239; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 5.

[3] Juwaynī, I. 61. In his history of the Khwārazm-shāhs (II, 99) Juwaynī also says that Muḥammad received Qāyir-Khān's message as he was returning from 'Irāq, according to Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī (*Ta'rīkh-i Guzidah*, p. 496) at Hamadān. But this is not compatible with other accounts, especially the detailed account given by Nasawī.

[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 272, 967.

As we have seen, Muḥammad dispatched an embassy to Chingiz-Khān on a pure mission of investigation, and with no intention of entering into commercial relations with Mongolia; it was natural therefore that he should suspect the numerous caravan sent by the Mongols of having the same purpose. It is difficult to say whether Nasawī is correct in stating that Muḥammad did not give a categorical command to kill the envoys, but in any case there is no doubt that he divided the spoils with his governor, and that there actually were articles which had been sold by the sultan in the hands of merchants of Bukhārā. Events which occurred in Bukhārā were well known to Ibn al-Athīr, who had received his information from a faqīh captured by the Mongols at Bukhārā, who subsequently escaped from them at Samarqand[1]. It is very likely that the sale of the merchandise to the merchants (with a profit for them) was partly due to the desire to compensate them for the cessation of trade with the nomads. As regards the number of those who perished, Juwaynī says that the whole caravan was exterminated (*i.e.* 450 men) except one man (according to Jūzjānī a camel driver), who succeeded in saving himself by flight, and carried the terrible news to Chingiz-Khān[2]. |

In this case also Chingiz-Khān gave proof of his invariable 430
restraint and self-control. Ibn Kafraj Bughrā[3] (whose father had formerly been in the service of Takash), accompanied by two Tatars, was sent as his envoy to the Khwārazm-shāh, with instructions to convey his sovereign's protest to the Khwārazm-shāh for his treacherous action, and to demand the surrender of Inālchik. The Khwārazm-shāh not only refused to meet this demand, but ordered the envoy to be killed; his companions were liberated after their beards had been shaved off[4]. Chingiz-Khān's expedition into the Khwārazm-shāh's territories was thus rendered inevitable. Contrary to the view put forward by A. Müller[5], we see no reason for assuming that the collision between the two states was accelerated by any outside influence. The effort made by Chingiz-Khān to enter into relations with the empire of the Khwārazm-shāh is fully explained by the commercial interests of his influential Muslim advisers; if his envoys, on their sovereign's order, called the Khwārazm-shāh "the son of Chingiz-Khān," this could hardly have been done with the intention of provoking Muḥammad, and even the latter did not put this forward as a *casus belli*. We can scarcely,

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 242; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 13.

[2] According to the Mongol narrative (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 143) the Muslims killed the Mongol envoy Ukhun and others, 100 men in all.

[3] On him, Nesawi, texte, pp. 34–5, trad., pp. 60–61.

[4] Thus in Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 237; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 7) according to Nasawī all three envoys were killed.

[5] *Der Islam*, ii, 205.

therefore, attach any importance to the statement that the Mongols were called in by the Caliph Nāṣir against the Khwārazm-shāh. Only in Mīrkhwānd[1] do we find a detailed account of the Caliph's embassy; in the thirteenth century this report existed only in the form of vague rumours[2], which, in view of the inimical relations between the Caliph and the Khwārazm-shāh, could not fail to arise. In the same way in Europe the adherents of the Pope maintained that Frederick II had summoned the Mongols, and the partisans of the Emperor accused the Pope himself of the same thing[3]. The Caliph was in fact seeking allies amongst the eastern neighbours of the Khwārazm-shāh, and with this object sent envoys first to the Ghūrids, and afterwards to Kūchluk; but there is no foundation for the supposition that he sought the co-operation of the sovereign of Eastern Asia. The Khwārazm-shāh's action, even
431 from the point of view of contemporary | international law, gave Chingiz-Khān more than sufficient reason for declaring war, and no sort of instigation was necessary. A Mongol invasion of the Khwārazm-shāh's territories would, it is true, have been undertaken, perhaps somewhat later, even without this reason. When the Mongols had definitely established their authority in the steppes bordering the Khwārazm-shāh's kingdom, they could not but become aware of its internal weakness, and under such circumstances a nomad invasion of the much richer lands of the civilized peoples was inevitable. At this time, however, Chingiz-Khān was not yet aware of this weakness, and, as is shown by his preparations for war, he had a very high opinion of the military strength of the Khwārazm-shāh. Under such conditions the Mongols would probably have been satisfied for some time with peaceful commercial relations, if Muḥammad had given his assent to this. The Khwārazm-shāh had already closed the trade route from Turkestan, according to Ibn al-Athīr[4], during the war with Kūchluk.

In preparing to take vengeance on the Khwārazm-shāh, Chingiz-Khān had first to finish with Kūchluk, and Jebe-noyon[5] was sent against him with a considerable force[6]. The Mongol

[1] Mirkhond, *Djenghiz Khan*, pp. 102–4.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 287; cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 211.

[3] L. Cahun, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie, Turcs et Mongols des origines à 1405*, Paris, 1896, pp. 356–7. For the accusation against the Emperor see also *Purchas his pilgrims*, new ed., xi, 181.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 236; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 5. The passage refers to the suspension of the sale of cloth and other goods to the nomads, not vice versa, as is mistakenly stated in the translation.

[5] On the spelling of this name comp. P. Pelliot in *J.A.*, ii, xv, 172 sq.

[6] The figure of 20,000 was probably taken by D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 172) from Nasawī, whose account as we have seen (p. 369) does not refer to the war with Kūchluk. Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, v, 127; vii, 164) contains the information that the Uighūr Īdīqūt took part in the campaign with a small force (300 men), the same in Juwaynī (i, 33).

general with great skill exploited the religious oppression of Kūchluk in order to seize his kingdom almost without opposition. First of all he established Mongol rule in Almāligh, which at that time was besieged by Kūchluk's armies. The latter by a sudden attack took prisoner Būzār, who had previously concluded an alliance with Chingiz-Khān and married Jūchī's daughter. He did not, however, succeed in capturing Almāligh; the inhabitants bravely defended the town, and the news of the approach of the Mongols caused him to withdraw. On the way he ordered Būzār to be killed. The Mongols entered Almāligh, and transferred the province to Būzār's son Suqnāq-tagīn, who also married Jūchī's daughter. This is the account given by Juwaynī[1]. According to Jamāl Qarshī[2], | Būzār, who had 432
assumed the title of Ṭughrul-Khān, sent his son Suqnāq-tagīn and his daughter Ulūq-khātūn to Chingiz-Khān, and concluded an alliance with the Mongols. Kūchluk, however, was able to seize Būzār as he was hunting and kill him, all of which occurred before Kūckluk's expeditions to Kāshghar, *i.e.* about 1211. After this Kūchluk besieged Almāligh, but Būzār's widow Salbak-Turkān succeeded in defending the town. When the news of Būzār's death reached Chingiz-Khān he dispatched Jebe-noyon with an army to Almāligh, but Jebe found that Kūchluk was no longer in the district of Kulja. Suqnāq-tagīn was not married to Jūchī's daughter Bulghān-bige until the reign of Uguday.

From Ch'ang-Ch'un's account[3] we know that in 1221 there was a Mongol darukhachi, *i.e.* representative of the head of the Empire, in Almāligh as well as the native ruler. According to the Chinese history[4] the following duties were laid, at least in later times, on the darukhachi: (1) Census of the inhabitants; (2) recruitment of an army from the natives; (3) establishment of postal communications; (4) collection of taxes; (5) delivery of tribute to the Court. Thus the darukhachi was both military leader and tax collector; he also furnished information to the central government. So far as is known the darukhachi of Almāligh was the first representative of Mongol rule in the civilized provinces of Central Asia; in Uighuria, so far as may be judged form Ch'ang-Ch'un's account, there was no such representative at this time.

We have no information as to the road by which the Mongols penetrated from the district of Kulja into Kashgaria, and whether a division was dispatched to Semiryechye. In the Chinese history[5] alone there is an account of Ho-sze-mai-li

[1] Juwaynī, i, 57 sq. [2] *Texts*, pp. 135–6, 140.
[3] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 304; *Med. Res.*, i, 70.
[4] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 256.
[5] *Mediaeval Researches*, i, 233.

(probably the Muslim Ismā'īl), who was formerly an intimate of the gūrkhān and governed the towns of Ko-san and Ba-sze-ha (Kāsān and Akhsīkath?[1]), dependent on Gudse-ordo, *i.e.* Balāsāghūn[2]. He went out to meet the Mongol army with the oldest citizens, and made his submission. Jebe reported this to Chingiz-Khān, who ordered Ho-sze-mai-li to join Jebe's advanced guard, *i.e.* to serve as his guide. |

433 Abu'l-Ghāzī[3] alone speaks of a conflict between the armies of Kūchluk and Jebe. Oppert[4] thought to find confirmation of this unsupported, as well as very late, statement in Plano Carpini's[5] account of the battle "in a narrow valley between two mountains," where the Mongols defeated the Naimans and the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and through which Plano Carpini himself passed on the way to Guyuk's ordu. Unfortunately our traveller conveys this information not in the description of his line of march, but in the chapter on the Mongol conquests, which contain, as is well known, many inaccuracies. In view of this we do not know where the field of battle of which he speaks was situated, or whether the nations named by him actually took part in it. According to other accounts Kūchluk fled from the Mongols without giving battle. The above-quoted account concerning Ho-sze-mai-li suggests that the Mongols marched from the Kulja country into Semiryechye, and thence invaded Kashgaria. The capital of Semiryechye, Balāsāghūn, was occupied by them without opposition, as it received from them the name of Gobāligh—*i.e.* "fine city."[6] In Kashgaria, perhaps already in Semiryechye, Jebe published an edict restoring to the Muslims the right of public worship of which they had been deprived by Kūchluk. The inhabitants welcomed the Mongols as liberators from cruel persecution, and before long they had killed Kūchluk's soldiery lodged in their houses. In contrast to Muḥammad, Jebe, thanks to the discipline established by Chingiz-Khān, was able to maintain the role of liberator. The Mongol forces only asked the inhabitants for information about Kūchluk, and did not touch their possessions, so that the Kashgarians from whom Juwaynī[7] obtained this information called

[1] Possibly this part of Farghāna, after its devastation by Muḥammad, was occupied by Muslim subjects of Kūchluk.

[2] *Mediaeval Researches*, i, 18.

[3] Aboul-Ghazi trad. par Desmaisons, p. 102. Evidently Abu'l-Ghāzī understood the verb دوانيدن in Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, vii, 278) in this sense. Elsewhere (*ibid.*, xv, 40, Persian text, p. 62) Rashīd ad-Dīn himself says that Kūchluk fled before even the Mongols had time to begin the battle.

[4] Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes*, S. 160.

[5] *Sobranie puteshestvii*, p. 126; Hakluyt Soc. ed., pp. 69, 102, 143.

[6] *Zapiski*, viii, 30, also x, 226 where Mīrkhwānd (*Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, p. 91) is quoted.

[7] Juwaynī, i, 50.

the advent of the Mongols the mercy of God. Kūchluk was overtaken at Sārykūl[1] and killed; according to the account | in 434
the Chinese history Jebe instructed Ho-sze-mai-li to "go with Kūchluk's head through the territories of the Naimans," after which all the cities submitted to the Mongols. Without touching the possessions of the peaceful inhabitants, however, the Mongols made considerable booty, and Jebe could offer Chingiz-Khān a thousand horses with white muzzles[2], evidently taken from the defeated or fleeing nomads. In the eyes of contemporaries the conquest of Kūchluk's kingdom was an event of such importance that Chingiz-Khān already began to fear that his general in the pride of victory would mutiny[3]. There is no doubt that the news of the conquest of Eastern Turkestan reached the subjects of the sultan and made a profound impression upon them. The Mongol general had without difficulty annihilated the military force which not long before had caused the sultan to evacuate and lay waste fertile and thickly-populated provinces, and had at the same time assumed, with very much greater success than the "Sultan of Islām," the role of liberator of the Muslims from oppression. Muhammad could no longer attach to his conflict with Chingiz-Khān the character of a religious war, the more so that the victims of the Utrār catastrophe which had made war inevitable were without exception Muslims.

Chingiz-Khān, evidently on the basis of the reports of his Muslim advisers, had formed a very high idea of the "ruler of the West," and prepared for the war with him as carefully as he had done on a former occasion for his war with the Jurchits. Whereas against Kūchluk he had sent only his general, he now set out on the expedition in person, with all his sons and his main forces. The summer of 1219 he spent on the Irtysh[4], and in the autumn advanced thence on his campaign; at Qayālīgh, probably the same locality which Rubruk[5] calls a "most beautiful plain," he was joined by Suqnāq-tagīn of Almāligh and the Uighūr Īdīqūt Bāwurchiq[6], besides the local ruler, the Qarluq Arslān-Khān, with their forces. | Thus all the armies 435
appointed for the campaign against the Khwārazm-shāh's kingdom were assembled here. We have no trustworthy

[1] Thus according to Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 40), to the Mongol account (Salikhun, see *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 131), and to Jamal Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 133). According to Juwaynī (f. 23) Kūchluk was killed in the valley of Wazārī in Badakhshān (in the printed ed., i, 50, وزارى).

[2] *Trudy*, v, 209; vii, 278.

[3] *Ibid.*, cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 172.

[4] *Ibid.*, xv, 42, 116 (in the first case there is a mistake in the translation, cf. the Persian text, p. 66). On the chronological data of Rashīd ad-Dīn see above, p. 371.

[5] *Recueil de voyages*, iv, 281.

[6] Thus in Juwaynī, i, 63 (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 110); for the name, *ibid.*, p. 32.

information as to what the strength of these armies may have been. The fantastic figures quoted by the Muslim authors (put by Jūzjānī[1] at 600,000 or even 700,000) deserve no credence whatsoever; on the other hand, we cannot be guided by the information on the Mongol regular army, the numbers of which, according to Rashīd ad-Dīn[2], amounted only to 129,000 in the year of Chingiz-Khān's death. This figure includes only the total of the forces forming the military strength of Mongolia proper and afterwards transferred by right of inheritance to Tūluy; of the armies of the three other brothers the only forces mentioned are the purely Mongolian divisions (of 4,000 men each) assigned to them, which undoubtedly formed but a small portion of the forces on which they depended in their appanages. Meanwhile so much is certain, that in the expedition to the West it was precisely the divisions of these princes that played the chief role; as the conquest of China and Tangut was not yet terminated Chingiz-Khān could hardly withdraw the troops of the commander of his left wing, Muquli, under whose command almost half of the regular army (62,000) was engaged. On the other hand, the chief commander of the right wing, Bughurji-noyon, as we know from Ch'ang-Ch'un's account[3], took part in the campaign. According to Jūzjānī's account[4], Arslān-Khān's force consisted of 6,000 men, but we have no data for the strength of the forces brought by the Īdīqūt and Suqnāq-tagīn. Our information on the distribution of the Mongol forces compels us to assume that Chingiz-Khān's army numbered scarcely less than 150,000 men in all, and hardly more than 200,000 men.

According to D'Ohsson's well-founded opinion[5] the Khwārazm-shāh's forces were much more numerous; but in view of his inimical relations with the generals the Khwārazm-shāh could not turn his superiority to advantage. Even before the arrival of the last Mongol embassy he summoned a military council, in which Shihāb ad-Dīn Khīwaqī expressed the opinion that the sultan should concentrate his army on the bank of the Syr-
436 Darya, meet the Mongols here, and fall | on them with his fresh forces before they had time to recover from the prolonged march. Others on the other hand said that the only way was to allow the Mongols to enter Transoxania, and annihilate them there, taking advantage of the defenders' familiarity with the country[6]. Some advised leaving Transoxania to its fate, and defending the crossings of the Amu-Darya; the most pusillanimous suggested concentrating the army at Ghazna (*i. e.* retreating

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 273, 968. [2] *Trudy*, xv, 132 sq.
[3] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 318, 414; *Med. Res*, i, 81.
[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1004. [5] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 212.
[6] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 237; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 6.

beyond the Hindu-Kush), and thence retiring to India[1] if it proved unavoidable. The sultan decided against accepting the first counsel, but left considerable garrisons in the towns of Transoxania; immediately afterwards he abandoned the province, promising to return thither with an army, and began to collect his forces at Balkh. Before leaving Samarqand he ordered a wall to be built round the city; Nasawī[2] says that this wall was to extend for twelve farsakhs, *i. e.* to protect not only the town but also its environs as in the pre-Muslim period (see above p. 84). In order to cover the expense involved in this grandiose undertaking, the sultan levied the whole annual taxation thrice in the course of one year. According to Nasawī not only was its construction unfinished at the time of the Mongol invasion, but it was not even begun, so that of all the money collected none had been used for this purpose. Juwaynī speaks only of the fortification of the citadel of Samarqand; the sultan was present at the work, and when the trench was dug is said to have remarked that the Mongol cavalry had only to throw their whips into it to fill it; these words made a most depressing impression on those present. In all probability this tale spread after the invasion, as Muḥammad would scarcely have started to weaken the courage of the population before the arrival of the Mongols. Nasawī[3] deplores the sultan's fatal decision to distribute his army amongst the towns of Transoxania, and is convinced that if he had met the Mongols on the frontier (that is, if he had taken Shihāb ad-Dīn Khīwaqī's advice), the enemy would easily have been annihilated. European scholars, down to, and including A. Müller[4], also accuse the sultan of criminal pusillanimity or | even of "stupidity." If, however, the events of the 437
latter years of Muhammad's reign be considered, we are forced to the conclusion that no other issue was possible for him. He could only have assembled his forces in one place if they had been as docile an instrument in his hands as was the Mongol army in those of Chingiz-Khān With the inimical relations existing between the sultan and his generals, this was of course out of the question. It is quite probable that if the sultan's generals had worked in harmony, and if they had been commanded by a capable leader who enjoyed general confidence, they would have succeeded in repelling the Mongols, but after the victory this imposing force would immediately have turned against its sultan and his dynasty. What the sultan's relations with his generals were, after his dispute with his mother, is

[1] Juwaynī, II, 106, cf. Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 78.
[2] Nesawi, texte, p. 35, trad., p. 61.
[3] *Ibid.*, texte, pp. 36–7, trad., p. 63.
[4] *Der Islam*, II, 209.

shown by the anecdote related by Juwaynī[1], that even at the time when the sultan was on the bank of the Amu-Darya, a plot against his life was discovered in the army; one evening Muḥammad, unobserved by the soldiers, left the tent in which he was to have spent the night, and in the morning the tent was found pierced by a large number of arrows. It is doubtful if the sultan enjoyed much popularity amongst the Ghūrs, a division of whom was stationed in Samarqand[2], and amongst the population, from whom he decided to recruit a militia of bowmen. Each district had to furnish a number of militiamen corresponding to the amount of taxation for which it was liable, and each bowman had to bring with him a camel, weapons, and provisions. Nasawī[3] complains that the sultan abandoned the bank of the Amu-Darya before the militia had time to assemble; people flowed in on all sides and "if he had waited he would have found himself at the head of the most numerous army ever heard of." The fact, however, that at the end of the spring of 1220 the militia had not yet been collected shows that the recruiting was not as successful as the historian declares, and that from this side the sultan met with as little sympathy as from his own Turkish soldiery[4]. |

438 In spite of the importance of this event in the history of Islām, the Muslim historians give us no precise indication of the time when the Mongol army appeared before the gates of Utrār. According to Juwaynī[5], Utrār defended itself for five months, and the citadel for a month longer; after the surrender of the town the force which had been left behind to besiege it joined Chingiz-Khān at the time when he was beginning to besiege Samarqand, that is, as we shall see, in March 1220. From this it may be concluded that the beginning of the siege is to be referred to September 1219. It is, however, very probable that Juwaynī somewhat exaggerates the duration of the siege. According to Nasawī[6] Chingiz-Khān advanced on Bukhārā only after the fall of Utrār, which, however, is very unlikely.

Near Utrār Chingiz-Khān divided his forces; one part of the army (according to Rashīd ad-Dīn[7] several tümens, *i.e.* tens of

[1] Juwaynī, ii, 109; Mirkhond, *Khārezm*, p. 80; cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 243.

[2] Nesawi, texte, p. 36, trad., p. 62.

[3] *Ibid*

[4] We have no reliable information on the state of public opinion in Transoxania immediately before the Mongol invasion. The verses of Khurramābādī quoted by 'Awfī (*Lubāb*, i, 202), in which the struggle with the Tatars is mentioned, may perhaps refer not to the struggle with Chingiz-Khān, but to that with Küchlük.

[5] Juwaynī, i, 64, 92; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 110–12, 132.

[6] Nesawi, texte, p. 43, trad., pp. 73–4.

[7] *Trudy*, xv, 43. In Juwaynī (i, 64) the same words (چند تومان) refer to Jūchī's division.

thousands), in which, amongst others, the Uighūr division[1] was incorporated, was left for the siege of the town; another under the command of Jūchī was sent down the Syr-Darya; a small division (5,000 men) up the river to Banākath and Khojend; while Chingiz-Khān himself and Tūluy marched on Bukhārā with the main forces, with the aim, according to Nasawī, of cutting the sultan off from his army. At Utrār, probably before the fall of the town, the local representative of the civil power, Badr ad-Dīn 'Amīd, governor on behalf of Ṣafī Aqra' (whom Nasawī calls "the sultan's wazīr in the province of the Turks"), went over to Chingiz-Khān. His father and uncle were formerly qāḍīs in Utrār and had been executed together with other of his relatives at the capture of Utrār by the sultan[2]; it is probable that they belonged to the priestly party which was inimical to the sultan, and manifested their opposition more vigorously than the ṣadr of Bukhārā and the shaykhs of Samarqand. From Badr ad-Dīn Chingiz-Khān obtained detailed information on the political condition of the country and on the enmity of Turkān-Khātūn and the military party to the sultan, of which he afterwards made use for his own ends. Besides this Chingiz-Khān himself, as well as his sons, were accompanied by Muslim merchants, who acted as intermediaries between the Mongols and the population and undoubtedly acquainted the Mongols | with the local conditions. Thus the 439
Muslims were unable to derive any advantage from their knowledge of the locality. The strategic plans of Chingiz-Khān and their brilliant execution prove that the geographical conditions were well known to him.

Chingiz-Khān now approached the fortress of Zarnūq, which is mentioned in the description of Tīmūr's last march from Samarqand through the Jilanuta defile to Utrār, as the last station before the bank of the Syr-Darya.[3] The Mongols had evidently encountered no difficulty in crossing the river, which, at that season of the year, was possibly frozen over. Dānishmand-hājib was sent to the inhabitants of Zarnūq, and succeeded in persuading them to surrender voluntarily, himself giving pledges for the preservation of their lives and property. This promise was fulfilled; the Mongols only destroyed the fortifications and recruited a division from the young men of the district for siege works. The town received from the Mongols (probably from

[1] *Trudy*, v, 127; vii, 164. According to Juwaynī the princes Jaghatāy and Uguday were in this division also.

[2] Nesawi, texte, p. 37, trad., 64; cf. Ta'rīkh i Guzīda, p 497.

[3] Pétis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, iv, 216; *Ẓafar-nāmah*, Calcutta ed., ii, 646 (where the name is read زرنوق).

the Turks who were taking part in the campaign) the title of Qutlugh-bāliq, *i.e.* "lucky town."[1]

In Zarnūq there were some Turkmens who led the Mongols to Nūr by a hitherto unknown road, which from this date received the name of "the Khān's road."[2]. Juwaynī travelled along it in 1251. It has been held by persons who are acquainted with these regions that the campaigns of Chingiz-Khān and Tīmūr compel the assumption that the nature of the country has changed considerably since their time, as "at the present day there is no road whatever between Nur-ata and the estuaries of the river Arys, not even a caravan route; between these two points stretches the waterless Kyzylkum desert."[3] This opinion has subsequently been rebutted, as caravan routes exist even at the present day between Utrār and Nūr.[4] Besides this it must be remembered that the Mongol army crossed the steppe in January. At that time, evidently, the canals on the left bank of the Syr-Darya had not been neglected, and the desert occupied a narrower strip. The advanced guard of the Mongol army advanced to Nūr under the command of Ṭāir-bahādur. In the night the Mongols crossed the gardens belonging to the inhabitants of the town; as everywhere in Central Asia, these gardens, of course, were used by the inhabitants as country resorts during the summer months and at this season were deserted. Ṭāir
440 ordered the Mongols to hew trees and prepare | ladders from them (evidently in case of a siege of the fortress). The appearance of the Mongols was so unexpected that the inhabitants took them for a trading caravan and only realized their mistake when the first divisions approached the town. Ṭāir invited the inhabitants to surrender and with his consent they dispatched an envoy to Chingiz-Khān, who ordered them to surrender the town to Sūbuday-bahādur[5] (who evidently held a higher rank in the army than Ṭāir). On Sūbuday's demand the inhabitants evacuated the town, taking with them only provisions, agricultural implements and cattle, after which their houses were plundered by the Mongols. After his arrival Chingiz-Khān demanded of the inhabitants only the payment of a sum of 1.500 dīnārs, which corresponded in amount to the taxes collected from Nūr by the government of the Sultan. Of this sum the women's ear-rings formed the half. The latter statement certainly shows that the property of the inhabitants was not

[1] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 120–21; Juwaynī, i, 77.

[2] خانی (Juwaynī, i, 78) not حالی ("desert") as in Rashīd ad-Dīn according to the edition and translation of Prof. Berezin (*Trudy*, xv, 52; Persian text, p. 80).

[3] *Protokoly Turk. kruzhka*, Feb. 17, 1897, Suppl. p. 13.

[4] A. Klare in *Protokoly, &c.*, ix, 16.

[5] As leader of a thousand Sūbuday belonged to the left wing (*Trudy*, xv, 141).

plundered (otherwise they would have had nothing out of which to pay the remaining 750 dīnars) or, at any rate, was returned to the owners on Chingiz-Khān's arrival. A small force (60 men in all) was recruited for siege works under the command of Il-Khwājah, the son of the local governor, and was afterwards employed at the siege of Dabūsiya.[1]

According to the account of two contemporaries of the event, Ibn al-Athīr[2] and Jūzjānī,[3] Chingiz-Khān reached Bukhārā in February 1220 and not in March, as related by Juwaynī and from him by much later compilers;[4] the date in Ibn al-Athīr and Jūzjānī is confirmed also by the account of the continuator of Narshakhī.[5] The strength of the garrison of Bukhārā is differently stated; Jūzjānī puts it at 12,000 cavalry in all, Juwaynī at 20,000 in the "exterior army" alone[6] (the numbers of the garrison properly | speaking are not indicated), and 441
Nasawī[7] at 30,000 in all. According to Nasawī the chief generals in the town were Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Kushlū,[8] equerry to the sultan, and Īnānch-Khān Oghūl-ḥājib; of the other generals Juwaynī mentions Ḥamīd-Pūr[9] (a Qarā-Khiṭāy by extraction, who was taken prisoner in battle in 1210, and had entered the Khwārazm-shāh's service), Suyunch-Khān and a certain Gūrkhān, said to be a Mongol who had deserted Chingiz-Khān and transferred to the service of Muḥammad. Juwaynī himself doubts the reliability of this information but it is possible that this was Chingiz-Khān's famous rival Jamuqa, who had in fact assumed the title of Gūrkhān, although according to Mongol tradition he was killed in Mongolia. Three days after the beginning of the siege, the army, under the command of Īnānch-Khān, decided to abandon the town and cut their way through the Mongol forces, but immediately afterwards the latter began to pursue the fugitives; Īnānch-Khān with only a very small section of his army succeeded in crossing the Amu-Darya, and Ḥamīd-Pūr fell in this

[1] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 121–2, Juwaynī, I, 79.
[2] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 239, V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik mat*, p. 8.
[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 976.
[4] Also in D'Ohsson (*Hist. des Mongols*, I, 228).
[5] Nerchakhy, pp. 23, 34.
[6] Juwaynī, f. 34 لشكريرون, in the printed ed. (I, 80) and the Khanykov MS. لشكريرونى, in Schefer (p. 123) لشكر اندرونى. That Juwaynī does not put the number of the whole garrison at 20,000 men, as D'Ohsson thought, is evident from the number of the defenders of the citadel quoted by him further on (in D'Ohsson, p. 233).
[7] Nesawi, texte, p. 34, trad., p. 62; according to Ibn al-Athīr, 20,000.
[8] The text has here erroneously كشكى (in the trans. Kechki); the correct reading is found on p. 43 of the text (trans., p. 74), also in Jūzjānī and the MSS. of Juwaynī (the printed ed., I, 80, has كشلى).
[9] See also II, 211.

battle. Abandoned by their defenders, the inhabitants decided to surrender, and the qāḍī Badr ad-Dīn Qāḍī-Khān headed a deputation sent to the Mongols. The latter entered the town according to Ibn al-Athīr on the 10th[1], according to Jūzjānī on the 16th of February. The defence of the citadel was prolonged for another twelve days[2], although its garrison numbered only 400 cavalry[3], amongst whom, according to Juwaynī, was Gūrkhān, who showed marvellous bravery. The inhabitants were obliged to deliver to the Mongols all the provisions prepared for the sultan's army and to fill up the citadel trench for them; after its fall all the defenders were massacred. Immediately afterwards the wealthy merchants were forced to give up the silver which they had bought from the Khwārazm-shāh after the catastrophe at Utrār (and probably other wares also). Finally the inhabitants had to leave the town with no more than the clothes in which they stood up, and their property was plundered by the Mongols; any one who remained in the town in defiance
442 of the orders was killed. According to Juwaynī, | the imām Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Ḥasan (or Ḥusayn) Zandī, seeing the Mongols plunder the mosque and the hoofs of their horses trampling the leaves of the Koran, expressed his anger to Rukn ad-Dīn Imām-zādah, one of the best scholars in the town, who answered: "Be silent; the wind of God's anger blows; the straw (scattered by it) has nothing to say."[4] Ibn al-Athīr's account, however, shows that Rukn ad-Dīn Imām-zādah was not so submissive to fate. Seeing that the Mongols were behaving churlishly to the prisoners and treating the women with violence, he and his son came to blows with them and were killed. Some others, including the qāḍī Ṣadr ad-Dīn-Khān, did the same, and among the number of those killed was also the ṣadr Majd ad-Dīn Mas'ūd, brother of the wazīr Nizām al-Mulk[5] (see above p. 379). Juwaynī's story that Chingiz-Khān assembled the people in the place for the festival prayers, entered the pulpit, and thence made a speech in which he called himself the scourge of God sent to the nation for its sins, is quite beyond belief. Of such an incredible incident, if it had in reality occurred, Ibn al-Athīr would undoubtedly have heard from his faqīh. Ibn al-Athīr's account tallies with that of Juwaynī in that Chingiz-Khān required the inhabitants to furnish a list of the chief persons and

[1] Compare V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 8, note. The day mentioned in Ibn al-Athīr is a Tuesday, not a Wednesday, as stated in the translation.

[2] This statement is made by the continuator of Narshakhī (Nerchakhy, p. 23), as well as by Ibn al-Athīr.

[3] D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 233) justifiably rejects Juwaynī's account (i, 83; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 125), according to which 30,000 men were killed at the capture of the citadel.

[4] Juwaynī, i, 81; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 123–4.

[5] Nesawī, texte, p. 24, trad., p. 43.

elders of the town and made his monetary requisitions to them. After being pillaged the town was burnt, and only the cathedral mosque and some palaces built of baked brick escaped destruction[1]. There is scarcely any reason to suppose that the burning of the town entered into Chingiz-Khān's plans; a fire was almost unavoidable in the pillage of a town in which devastating conflagrations were of common occurrence owing to the density of the buildings (see above, p. 112).

On the way from Bukhārā to Samarqand the Mongols already carried vast numbers of prisoners with them. According to Ibn al-Athīr's information, undoubtedly obtained from the faqīh already mentioned, the lot of these prisoners was extremely hard; they had to follow the Mongol horsemen on foot, and whoever gave out from exhaustion on the way was | killed[2]. 443
This mass of human beings undoubtedly contained not only captured townsmen, but also rural inhabitants; in all countries where they happened to be operating the Mongols beat up the peasants from the neighbouring villages for siege works[3]. Of the fortified points between Bukhārā and Samarqand, Dabūsiya and Sar-i-pul alone showed opposition; from this it may be inferred that the Mongol forces marched on both banks of the Zarafshān. The story about Chingiz-Khān heard by Ch'ang-Ch'un in 1221[4] compels us to assume that he himself travelled on the northern bank. He did not halt before unsubdued fortresses, but left small divisions to besiege them.

We have seen that the Khwārazm-shāh attached special importance to the defence of Samarqand,[5] the chief town of Transoxania; naturally a larger army was concentrated here than elsewhere. Juwaynī says that there was at Samarqand an army of as many as 110,000 men, of whom 60,000 were Turks, and 50,0000 Tajiks, with twenty elephants. According to Nasawī[6] the army was only 40,000 strong, to Ibn al-Athīr 50,000, to Jūzjānī 60,000, including the Turks, Tajiks, Ghūrs, Khalaj, and Qarluqs. Nasawī says that the governor of the town was Tughāy-Khān[7], the brother of Turkān-Khātūn.

[1] These words, which D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 234) ascribes to Ibn al-Athīr, are in fact found only in Juwaynī (1, 82; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 124).

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 240, V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p 10.

[3] *Trudy*, IV, 224; Patkanov, *Istoriya mongolov po armyanskim istochnikam*, ii, 20; Nesawī, text, p. 53, trad., p. 91.

[4] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 310; Bretschneider, *Med. Res.*, i, 76.

[5] On the siege of Samarqand Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 240–41; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 10–11; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 979–80; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 131–6; Juwaynī, i, 90–6; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, 1, 234–40.

[6] Nesawī, texte, p. 36, trad., pp. 62–3.

[7] In Juwaynī (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 135) يغای خان, in Nesawi (texte, p. 36) in the manuscript طغا سحا.

Chingiz-Khān reached Samarqand in March, and stayed in the suburb in the Kök-serāi palace (which of course except in name has no connexion with the palace built for Tīmūr, although it may have occupied approximately the same position, as the Mongols approached the town from the western side). In order to deceive the defenders the Mongols drew up the prisoners in battle formation, and for every ten men set up a standard, so that it appeared to the inhabitants as though an immense army were before the town. The number of prisoners was augmented by the arrival of Jaghatāy and Uguday with crowds of the captured inhabitants of Utrār. The siege of Utrār lasted
444 longer than that of the other cities | of Transoxania; Īnāl-Khān had sound reason to fear his personal fate, and therefore defended himself to the last extremity, although he had under his command only 20,000 horsemen, if Nasawī is to be believed.[1] According to Juwaynī, the sultan gave him 50,000 men of the "external army," and besides this, not long before the siege, the ḥājib Qarāja was sent to his assistance with a division of ten thousand men. After a five months' (?) siege[2] Qarāja decided to surrender, and marched out of the town with his army; Jaghatāy and Uguday, however, ordered him to be killed, as they did not trust him after his treachery to the sultan. The inhabitants of Utrār suffered the same fate as those of Bukhārā; they were driven out of the town, which was sacked. The citadel held out another month, and on its fall all its defenders were massacred; Īnāl-Khān himself fled to the roof of a building, and having no more arrows threw bricks on the Mongols. The latter evidently had orders to take him prisoner alive, surrounded him, captured him, and dispatched him to Chingiz-Khān at Kök-serāi, where he was cruelly executed, as described in Nasawī[3].

At Samarqand the besieged made a sortie on the third day, which, according to Ibn al-Athīr and Jūzjānī, ended in utter disaster. The Mongols ambushed the Muslims, and destroyed them to the last man, the losses amounting, according to Ibn al-Athīr, to 70,000 men, and according to Jūzjānī 50,000. Ibn al-Athīr asserts that the sultan's army took no part in the sortie, which was made entirely by the inhabitants of the town. These accounts of contemporaries compel us to reject Juwaynī's story, according to which the sortie was made by the Turks, who, under the command of Alp-Er-Khān[4], Shaykh-Khān,

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 36, trad., p. 62.

[2] Juwaynī alone gives details of the capture of Utrār (1, 64 sq.; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 110–11). Compare D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, 1, 219–21.

[3] Nesawi, texte, p. 37, trad., p. 63.

[4] In the text (1, 92; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 133) البار خان.

Bālā-Khān, and some other Khāns, went out of the town, killed several Mongols, took some prisoners, and themselves lost 1,000 men. On the fifth day of the siege[1] both the Turks and the local inhabitants decided to surrender. With the exception of a small force who shut themselves up in the citadel, the Turks, | headed by Tughāy-Khān himself, offered their 445
services to the Mongols, to which the latter at first agreed. The citizens dispatched a deputatton headed by the qāḍī and shaykh al-Islām; the Mongols entered the town through the Namāzgāh[2] gate, and immediately busied themselves with the destruction of the fortifications. As usual the inhabitants were driven from the town, and the town was sacked. An exception was made for the qāḍī, the shaykh al-Islām, and the persons under their protection, the number of whom, it is said, amounted to 50,000. This information is very interesting as a proof that the priesthood of Samarqand, in contrast to that of Bukhārā, showed no opposition to the Mongols, and from the very beginning enjoyed the consideration which Shamanists generally showed to the priesthood of all religions. If all the sayyids were included in the number of the priesthood, as in later times, then this figure must have been very considerable, though it could hardly have reached 50,000. The citadel, as at Bukhārā, was taken by assault, when the Mongols destroyed "the leaden watercourse," *i.e.* the Jākardīza canal (see above, pp. 85, 89); probably they destroyed one of the dams so that the water inundated the neighbourhood of the citadel and undermined part of its walls[3]. The night before this Alp-Khān (probably identical with Alp-Er-Khān) made a sortie with 1,000 soldiers, and succeeded in passing through the Mongol lines, subsequently rejoining the sultan's armies. The remaining defenders of the citadel, to the number of 1,000 men, assembled in the cathedral mosque; here they were all killed, and the mosque burnt. It is probable that the mosque in question was the new edifice built by the Khwārazm-shāh (see above, p. 366), on which traces of fire were found during my excavations in 1904. The sultan's Turkish troops, who had at first been taken into their service by the Mongols, were now surrounded in a level locality and

[1] Thus according to Juwaynī; Jūzjānī says that the siege lasted another 10 days after the ambuscade. The town was taken, according to him, on the 10th of Muḥarram (17th March).

[2] *I.e.* the gate of the place of festival prayers. It is supposed to have been on the north-western side of the city, where excavations were made by V. Vyatkin in 1905. Cf. *Bulletin du Com. Russe pour l'exploration de l'Asie centrale*, Russian ed., No. 7, p. 12 sq.; also my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 110.

[3] From this information it is clear that the citadel taken by the Mongols included not only the citadel described by the geographers of the tenth century, but the shahristān as well, *i.e.* the whole territory now called Afrāsiyāb which was then irrigated by the "leaden watercourse." *Cf.* the description of Samarqand above (p. 86).

massacred with all their leaders, including Tughāy-Khān. According to Juwaynī there were more than 30,000 troops and over twenty leaders, whose names were subsequently enumerated in the order (yarligh) written on Chingiz-Khān's behalf for Rukn ad-Dīn Kurt, the ancestor of the famous dynasty of rulers of Herāt. This document contained a list of all the heads of the armies and the provinces conquered by the Mongols, but unfortunately it has not come down to us. Of the remainder of the
446 inhabitants 30,000 artisans were given to the sons and | relatives of Chingiz-Khān, as many more were put to siege works, and the remainder received permission to return to the city, after they had paid a ransom of 200,000 dīnārs (*i. e.* the remainder of their property was restored to them?). Several times after this the inhabitants were driven out of the town, so that it became almost entirely waste. In the time of Ch'ang-Ch'un Samarqand possessed only one quarter of the former population of the city[1].

After the conquest of Samarqand, Chingiz-Khān temporarily suspended the advance of his corps. The division he had sent from Uttrār down the Syr-Darya under the command of Jūçhī was equally successful; the subjugation of this part of the country was evidently entrusted to Jūchī because the north-western provinces of the empire were to form part of his appanage. Details of his victories are communicated only by Juwaynī[2]. The Mongols first approached Sighnāq (twenty-four farsakhs from Utrār)[3], with whose inhabitants Jūchī opened negotiations. As his envoy he sent the Muslim merchant Ḥasan-Ḥājī[4], who had already spent many years in the service of the Mongols, and is probably to be identified with the Asan mentioned in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shi*[5]. The inhabitants killed the envoy, after which the Mongols besieged the town for seven days, finally took it by assault, and massacred the whole population. The son of the murdered Ḥasan was left as governor of the district. Continuing their advance the Mongols captured the towns of Ūzgand, Bārchinlighkant, and Ashnās, the last named of which, whose garrison was composed for the most part of "depraved

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 311; *Med. Res.*, i, 78. Juwaynī (i, 94) relates an anecdote on the destruction of the elephants taken by the Mongols in Samarqand. Chingiz-Khān asked how they were fed, and was told, on grass; he then ordered them to be let loose in a field, and they perished from hunger. From what Ch'ang-Ch'un says, however, it is evident that the elephants were still alive in the winter of 1221–2 (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 312; *Med. Res*, i, 79).

[2] Juwaynī, i, 66–70; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 112–15. Cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 221–4.

[3] See above, p. 179.

[4] In the printed edition of Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Tʾudy*, xv, 45, Persian text, p. 69) Ḥusayn Ḥājī.

[5] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv. 95; *Med. Res.*, i, 269. In this passage it is stated that Asan lived formerly in the country of the Onguts and came to the river Argun in pursuit of trade.

men and robbers," made a specially obstinate resistance. After this Chīn-Tīmūr, who belonged to the Onguts[1] (White Tartars), and subsequently played an important part in the history of Persia, was sent to Jand to open negotiations. | Jand had been 447
abandoned some time before by the army of the sultan, whose commander Qutlugh-Khān fled through the steppe to Khorezmia; according to Nasawī[2], Qutlugh-Khān was stationed at Shahrkant (Yanikant) at the head of a corps of 10,000 men. Chīn-Tīmūr was badly received at Jand by the inhabitants, and succeeded in securing his return only by reminding them of the fate of Sighnāq and promising them to withdraw the Mongols from Jand. Prior to this the Mongol generals had not intended to make an immediate move on Jand, but wished[3] to rest at Qarāqorum. This is not, of course, the Mongol capital of Chingīz-Khān, but the settlement of the Qanghlis (Qipchāqs) bearing the same name, which is mentioned by Juwaynī[4] also in the account of the first collision between the sultan and the Mongols as the place to which the Mergīts fled from the Mongols[5]. The intention of the generals shows that at this period the Mongol cavalry were already in need of remounts, and that Jūchī wished to take advantage of the summer quarters of the nomads for this purpose. He now postponed his intention, and advanced on Jand. In all manuscripts of Juwaynī, and in Rashīd ad-Dīn's quotation from him, it is stated that this occurred on the 4th[6] or 14th of Ṣafar[7], 616 (April 21 or May 1, 1219), which, however, is scarcely possible; in all probability 617 should be read instead of 616, and this event referred to the 10th or 20th of April, 1220. The inhabitants shut the gates, but showed no resistance; the Mongols set up ladders, mounted the walls, occupied the town, and forced the inhabitants to leave and remain in the fields for nine days, while the sack of the town lasted. Only those who had offended Chīn-Tīmūr by their speeches were put to death. The Bokharan 'Alī-Khwājah,

[1] This statement is made by Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, v, 117; vii, 149). Elsewhere (MS. AS. Mus. a 566, f 182 a; ed. Blochet, ii, 37) Rashīd ad-Dīn quoting Juwaynī (ii. 218) calls him a Qarā-Khiṭāy; in all probability he was indebted to the latter for his education, though it is also possible that he may have been a Qarā-Khiṭāy, living in the country of the Onghuts.

[2] Nesawi, texte, p. 36, trad., p. 62.

[3] In Schefer's *Chrestomathie* (p. 114) read بود (as in the Khanykov MS. and the printed ed., i, 69, 1) instead of نبود.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 101: قراقورم كه موضع اقامت قنقليان بود.

[5] According to the editor of the *Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-gushāy* the correct reading is قراقوم Qarāqūm,

[6] This date in the printed ed., i, 69, and in MS. iv, 2, 34; also in Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 46; Persian text, p. 71).

[7] Thus in the Khanykov MS. and in Schefer's edition (p. 114).

whom D'Ohsson, apparently on good grounds, identifies with Chingiz-Khān's envoy to Muḥammad mentioned in Nasawī (see above, p. 396), was appointed governor of the town. Jūchī himself, so far as is known, remained in Jand, whence in the
448 following | year he marched on Khorezmia. A small force was sent to Yanikant (Shahrkant), and apparently occupied the town without opposition. Part of the army was sent to Qarāqorum or Qarāqūm under the command of Ulūs-Idī [1], being replaced by a division of 10,000 men recruited from the Turkmens, which was incorporated in the army sent to Khorezmia under the command of Tāynāl-noyon. Tāynāl [2], with the advance guard of this army, had already accomplished several marches when he learnt that the Turkmens' division had mutinied and killed the Mongol general appointed to command them. He immediately returned, fell upon the Turkmens, and killed the greater number of them; the remainder fled to Merv and Āmul. This story is hardly to be fully credited. Jūchī's corps could scarcely have been sufficiently numerous to be in a condition to detach a division, the numbers of which, judging from the information given, could not have been less than 20,000 men; and, finally, an advance with such a weak force on Khorezmia, the centre of the power of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs, would have been devoid of all sense. In any case the movement was not renewed, and up to the end of the year Jūchī's corps remained on the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya on the defensive; moreover, as we shall see, even the conquered towns did not remain all the time under the rule of the Mongols.

The division dispatched to Banākath [3], consisting in all of 5,000 men, was placed under the command of Alāq-noyon, of the Barin tribe, who with his brother always accompanied Chingiz-Khān [4]. The other generals of the division were Suketu-cherbi of the Kong-Khotan [5] tribe, a commander of 1,000 on the right wing, and Tughāy. The Turkish garrison

[1] Prof. Berezin's view (in *Trudy*, xv, 171) that "by Ulūs Idī is meant the Idīqūt with his Uighūrs" is hardly correct. D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 223) also fell into the same error. We have seen that the Uighūr division took part in the siege of Utrār. The texts clearly show that Ulūs-Idī was the name of the Mongol general. In all probability the name refers to Jida-noyon, commander of a thousand on the right wing (*Trudy*, v, 190–1; xv, 134–5), whose name is found in Prof. Berezin's translation also in the forms Jadi and Jede (*Trudy*, v, 76, 87, 157); in the text جدى; in the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi* Jeday (*Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 60, 62).

[2] This reading was adopted by Prof. Berezin (*Trudy*, xv, 46) as well as by D'Ohsson; so also in the printed edition of Juwaynī (i, 70: تاينال), but in Schefer's edition and MS. iv, 2, 34 باينال.

[3] On its activities see Juwaynī, i, 70; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 115; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 224.

[4] On him see *Trudy*, v, 196; vii, 261.

[5] *Ibid.*, v, 160; vii, 215; xv, 135.

of Banākath, | under the command of Ïlatgū[1]-malik, held out 449
for three days, but on the fourth the town surrendered. The Mongols slaughtered the garrison, and carried off from among the population the artisans and a body of youths for siege works. Thus the resistance offered to the Mongols was by no means more stubborn at Banākath than at other towns, yet of all the towns of Transoxania Banākath is the only one of which it is said that it remained in ruins from the time of Chingiz-Khān to that of Tīmūr.[2] It is very probable that the town met with destruction during the disturbances of the second half of the thirteenth century, and that legend mistakenly ascribed this destruction to Chingiz-Khān.

From Banākath the division, according to Juwaynī, marched on Khojend, but Juwaynī himself in another passage[3] mentions Alāq-noyon as one of the two commanders of the force sent by Chingiz-Khān to Wakhsh and Ṭālqān. In view of this it must be assumed as more probable that after the surrender of Banākath the force of 5,000 returned to Chingiz-Khān, then besieging Samarqand, and that the siege of Khojend was entrusted to a special force which was dispatched only from Samarqand. Ibn al-Athīr[4] and Jūzjānī[5] also say that after the fall of Samarqand Chingiz-Khān dispatched a division to Farghāna, and Juwaynī himself admits that the main body of the army besieging Khojend consisted of divisions collected from Utrār, Bukhārā, Samarqand, and other conquered "towns and villages," amounting to 20,000 Mongols and 50,000 prisoners. It is quite probable that it was the division of Jaghatāy and Uguday, which, on its return to Chingiz-Khān after the fall of Utrār, was sent to Khojend. Whether both princes took part in the campaign is not stated, nor, for the rest, do we know who conducted the operations of the Mongols at the siege of Khojend, which forms one of the interesting episodes of military history.[6] The governor of Khojend, Tīmūr-malik, | could not maintain himself 450
in the town, and with 1,000 soldiers entrenched himself on one of the islands in the Syr-Darya. There is reason to suppose

[1] The manuscripts of Juwaynī have ايلكو, vocalized in the printed text (i, 70) and in Schefer's edition as ايلتكو, probably from the verb ايلتمك to carry; Prof. Berezin (*Trudy*, xv, 47; Persian text, p. 73) reads ايلكنو Ïlgatū.

[2] Pétis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur Bec*, iv, 207; *Ẓafar Nāmah*, Calcutta ed., ii, 636.

[3] i, 92, where the name is spelled غداق; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 132, with another spelling علاق. Rashīd ad-Dīn has in both cases الاق (*Trudy*, xv, 47, 57; Persian text, p. 73, 86).

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 254; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 28.

[5] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p 980.

[6] On the siege of Khojend, Juwaynī, i, 71 sq. Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 115–17; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 224–6.

that this island was the one which is situated one verst below Khojend, where in recent times there have been found "many gold, silver, and copper coins, many vessels of different kinds, and articles of household furniture, &c.[1]" The island was sufficiently far from the shore to render it impossible to bombard its fortifications with arrows or stones. The Mongols divided the prisoners into tens, and placed a Mongol at the head of each score; the prisoners were compelled to fetch stones from the mountains situated three farsakhs from Khojend, and the Mongol cavalry threw these stones into the river so as to form a dam. Tīmūr-malik built twelve roofed-in boats covered over with damp felt, and above that a layer of clay, soaked in vinegar, with small apertures; against these boats arrows, fire, and naptha were ineffectual. At night time and early in the morning the defenders of the fortress sailed to the bank, attacked the Mongols, and destroyed the dam. In the end, however, Tīmūr-malik was obliged to abandon his island, probably because the stock of provisions and weapons was running out. No reinforcement from any direction, so far as is known, was expected by the besieged, nor is there any information on the duration of the siege. During the night Tīmūr-malik embarked his force, with the remainder of the provisions and other materials, on seventy boats, previously prepared for this eventuality, and by the light of torches sailed down the river. The Mongol forces pursued them along both banks, but even then Tīmūr-malik, if the historian is to be believed, carried out attacks on them and drove them off by his well-aimed arrows. Near Banākath the Mongols had stretched a chain, but Tīmūr-malik succeeded in breaking it. When he reached the neighbourhood of Bārchin-lighkant and Jand, Ulūs-Idī had posted forces in advance on both banks of the river, built a bridge of boats, and erected catapults. Tīmūr-Malik, however, was able to land on the bank, but, pursued by the Mongols, lost his entire baggage and all his followers, and arrived safely alone in Khorezmia, where he evidently recounted his exploits and saw to their immortaliza-
451 tion. It was scarcely necessary to have recourse to marvels | of invention to attain this result. The preservation of the life of Tīmūr-malik was of no advantage either to Khorezmia nor to the sultan Jalāl ad-Dīn, whom he rejoined soon after this, and whose fate he shared up to his death. The exploits of Tīmūr-malik, like the subsequent exploits of Jalāl ad-Dīn himself, are examples of personal heroism quite useless to the common cause. On the Muslim side we find heroes with a handful of people performing prodigies of valour (probably exaggerated, for the rest, by their own boastfulness, or that of others), but

[1] *Srednеaz. Vyestnik*, May, 1896, p. 19 (article of M. S. Andreyev).

completely unable to organize larger forces, and for that reason constantly retreating before the main forces of the Tatars. On the side of the Mongols we scarcely ever find examples of personal heroism in this war; the commanders are no more than obedient and skilful executants of the will of their sovereign, who detaches and reunites separate corps of his army as occasion demands, and rapidly takes measures to evade the consequences of occasional failures. The strictly-disciplined Mongol soldiers sought no occasion to distinguish themselves from their companions, but carried out with precision the orders of their sovereign or of the leaders appointed by him.

The Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad was not even able to show the Mongols as much resistance as afterwards proved possible for Jalāl ad-Dīn. Chingiz-Khān took advantage of the advice of Badr ad-dīn, the traitor from Utrār, in order to increase the sultan's distrust of his generals, who were relatives of Turkān-Khātūn; and forged letters, ostensibly written by the generals to Chingiz-Khān, were secretly delivered to the sultan [1]. During the operations of the Mongols in Transoxania the Khwārazm-shāh occupied Kālif and Andkhud [2] with his forces, evidently with the intention of preventing the Mongols from crossing the Amu-Darya. During the siege of Samarqand the sultan sent to the help of the besieged on one occasion 10,000 horsemen, and on another 20,000; but neither the one nor the other division dared approach the appointed place [3], nor in fact would it have been of any use had they done so. At Samarqand Chingiz-Khān distributed his forces in the following | manner. Besides 452
the division sent to Khojend and Farghāna, one division under the command of Alāq-noyon and Yasawur [4] (of the Jalair tribe), a leader of 1,000 on the left wing, was sent to Wakhsh and Ṭālqān, and, according to Ibn al-Athīr [5], to Kulāb; we have no details of its movements. Ibn al-Athīr also speaks of the dispatch of a division to Tirmidh, but this fortress, as we shall see further on, was taken by Chingiz-Khān himself. Finally, three tümens (30,000 men [6]) under the command of Jebe,

[1] Nesawi, texte, pp. 37–8, trad., pp. 64–5; *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda*, p 497; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, I, 213–15. In spite of D'Ohsson's opinion we see no reason to doubt the authenticity of this fact.

[2] Nesawi, texte, p. 43, trad., p. 73.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 241; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 11.

[4] On him see *Trudy*, V, 42; VII, 53; XV, 140, Persian text, p. 210. Prof. Berezin has two different readings, Bisur and Bisuder. This is, in our opinion, the same name as that of the celebrated Jaghatay prince of the fourteenth century who migrated to Persia (D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, IV, 564–8, 612–28, 643–4). His name is spelt يسور by Wassāf and يساوور by the continuator of Rashīd ad-Dīn.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 254; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 28. The reading كلاب or كلابه seems to be the most probable.

[6] We find this figure not only in authors who were in the service of the Mongols but also in Nasawī (texte, p. 44, trad., p. 75); Ibn al-Athīr (XII, 241), who did not

Sūbuday, and Toquchar-bahādur, were detailed to cross the Amu-Darya, and, without molesting the peaceful inhabitants or besieging the towns, pursue the Khwārazm-shāh. Chingiz-Khān decided on this measure only after trustworthy information had reached him on the weakness of the sultan's army. Not long before this a section of Qarā-Khiṭāys (7,000 men) and Alā ad-Dīn [1], the ruler of Qunduz, had separated from this army; they brought Chingiz-Khān accurate information on the condition of the army of his enemy [2], who not long before this, if Juwaynī is to be believed, narrowly escaped assassination in his camp (see p. 406). The sultan decided to follow the advice of the wazīr of his son Rukn ad-Dīn, then governing 'Irāq, to retire to that country and collect an army there. Notwithstanding all Naṣawī's pearls of eloquence [3], we must regard this as a perfectly natural decision. Juwaynī [4] states that Jalāl ad-Dīn persuaded
453 his father not to take such a | pusillanimous decision, or at any rate to leave the army to him, Jalāl ad-Dīn; otherwise the people would be justified in reproaching the dynasty for merely collecting taxes from the population without fulfilling the obligations arising therefrom, the defence of the country from external enemies. We may doubt whether these words were ever spoken. No one could at that time prevent Jalāl ad-Dīn from setting out for his appanage at Ghazna, and organizing opposition to the Mongols there. If he and his brothers shared their father's fortune right down to his flight to the island, it is evident that they were inspired with the same terror of the Mongols [5].

Not long before the arrival of the forces commanded by Jebe and Sūbuday the Khwārazm-shāh abandoned the bank of the Amu-Darya, leaving only an observation corps at Panjāb. This force, evidently, was extremely insignificant, as the Mongols crossed the Amu-Darya as easily as formerly the Syr-Darya. Their manner of crossing is described in Ibn al-Athīr as follows [6]: "They made out of wood something like large water troughs,

know of the existence of Toquchar's division, only speaks of 20,000. This is also the figure given by Vardan (K. Patkanov, *Istoriya mongolov po armyanskim istochnikam*, 1, 2). In view of this, and in spite of Raverty's opinion (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 987), there is no ground for supposing that the historians intentionally decreased the numbers of the Mongol division, in order to show up its successes in a more brilliant light, and that the figure of 60,000 quoted by Jūzjānī is the more accurate.

[1] He is called also 'Alā al-Mulk (Juwaynī, ii, 197, 18; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, 1023, note).

[2] Nesawi, texte, pp. 43–4, trad., p. 75.

[3] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 45, trad., p 77.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 107, 127; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, p. 79; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, 1, 242–3.

[5] Juwaynī in one passage (1, 135; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 165) says that the Sultan sent Jalāl ad-Dīn from Nīshāpūr for the defence of Balkh, but that he returned to his father on receiving news of the Mongol crossing.

[6] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 241; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 12.

covered them with ox-hides, in order that they should be water-tight, placed their weapons and utensils in them, led their horses into the water, grasped their tails (with their hands), having fastened these wooden troughs to themselves, so the horse towed the man and the man towed the trough filled with weapons, &c., and thus everything crossed at the same time." It is doubtful whether the Mongols were able to prepare such a large number of wooden troughs on the bank of the Amu-Darya; it is more probable that Ibn al-Athīr did not grasp quite correctly the narrative of his authority, and that the Mongols adopted the method usually employed by the nomads to cross large rivers, described amongst others by Plano Carpini[1]. "The leaders are provided with a light circular hide, round the top of which are fastened a large number of loops; a cord is passed through these loops and drawn tight so that within the circle there is formed a sort of repository, which is filled with clothing, weapons, and other articles, and firmly tied; after this saddles and firmer articles are placed in the centre, | and the people sit 454
on these. The vessel thus formed is fastened to a horse's tail, and one man is sent ahead swimming to guide the horse; sometimes they have oars which they use for crossing. The horse is chased into the water, one rider goes ahead swimming; the remainder of the horses follow him. The poorer men are obliged to provide themselves each with a leather sack well sewn; in this pannier or sack he places his clothes and all his goods, fastens it firmly together at the top, ties it to a horse's tail, and crosses as described above." As is well known, the same sacks served during steppe marches for the storage of water.

According to Juwaynī, the news of the Mongol crossing reached the sultan[2] at Nīshāpūr, where he arrived on Ṣafar 12, 617 (April 18, 1220)[3]. Jūzjānī says that the crossing was made only in the month of Rabī' I, *i.e.* in May. Juwaynī's account, according to which the sultan spent almost a whole month in Nīshāpūr (from April 18 to May 12), and during this time gave himself up to enjoyment, forgetting the danger threatening him, is extremely doubtful. Nasawī, who had had an opportunity of speaking with one who had accompanied the sultan, says that the latter through fear of the Mongols did not remain a single day in Nīshāpūr. This was probably the case; the sultan's flight to Nīshāpūr shows that he expected the Mongol

[1] *Sobranie puteshestvii*, p. 170–2; Hakluyt Soc. ed., pp. 81, 113, 156.

[2] On the flight and death of the sultan see Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 241–2, 246; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 12–13, 17; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 277–9; Nesawi, texte, pp. 45–8, trad., pp. 76–92; Juwaynī, ii, 105–17; Mirkhond, *Kharesm*, pp. 79–85; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 243–56.

[3] The same date is given twice, i, 134, 20 and ii, 109, 20.

crossing of the Amu-Darya, and under such conditions he can scarcely have made prolonged halts in the cities of Khurāsān. At Bisṭām the sultan delivered to one of the wakīls of the Court, the amīr Tāj ad-Dīn 'Omar Bisṭāmī, two chests of precious stones, and ordered them to be sent to Ardahan[1], "one of the strongest fortresses in the world" (in Nasawī's words). To this fortress the remains of the sultan[2] himself were afterwards removed. He did not succeed in saving the treasure; the fortress was subsequently compelled to surrender to the Mongols, and the chests were sent to Chingiz-Khān. The Khwārazm-shāh fled through Rayy to Qazwīn, where his son Rukn ad-Dīn
455 Ghūrshānchī was stationed with an army of 30,000 men. | The sultan now had ample opportunity of destroying the scattered divisions of Jebe and Sūbuday, but he failed to take advantage of it. He sent his wife, the mother of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Pīr-Shāh, and the other women to the fortress of Qārūn, which was commanded by Tāj ad-Dīn Ṭughān, and himself summoned as his adviser the atābeg Naṣrat ad-Dīn Hazārasp of Luristān[3]. The latter pointed out to him a mountain chain[4] between Luristān and Fārs, beyond which there lay a fertile district; here it was possible to recruit 100,000 infantrymen from the Lurīs, Shūlīs, and inhabitants of Fārs, and with their help drive back the Mongols. The sultan did not favour even this plan, and concluded that Naṣrat ad-Dīn was pursuing his own personal aims, desiring, namely, to revenge himself on his enemy the atābeg of Fārs. Naṣrat ad-Dīn returned to his province, and Muḥammad remained in 'Irāq. On the approach of the Mongols he fled with his sons to the fortress of Qāiūn, but remained there only one day, and taking some horses and guides with him left by road for Baghdād. Avoiding the Mongols who were in pursuit of him he arrived at the fortress of Sar-Chāhān, where he remained seven days, and thence gained the shores of the Caspian Sea.

This is Juwaynī's account, which makes no mention whatever of the fact that the sultan went to Hamadān, where he was seen by the merchants from whom Ibn al-Athīr obtained his information. According to Nasawī, there was even a battle between the sultan and the Mongols in the meadow of Dawlatābād in the neighbourhood of Hamadān. Our information on the movements

[1] In the French translation of Nasawī it is called Erdelin by mistake; the text has the correct reading.

[2] So according to Juwaynī (ii, 117). The fortress was at a distance of three days' journey from Rayy (Yāqūt, i, 204).

[3] Compare Lane-Poole, *Mohammedan Dynasties*, pp. 174–5.

[4] Its name is given in Juwaynī (ii. 113) as تنك تكو (MS. iv, 2, 34 (f. 141) has تنك تكو; the Khanykov MS. تنك تكو), and by Raverty (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 277) as Tang-Talū.

of the Mongols[1] is not very clear either. According to the instructions quoted in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shi*[2], they were ordered to "avoid the towns inhabited by Muslims, and not to interfere with the local population until he himself (Chingiz-Khān) arrived there, then to attack the Muslims on two sides." Plano Carpini[3] says of similar advanced forces (*praecursores*) that they "take nothing | with them save their felts, horses and weapons. They 456
plunder nothing, burn no houses, kill no animals; they wound people, kill them or at least drive them to flight, but they do the first far more willingly than the last." Jebe and Sūbuday had besides this the task of pursuing the Khwārazm-shāh, and therefore, according to the testimony of Ibn al-Athīr[4], they "made no halts on their road, neither for plunder, nor for murder, and only redoubled their pace in his pursuit, allowing him no rest." Jūzjānī[5] also says that the Mongols "conformably to the orders they received from Chingiz-Khān, caused no damage to a single one of the cities of Khurāsān," except Būshang in the province of Herāt, where one of their leaders was killed, and the town was destroyed in consequence and the population exterminated. On the other hand, Juwaynī says that the Mongols left a governor in Balkh, destroyed the town of Zāwa, the inhabitants of which had opposed them and offended them by their jeering, and at the beginning of the month of Rabī' II (June) approached Nīshāpūr.

The order concerning devastation was broken only by the third division, that of Toquchar. Rashīd ad-Dīn[6] relates that the governor of Herāt, Malik-Khān[7] Amīn al-Mulk[8], had some time before this submitted to Chingiz-Khān, and received from him an edict by which the Mongols were enjoined not to plunder in his territories. Jebe and Sūbuday respected this order, but Toquchar infringed it, and was killed in a dispute with the mountaineers. This infringement of discipline was a matter of such importance in the eyes of the Mongols that it is mentioned in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shi*[9], which gives on the whole only the scantiest information on the campaign on the West. According to this account Toquchar only "took the grain in the ear," and nothing is said of his death: when he returned to Chingiz-Khān the latter wished to have him executed, then forgave him, but

[1] On them, besides the passages mentioned, see also Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 243–6; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 13–17; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 987–95; Juwaynī, i, 112–16, 134–8 (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 147–50, 164–8); Mirkhond, *Djenghiz-Khan*, pp. 124–34.

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, p. 146.

[3] *Sobranie puteshestvii*, p. 170; Hakluyt Soc. edit., p. 81.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 241; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 12.

[5] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 989–92. [6] *Truly*, xv, 78.

[7] More often thus than Khān-malik.

[8] In different passages Amīn-Malik, Amīn al-Mulk, Yamīn-malik, Yamīn al-Mulk.

[9] *Works of the Peking Mission*, pp. 146–7.

reprimanded him and removed him from command of an army. It is to Toquchar evidently that the destruction of Būshang of
457 which Jūzjānī speaks must be ascribed. | That Toquchar was not killed on this occasion is confirmed by Nasawī's [1] account of the destruction of the town of Nasā (which Toquchar could not, of course, have reached until after his operations in Herāt province) by a Mongol division of 10,000 men under the command of Toquchar-noyon, son-in-law of Chingiz-Khān, and his assistant Būrka-noyon [2]. Not long before this the inhabitants of Nasā had with the sultan's permission restored the citadel of their town, although the sultan had counselled them through a messenger to fly from the Mongols into the steppes and mountains, and wait until the latter, having collected sufficient booty, should return to their native country. According to both Jūzjānī [3] and Juwaynī [4], Toquchar was killed near Nīshāpūr, and Juwaynī gives the date as the middle of Ramaḍān (November). Toquchar's division after this destroyed Sabzawār. There is no further information about his division, but in all probability those Tatars with whom the Khorezmian princes came into contact at the beginning of 1221 belonged to it. Nasawī [5] makes Nasā the first city of Khurāsān to be seized by the Tatars, which contradicts Juwaynī's account of the destruction of Zāwa. In any case Jebe's and Sūbuday's forces were too weak numerically to leave their commanders in such large towns as Balkh, since to leave a commander unsupported by a garrison would be senseless. There is greater probability in Juwaynī's story of the edict received by the inhabitants of Nīshāpūr [6], written in the Uighūr script, with a red seal attached. In the edict the inhabitants were exhorted to show no resistance to the Mongols, and to make submission immediately after the arrival of the Mongol army, *i.e.* the army of Chingiz-Khān.

There is no doubt that on leaving Nīshāpūr Muhammad was able to cover his tracks; of his movement towards 'Irāq neither the faqīh with whom Ibn al-Athīr spoke nor the historian Jūzjānī knew anything. This explains why the Mongols sent |
458 out their forces in different directions from the neighbourhood of Nīshāpūr, evidently to obtain information of the direction in

[1] Nesawi, texte, pp. 50–2, trad., pp. 84–9.

[2] In the text of Nasawī برکا, in Juwaynī, i, 138 نوین نورکای, and in *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 167 بورکا. He belonged to the tribe of Jalayir (*Trudy*, v, 41, 209; vii, 52, 278).

[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p 992.

[4] i, 138; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 167; Mīrkhwānd (*Djenghiz-Khan*, p. 153) incorrectly maintains that Toquchar was sent to Tūluy.

[5] Nesawi, texte, p. 58, trad., p. 98.

[6] According to Juwaynī (i. 136; *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 166) the Mongol advanced guard approached the city on 19th Rabī' I (24th May), and Jebe himself on 1st Rabī' II (5th June).

which the sultan had fled. According to Juwaynī, Sūbuday's division after sacking Ṭūs and some other towns took the direct route through Dāmghān and Samnān to Rayy, and Jebe's division reached the same place after sacking some of the towns in Māzandarān, particularly Āmul. Juwaynī says that the inhabitants of Rayy submitted voluntarily; according to Ibn al-Athīr the Tatars appeared unexpectedly before the town, seized it, and led away the women and children as prisoners. Ibn al-Athīr explains their appearance before Rayy by the fact that rumours had reached them of the sultan's arrival in that town. At Rayy they heard of the sultan's departure for Hamadān, and moved in that direction; on the way they "plundered every town and every village, burnt, laid waste, and put to the sword men, women, and children." According to Ibn al-Athīr's account the sultan left Hamadān before the enemy arrived; Juwaynī says that he met the Mongols on the road from Qazwīn to Qārūn, but was not recognized by them; the Mongols shot some arrows at his party, and wounded the sultan, who nevertheless safely reached the fortress. The Mongols besieged the fortress after the sultan had left it, but on learning that he was no longer there they immediately raised the siege, caught some of his guides on the road, and followed up his traces. The sultan suddenly changed his route, and reached the fortress of Sar-Chāhān; the Mongols lost track of him, killed the guides, and turned back. Finally, according to Nasawī, the sultan with an army of 20,000 men was surrounded by the Mongols in the plain of Dawlatābād, in the neighbourhood of Hamadān, and escaped with difficulty, the larger part of his followers being killed by the Mongols. Here then in the extreme west of the sultan's territories took place the only battle fought between him and the Mongols. Even if he had been confronted with the whole of Jebe's and Sūbuday's corps, which is little probable (according to Juwaynī only Jebe's division moved on Hamadān), even then the Mongol forces would not have exceeded his own; nevertheless here also he thought only of saving his life by flight.

In spite of the accounts of Ibn al-Athīr, Juwaynī, and Nasawī, it is hardly open to doubt that in the neighbourhood of Hamadān the Mongols finally lost track of the sultan, and that on his way to the Caspian Sea, and on the island where he ended his life, the sultan was no longer being pursued. The island was situated | so close to the shore that, as related by Nasawī himself, the 459
Māzandarānīs brought the sultan food and other articles daily. There can be no doubt that in the ports of Māzandarān the Mongols would have found a sufficient number of boats to reach their enemy[1], especially in view of the feud between the Khwā-

[1] This conclusion was reached also by Ivanin (*O voennom iskusstvye i zavoevaniyakh mongolo-tatar*, p. 66).

razm-shāh and the local princes. Of the movements of the Tatars we know that from Hamadān they returned to Zanjān and Qazwīn, and destroyed these towns; according to Juwaynī they also destroyed a Khorezmian army, under the command of Begtagīn and Kuch-bughā-Khān. In the beginning of the winter they invaded Ādharbāyjān, where they sacked Ardabīl, and, as the weather became colder, they retired towards the shores of the Caspian Sea at Mughān, and on the way came into conflict with the Georgians. By the time the Tatars reached the shores of the Caspian the sultan was no longer amongst the living.

The island where the sultan concealed himself was situated close to the maritime town of Ābaskūn, which lay three days' journey from the town of Gurgān[1], *i. e.* not far from the mouth of the river Gurgen. It is possibly the island now known as Ashur-Ade. How long the sultan spent on this island is not known. According to the account of those who accompanied him, with whom Nasawī subsequently conversed, on his arrival at the island he was already suffering from inflammation of the lungs to such an extent that there was no hope of his recovery. During the last days of his life he richly rewarded with honours, dignities, and territorial grants those who had shown him service; these grants it is true had no real importance at the time, but if Nasawī is to be believed all these edicts were subsequently confirmed by Jalāl ad-Dīn. The exact date of the sultan's death is not found in the original sources; both Raverty's date[2] (Shawwāl 617 = December 1220) and A. Müller's[3] (15 Dhu'l-qa'da 617 = 11th January 1221) seem to have been borrowed from later compilations. The first date is, in any case, the more likely one, as in January 1221, according to Nasawī[4], the siege of the capital of Khorezmia by the Mongols had already
460 begun. Nasawī relates | that after the death of the sultan there was not enough to buy him a shroud, and that one of his followers had to sacrifice his shirt for the purpose.

Such was the end of the sovereign who had united under his rule most of the countries incorporated in the empire of the Saljūqids. On the Mongol invasion he played such a pitiful role that the Mongols themselves completely forgot him. Even the Mongol account of the thirteenth century omits all mention of Muḥammad, and speaks only of Jalāl ad-Dīn, merging both persons in one, as is apparent from the narrative of the operations of Jebe, Sūbuday, and Toquchar[5]. In the same way Ibn

[1] Yāqūt, i, 55–6. On Ābaskūn see also *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i, 214; ii, 273.
[2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 278.
[3] *Der Islam*, ii, 213. The date given by Dawlatshāh 136, 18 is 22nd Dhu'l-Ḥijja 617 (17th Feb. 1221).
[4] Nesawi, texte, p. 92, trad., p. 153.
[5] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 146.

Baṭṭūṭa[1], who undoubtedly recounts the Mongol invasion from what he must have heard in Central Asia, mentions only Jalāl ad-Dīn, and refers to his reign events which took place in his father's time. It is, however, difficult to blame the Khwārazm-shāh for fleeing from an enemy against whom he, as a ruler, was completely powerless; he could maintain the struggle against the Mongols only as an adventurer, a character which was evidently as foreign to his nature as it was congenial to that of his son.

As early as the spring of 1220 Chingiz-Khān could count Transoxania among his territories, and had already taken measures for the restoration of peaceful life: Nūshā-Basqāq was sent as Mongol governor from Samarqand to Bukhārā, and the organization of the province was taken in hand[2]. Chingiz-Khān passed the summer in the neighbourhood of Nasaf, where he allowed the horses in his army to recuperate; in later times Nasaf and its environs were favourite summer quarters of the Mongol commanders; as is well known, one of the Jaghatāy Khāns built a palace here, from which the town received its present name[3]. Even Bābur[4] in his description of Qarshī says that though the district was somewhat scantily supplied with water the spring there was delightful. There can be no doubt that | before the Mongol invasion, for unknown reasons, Kish 461
and its neighbourhood fell into decay, and Nasaf began to flourish in its stead. This explains the fact that the geographers of the tenth century reckon Khuzār (Guzār) and even the locality of Māymurgh, situated on the road from Bukhārā to Nasaf, as in the district of Kish, whereas Sam'ānī reckons as in the province of Nasaf not only these places, but also a village situated on the road from Samarqand to Kish[5].

In the autumn Chingiz-Khān advanced on Tirmidh. The defence of the town was entrusted to a division from Sijistān, the name of whose commander, according to Nasawī[6], was Fakhr ad-Dīn Ḥabash 'Inān an-Nasawī, but, according to Jūzjānī,[7] Zangī b. Abū Ḥafṣ. The numbers of the garrison are not indicated. A proposal to surrender was rejected, and both sides fought against each other with catapults for some days. Finally the Mongols silenced the weapons of their enemies, and the fortress was then taken by assault after a siege of eleven days; the town was destroyed and all the inhabitants massacred[8].

[1] *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, III, 23 sq.
[2] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 125-6. In the printed edition of Juwaynī (i, 83 sq.) the reading بَوشا has been adopted. [3] Cf. above, p. 136.
[4] Baber Nameh, ed. Ilminski, p. 62; facs. Beveridge, f. 49 b trans., p 84.
[5] Cf. above, pp. 134–7. [6] Nesawī, texte, p. 36, trad. p. 63.
[7] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1002.
[8] On the capture of Tirmidh see *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1004–5; Juwaynī, i, 102; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 140.

Chingiz-Khān spent the winter of 1220–1 on the bank of the Amu-Darya. Like the banks of other big rivers this locality always appeared to the nomads a suitable place for wintering in, and in later times became the site of one of the Jaghatāy capitals, Sālī-Sarāy [1]. In the course of this winter and of the following spring events occurred which altered the state of affairs for a short time in favour of the Muslims. Up till then the military operations had taken place in provinces which were united to the Khorezmian kingdom only under Takash and Muḥammad, and had not touched Khorezmia proper at all. We have seen that this province was ruled by Turkān-Khātūn, the mother of the Khwārazm-shāh, who stood at the head of the military party. The behaviour of her adherents in the conquered provinces was one of the principal causes of the ruin of the Khwārazm-shāh's kingdom, but as the nomads found sufficient room for themselves in these provinces Khorezmia itself did not suffer from them; on the contrary, this province, which since
462 1204 had been free from hostile invasions, and whither | the riches of the conquered provinces had flowed, must have attained a high degree of prosperity. This may be seen from the statements of Yāqūt, who visited the country and its capital in 1219 [2]. The degree of its material prosperity was reflected in the height of its intellectual culture. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were not a period of progress for the Muslim world, like the preceding centuries, but the zealous preservation of the treasures of learning bequeathed by former generations was still continued; at this period several most important compilations were made and rich collections of books were formed. At the very beginning of the rule of the dynasty of Khwārazm-shāhs, Shahristānī, the author of a famous work on religious and philosophical creeds, lived in Khorezmia till 510 (1116). A local historian gives us some details of his activities; this account, quoted by Yāqūt [3], shows that the jealous pietists of Khorezmia could not forgive the famous scholar his love of philosophy, but that philosophy met with no outward obstacles. According to this account Shahristānī "was a good scholar; had it not been for some lack of faith and inclination towards this heresy (philosophy) he would have been an imām. We were often astonished that with his many merits and the perfection of his mind, he showed an inclination towards matters possessing no sound foundation, and made choice of a subject which can adduce in its favour neither intellectual proof nor the authority of tradition. May God save us from

[1] Petis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, i, 21; *Ẓafar-Nāmah*, i, 38, where the reading is شالی سرای.

[2] See above, p. 147.

[3] Yāqūt, *Mu'jam* III, 343. The same local history is mentioned in his *Irshād*, ed. Margoliouth, III, 212; V, 412.

treachery and rejection of the light of the faith. All this arose only because he turned aside from the light of the Sharī'a, and became immersed in the mazes of philosophy. We were his neighbours and associates; he gave himself much trouble in order to demonstrate the rectitude of the teachings of the philosophers and to remove the accusations brought against them. I was present at some assemblies where he fulfilled the duties of preacher, and not once did he say 'Thus spake God,' or 'Thus spake the Prophet of God,' nor did he determine a single question of the Sharī'a. God knows best what were his views." Towards the end of the dynasty another famous philosopher, Fakhr ad-Dīn Rāzī, the author of extensive compilations in all branches of knowledge, lived at the court of the Khwārazm-shāhs. As regards the libraries in the eastern provinces, | alongside the widely-known evidence of Yāqūt for the libraries of Merv, may be quoted the statement made by Ibn al-Athīr [1] concerning the poet Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārak-shāh b. Ḥasan al-Marwarrūdī, who lived at the court of the Ghūrid Ghiyāth ad-Dīn, and died in 1206 [2]. This man built a khān, in which there were books and games of chess; the learned (visitors at the khān) read the books, and the ignorant played chess. Thus scholars found intellectual provision even in rest houses. In Gurgānj the wakīl Shihāb ad-Dīn Khīwaqī, who was deeply versed in all branches of knowledge, and had lectured in five madrasahs, built a library near the Shafi'ite cathedral mosque, which had no equal, in Nasawī's words [3], "either before or since." On receipt of the news of the Mongol invasion Shihāb ad-Dīn abandoned Khorezmia, but it grieved him to leave his books, and he therefore carried the most valuable away with him. After his death (he was killed at Nasā, on the capture of the town by Toquchar) his books were found in the hands of people of the lowest class. Nasawī made every effort to acquire the more valuable of them, and succeeded in doing so, but some years later he was obliged to leave his native country for ever, and to leave all his possessions, inherited and acquired, in his family castle [4]. "Of all that I left there," he adds, "I regretted only the books [5]." Nasawī's books probably shared the fate of the rest of the historian's property, which was plundered on 463

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 160–1.

[2] On him, his views and his life in Khwārazm, cf. now I. Goldziher in *Der Islam*, iii, 213 sq., and Sir E. D. Ross in *'Ajab-nāmah*, 393.

[3] Nesawi, texte, p. 49, trad., pp. 83–4.

[4] In the texte only بالقلعة, not "citadelle de Nesâ" as in the translation.

[5] The strange phrase in the French translation "De tout cela plus tard je ne pus recouvrer que mes livres" was due to the fact that the editor read انجسر instead of انحسر. This mistake has already been pointed out by Baron V. R. Rosen (*Zapiski*, vi, 387) and also in the list of errata annexed to the translation.

the capture of the city of Nasā by the army of Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Pīr-Shāh, whom the local ruler had refused to recognize as sultan [1].

Ruling a rich province and enjoying the devotion of the Turkish army, Turkān-Khātūn would have been able to inflict severe losses on the army of Chingiz-Khān, or at any rate on Jūchī's corps. Chingiz-Khān was fully aware of this, and therefore sent an envoy, Dānishmand-hājib, to the queen from Bukhārā or Samarqand in order to explain to her that the Khān was warring only with her son, who had offended her as well, and that he
464 would not touch the provinces under her administration [2]. | Of course this promise would not have been kept later on. The aged queen did not show such energy on this occasion as on the invasion of 1204. Simultaneously with the arrival of Dānishmand the news was received that the sultan had abandoned the bank of the Amu-Darya, and Turkān-Khātūn determined to follow his example [1]. Before her departure she commanded that the princes imprisoned at Gurgānj, who might deirve advantage from the difficult position of the dynasty, should be thrown into the Amu-Darya; according to Nasawī the queen was convinced that these difficulties would be no more than temporary. The princes who were put to death on this occasion numbered about twenty, and together with them perished the ṣadr of Bukhārā, Burhān ad-Dīn, with his brother and two nephews. According to Juwaynī's [4] account Turkān-Khātūn had even earlier murdered at night by such means the rulers then residing at Gurgānj as hostages. The queen at first removed to the province of Yāzir [5] in the western part of the present Turkmenia [6], and thence to Māzandarān, where she remained with her followers in the fortresses of Lārjān and Ilāl. Here they were besieged by the Mongols. As on other occasions when they were obliged to besiege fortresses in lofty situations [7] the Mongols built a wooden fence round them and cut off the garrison from all communications. After a four months' siege the fortresses surrendered owing to scarcity of water. According to Juwaynī and Nasawī, this was a very rare occurrence in regions with such a rainy climate as Māzandarān; Nasawī says that during the four months there was not a drop of rain, and according to Juwaynī

[1] Nesawi, texte, pp. 106–9, trad., pp. 175–80.

[2] *Ibid*, texte, p. 38, trad, p. 65.

[3] On the queen's fate, Nesawi, texte, pp. 38–41, trad., pp. 66–71; Juwaynī, ii, 198–200; Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 84–5; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 259–61.

[4] Juwaynī, ii, 198 sq

[5] The old spelling Yāzghir is given by Maḥmud Kāshgharī; also in Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārakshāh, *'Ajab-nāmah*, p. 407.

[6] Cf. *Zapiski*, ix, 302–3 (by A. Tumansky). This town was afterwards called Durun, near the modern station of Beharden, about halfway between Askhabad and Kizil-Arvat. Cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 41.

[7] Compare the statement in the Novgorod annals quoted by Karamzin, vol. iii, note 367.

the supply of water in the fortresses was exhausted in a period of from ten to fifteen days. Both historians maintain that by the irony of fate abundant rains began immediately after the surrender of the town. From Ibn al-Athīr's account [1] it may be inferred that the queen was taken prisoner in the summer of 1220, before the Mongols reached Rayy. Juwaynī in one place [2] puts both the beginning of the siege of the fortresses and their surrender as occurring at the time when the sultan was on | the island, in another [3] at the time of Jebe's activities in 465
Māzandarān; and the force which besieged the fortresses is reckoned in two passages in the armies of Jebe, and in a third [4] in those of Sūbuday. Nasawī says that the Mongols surrounded the fortress after the sultan's flight to the island. In view of this it is difficult to determine whether the capture of the fortresses should be referred to the time of Jebe's operations in Māzandarān or to the time when the Mongols arrived on the shores of the Caspian Sea to take up their winter quarters. The story of the drought makes the first the more probable. The sultan's daughters and younger sons were captured along with the queen; all the sons, except the very youngest, were immediately killed, but he also was strangled later on by command of Chingiz-Khān. The princesses were all distributed by Chingīz-Khān to "bastards," or according to another more probable reading "renegades," *i.e.* to Muslims in the Mongol service, one of whom was the ḥājib Dānishmand. An exception was the fate of Khān-Sultān, the widow of 'Othmān of Samarqand, whom Jūchī selected for himself. According to Juwaynī [5] it was precisely Khān-Sultān who was given to a dyer living at Īmīl, whose wife she remained up to her death. The same historian says that two princesses were given to Jaghatāy, who took one for himself and left the other to his Muslim minister, Ḥabash-'Amīd. Together with the queen was captured her wazīr, Niẓām al-Mulk, who was executed by Chingiz-Khān in 1221. The queen was subsequently carried off to Mongolia by Chingiz-Khān, where she lived until 630/1232–3; on leaving their native land she and the other women were ordered to express their grief by loud lamentations.

On the withdrawal of Turkān-Khātūn the civil administration [6] of Khorezmia was seized by one 'Alī, whose addiction to lying earned him the surname of Kūhi-durūghān ("mountain of lies"),

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 243; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 13–14.
[2] Account of the flight of the sultan (Juwaynī, ii, 116); Mirkhond, *Kharezm*, pp. 84–5.
[3] Account of the campaigns of Jebe and Sūbuday (Juwaynī, i, 115; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 149).
[4] Account of Turkān-Khātūn (Juwaynī, ii, 199); also in D'Ohsson.
[5] Juwaynī, ii, 126.
[6] On the events in Khorezmia up to the departure of the princes, see Nesawi, texte, pp. 55, 57, trad., pp. 94–6; Juwaynī, ii, 131 f.; *Trudy*, xv, 67–8.

and the revenues of the state were unscrupulously plundered. We are not told who was at the head of the military forces of
466 the country, the numbers | of which amounted to 90,000 men [1]. In the summer of 1220 Tīmūr-Malik, the defender of Khojend, arrived in Khorezmia. On gaining so enterprising a leader the Khorezmian army proceeded to attack Jūchī's corps, and took Yanikant from the Mongols, the Mongol governor of the town being killed [2]. The fact that Tīmūr-Malik did not take advantage of the fruits of this victory, but returned to Khorezmia, shows that there was already some disagreement between him and the Turkish leaders. In the winter, order was partly restored in the civil administration by the arrival of two officials of the treasury, the mushrif 'Imād ad-Dīn and the wakīl [3] Sharaf ad-Dīn; they brought the news that the sultan was still alive, and began to act in his name. Their arrival was immediately followed by that of the princes Jalāl ad-Dīn, Ūzlāgh-Shāh, and Āq-Shāh [4], who had been on the island with the sultan until his death; after burying their father they had arrived in Manqishlāgh accompanied by seventy horsemen, and obtained horses there from the local inhabitants. After this they reached the capital in safety, where they announced the death of the sultan, stating that he had previously altered his will, according to which Uzlāgh-Shāh had been proclaimed heir to the throne, and had nominated Jalāl ad-Dīn in his stead. In spite of the assent of the former heir himself, the Turkish amīrs could not be reconciled to the transfer; at the head of the malcontents was Tūjī-Pahlawān [5], who bore the title of Qutlugh-Khān, and had 7,000 cavalry under his command, and was probably the same person as the former governor of Jand and Yanikant. A conspiracy was formed with the object of imprisoning or killing Jalāl ad-Dīn. The latter was warned in time by Īnānch-Khān, and fled from Khorezmia to Khurāsān, accompanied by Tīmūr-Malik and
467 300 | cavalry. Three days after the departure of Jalāl ad-Dīn, Uzlāgh-Shāh and Āq-Shāh also abandoned Khorezmia, as rumours had reached them of the approach of the Tatars.

[1] Figures in Juwaynī, ii, 131.

[2] Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 117, with an incorrect reading شهر بارخلبغ كنت; in the Petrograd MSS. of Juwaynī (MS. iv, 2, 34, f. 32) and in the printed edition (i, 72) شهر كنت; in Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 49; Persian text, p. 76) ينكى كنت.

[3] The word is defaced in the text of Nasawī but evidently refers to the name of a post, not a proper name, as the translator supposed.

[4] According to Juwaynī these princes were in Khorezmia still earlier, which, however, in view of Nasawī's accurate account, is little probable.

[5] In Nasawī نوحى and so also in the Khanykov MS. of Juwaynī; in the printed edition (i, 131) نوح; in the manuscripts of Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 49, Pers. text, p. 102) بوحى.

The defence of Gurgānj[1] is undoubtedly one of the most noteworthy events in history. Up to this time the disputes regarding the succession to the throne had prevented the union of all forces in its defence, but the withdrawal of the members of the dynasty sufficed to restore unanimity between the army commanders. One of these, Khumār-tagīn, a relative of Turkān-Khātūn, assumed the title of sultan with the consent of the others; of the other defenders of the town Juwaynī mentions Oghūl-ḥājib[2] (already mentioned as the defender of Bukhārā), Er-Būqā Pahlawān, and 'Alī Durūghī[3], *i.e.* Kūhi-Durūghān, who appears here even as an "army commander" (sipahsālār). For the siege of such a large town as Gurgānj Chingiz-Khān was obliged to send a much larger force than against the other towns. From the south-east Jaghatāy's and Uguday's corps, with the thousands of the right wing[4], advanced on Khwārazm through Bukhārā, while Jūchī's corps advanced from Jand in the north-east. According to Nasawī, Tājī-Beg[5] (?) was the first to arrive at the head of the Mongol advanced guard, followed by Uguday's corps, then the "personal division" of Chingiz-Khān, under the command of Bughurji-noyon[6], finally Jaghatāy's corps, which included Tulun-cherbi, the famous leader of a thousand of the right wing[7], Ustun (Usun?)-noyon, and Qadan-noyon; the latter, of the Sunit tribe, was also commander of a thousand of the right wing and leader | of the thousand keb- 468
tewuls[8]. It is said that the numbers of this army even before the arrival of Jūchī's corps exceeded 100,000 men. Juwaynī gives some information on the movements of the advanced guard, but the topographical data which it includes could be elucidated only if we had the good fortune to find a detailed description of Gurgānj in the thirteenth century. The Mongols appeared in

[1] On this, Juwaynī, I, 96–101 (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 136–40); *Trudy*, XV, 68–73, Pers. text, pp. 104–10, Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 257–8; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 32–3; Nesawī, texte, pp. 92–4, trad., pp. 153–6, D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, I, 265–71.

[2] In Schefer's edition the word اغول is omitted; the printed edition has معول.

[3] Incorrect reading in Prof. Berezin; the printed edition of Juwaynī has دروغيني.

[4] Thus in Rashīd ad-Dīn and in the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi* (*Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 147).

[5] In Nesawī باجی (MS. without points).

[6] Undoubtedly بغرجی should be read in Nasawī's text instead of بقرجن. In Prof. Berezin's edition and translation this name appears in different forms, but the Professor himself accepts the form Bughurji as the most correct (*Trudy*, XIII, 242). In spite of Nasawī's statement the expression can only refer to the "personal thousand" of the commander of the right wing (*Trudy*, XV, 134); as we have seen, the "personal thousand" of Chingiz-Khān only went into battle when the Khān himself took part.

[7] *Trudy*, V, 160; VII, 214; XV, 135; *Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 120.

[8] *Ibid.*, XV, 137.

small numbers before the gates of the town and began to drive off the cattle; deceived by the small numbers of the enemy some of the defenders of the town made a sally from "the gate of the world [1]," and began to pursue them. The Mongols lured them into an ambush prepared near the "garden of happiness [2]," a farsakh distant from the town; here the Khorezmians were surrounded by strong forces of Mongols, who slaughtered a thousand [3] men before sunset. The remainder they pursued to the town, entering it immediately on their tracks, through the Aqābīlān (?) gate [4], and reached the place called Nabūrah (?) [5], but retreated at sunset. On the following day the battle was resumed, and Farīdūn Ghūrī with a force of 500 men repulsed an attack on the gate. After this the armies of Jaghatāy and Uguday arrived, and opened negotiations with the inhabitants, but at the same time occupied themselves with measures for a regular siege. As there were no stones in the neighbourhood of Gurgānj the Mongols started to make projectiles out of the trunks of mulberry trees; for this purpose each trunk was cut into circular pieces, which were soaked in water until they acquired the requisite hardness. After the arrival of Jūchī's corps the town was invested on all sides. The prisoners were ordered to fill up the ditch, and succeeded in doing so (according to Rashīd ad-Dīn this operation took ten days); immediately
469 afterwards they | were set to mining to destroy the walls. The operations of the Mongols so terrified the sultan Khumār-tagīn that he went out of the gate and surrendered to the Mongols [6]. None of our sources say who took command after him [7]. The sultan's treachery depressed the spirit of the inhabitants to some extent, but the defence continued none the less, and the Mongols, who had already planted their standards on the walls, were obliged to make themselves masters of each street and quarter separately. They set fire to the houses by means of vessels

[1] دروازهٔ عالی, printed ed., i, 98. [2] باغ خرم, *ibia.*

[3] In Rashīd ad-Dīn 100,000, which is, of course, impossible.

[4] آقابیلان in Schefer; اقابیلاں in MS. iv, 2, 34; قابیلان in the Khanykov MS.; قابیلان in the printed ed. (i, 99); قابیلان and قابیلان in the MSS. of Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, Pers. text, p. 106). Prof. Berezin reads Khaïlan.

[5] Thus in Prof. Berezin; Schefer has اتنوره; the MSS. of Juwaynī نوره (in the printed ed., i, 99 تنوره); the MSS. of Rashīd ad-Dīn تنوز.

[6] So Juwaynī (i, 100) D'Ohsson follows Rashīd ad-Dīn's account, which makes no mention at all of Khumār-tagīn's treachery and states that the Mongols occupied the walls and planted their standard there after the slaughter of the 3,000 and the assumption of the chief command by Uguday, seven days before the final fall of the town.

[7] From Juwaynī's account of the siege of Merv (i, 124; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 157; Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Staravo Merva*, p. 50) it appears that even at the beginning of 1221, 2,000 warriors, one of whom was Oghūl-ḳājıb, fled from Khwārazm to Merv.

filled with naphtha, and a large portion of the town had already been destroyed before they decided that the action of fire was too slow, and that it was necessary to deflect the waters of the Amu-Darya from the town. In the town itself a bridge was built across the river; 3,000 Mongols occupied it in order to proceed with the work when they were surrounded by the Khorezmians, and all were killed. This success gave fresh courage to the inhabitants, and the defence was continued with even greater obstinacy. Ibn al-Athīr says that in the defence of the town, up to the occupation of the walls by the Mongols, more of the latter than of the inhabitants were killed; according to Rashīd ad-Dīn the bones of the slaughtered Mongols formed actual hillocks, which were still visible in his time near the ruins of old Gurgānj. The principal cause of the ill-success of the siege is stated by the same historian to have been the disputes between Jūchī and Jaghatāy. The reason of these disputes is not mentioned, but from Nasawī's account it is evident that Jūchī made every effort to save the rich city, which would afterwards have been incorporated in his territory, from destruction. With this aim he invited the inhabitants to surrender several times, and in proof of the sincerity of his promises he pointed to the fact that the Mongols avoided military action to the utmost of their power, and that, in contrast to their own custom, they had even abstained from damaging the country districts (rustāqs) in the neighbourhood of the town. Amongst the inhabitants the wiser heads counselled acceptance of the proposal, but the "blockheads" prevailed. The first pointed out | that sultan Muḥammad him- 470
self when on the island[1] advised the inhabitants in his letters not to oppose the enemy. Jūchī's indecision, of course, evoked Jaghatāy's indignation, and Chingiz-Khān on hearing of the dissensions between the princes appointed Uguday to the chief command of all three corps[2]. The Mongols continued to take quarter after quarter; when there remained but three in the hands of the inhabitants they at last decided to send the muḥtasib of the town, the faqīh 'Alī ad-Dīn Khayyāṭī, to Jūchī with a prayer for mercy. But now even Jūchī himself could not grant their prayer. The inhabitants were driven out into the fields, and the artisans were ordered to be separated from the rest. Some obeyed the command, others hid their profession, supposing that the Mongols, as at other towns, would take the artisans with them, and allow the others to remain in their native land. According to Juwaynī there were over 100,000 artisans; these were carried away to "the Eastern lands," where they formed

[1] It is unknown why the French translator takes the word الجزيرة here as a proper name.

[2] This information is confirmed by the account in the Mongol epic, *i.e.* the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi* (*Works of the Peking Mission*, IV, 147).

a large number of settlements[1]. The children of tender years and young women[2] were made prisoners; the remainder of the inhabitants were killed, and it is said that to each Mongol soldier (of whom, according to Rashīd ad-Dīn, there were over 50,000) there were twenty-four men. Juwaynī had evidently heard an even higher figure, which seemed even to him so incredible that he could not make up his mind to quote it. Rashīd ad-Dīn quotes also a story about the shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā. It is said that the shaykh's reputation for piety had reached Chingiz-Khān, who ordered him to be warned of the Mongol advance on Khwārazm, and suggested that he should leave the town. The shaykh said that in good and evil fortune he intended to share the fate of his fellow-citizens, and perished at the capture of the town. The story of Chingiz-Khān's mission to the shaykh has, of course, little probability, the more so that
471 the Mongols had originally | no intention of subjecting the capital of Khorezmia to "massacres and pillage," and had no reason for proposing to the shaykh that he should abandon the town.

According to Ibn al-Athīr the fate of Gurgānj was even more unhappy than that of the other cities taken by the Mongols. In the other cases there always appeared some survivors from the massacre: "Some hid themselves, some fled, some were dragged out, but afterwards escaped (all the same), some even lay down among the dead (and rose up after the Mongols had gone)." In Gurgānj after the massacre of the inhabitants the Mongols destroyed the dam; the water flooded the whole town and destroyed the buildings; the site of the town even in later times remained covered by water, and whoever escaped from the Tatars was drowned in the flood or perished among the ruins. According to Jūzjānī[3], however, two edifices remained intact, namely, "the old palace," Kūshk-i Akhchak (?), and the tomb of Sultan Takash[4] (in one passage incorrectly called the tomb of

[1] It is possible that these Khorezmian colonists were the ancestors of the Dungans, or that the ancestors of the Dungans adopted Islām under their influence (on the question of the Dungans *cf Izvyestia Russk. Geogr Ob.*, vol xxxv, pp. 700–4, where Rashīd ad-Dīn's account of the conversion of the prince Ananda and his troops in Tangut is quoted; cf now Blochet's ed., pp 599 sq). As is well known, the Dungans even now are all Shāfi'ites, and our historical information shows that the followers of this school were stronger in Khorezmia than elsewhere at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

[2] So Juwaynī (i, 101 : جوان وزنان کودکان); in Rashīd ad-Dīn "women, males, and boys" which makes no sense.

[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 281, 1100.

[4] According to much later information of unknown origin (Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary, *Histoire de l'Asie Centrale*, texte, p. 78, trad., p. 177) the tombs of Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā and Ibn Ḥājib, the minaret, the tomb of Muḥammad's daughter, the baths, and the remains of the bazaar were saved. The mausoleum of Shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā is still situated between the ruins and the modern town (H Lansdell, *Russian Central Asia*, ii, 347) and is now "much revered by the Khivans"; *cf.* E. Smirnov, *Dervishism v Turkestanye*, Tashkent, 1898 (reprinted from *Turk.*

Muḥammad). In view of this the Mongols can scarcely have flooded the town intentionally; but there can be no doubt that in consequence of their devastations the dams, especially those which, like the dam of the capital, required to be repaired every year[1], must have fallen into decay. This explains the inundation of some of the cities of Khorezmia, and the change of course of the Amu-Darya, which again began to discharge its waters into the Caspian Sea[2].

The siege of Gurgānj lasted seven months according to Rashīd ad-Dīn, five according to Ibn al-Athīr, but Nasawī's account, according to which the city was captured as early as April, 1221, is more trustworthy. As Khorezmia was to be incorporated in Jūchī's dominions, Jaghatāy and Uguday returned to their father, who at that time was besieging Ṭālqān, and on their way destroyed yet another town[3].

On their journey from Khwārazm the Khorezmian princes had to pass through Khurāsān, which, as we have seen, was occupied by Toquchar's division, but at that time the Mongols did not maintain garrisons in the large towns of Khurāsān. On hearing of the flight of the princes, Chingiz-Khān ordered the Mongols to post observation parties on the northern frontier of Khurāsān. A Mongol force of 700 horse, which was stationed in the neighbourhood of the town of Nasā, was unexpectedly attacked by Jalāl ad-Dīn and his 300 horse, whose onset was so impetuous that the Mongols turned in flight, leaving their enemies in possession of their arms and stores, but only a few succeeded in escaping. Nasawī[4] calls this encounter the first Muslim success in this war, as Tīmūr-Malik's other success (the capture of Yanikant) was unknown to him. Thanks to this victory Jalāl ad-Dīn and his followers were able to change horses and reach Nīshāpūr in safety. His brothers Uzlāgh-Shāh and Āq-Shāh were not so fortunate. They also succeeded in eluding the Mongol frontier guards, but were surrounded by the Mongols 472

Vyedomosti), p. 18. It is also mentioned by Ibn Battūṭa (*Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, III, 6)

[1] Yāqūt, II, 483.

[2] المطفرية (*Sbornik statei*, &c.), pp. 8–11. *Cf.* my article "Amū Daryā" in *Encyc. of Islām*. Plano Carpini's account (Hakluyt Soc ed., 76, 110, 152) of the destruction of the city called Orna by flooding undoubtedly refers to Gurgānj.

[3] Its name in the printed ed. of Juwaynī (I, 101), in Schefer and in MS. iv, 2, 34 is كاسف, in the Khanykov MS. كاشف. Schefer (*Chrestomathie persane*, ii, notes, 175–6) suggests the reading كاسن and holds that the place referred to is the village of Kāsan, in the Nasaf province (see above, p. 140). There is, however, but little likelihood that this village, situated in the locality where Chingiz-Khān spent the summer of 1220, could by the spring of 1221 be showing opposition to the Mongols. It is possible that the name stands for Kalif (كالبف).

[4] Nesawi, texte, p. 60, trad., p. 101.

in the interior of the country and killed with all their followers[1]; according to Juwaynī[2] the princes were taken prisoner and were not killed until two days later. Notwithstanding the insignificance of the military forces of the Mongols in Khurāsān, Jalāl ad-Dīn was unable to collect an army there. Nasawī[3] says that he spent a whole month at Nīshāpur, Juwaynī that he spent only three days there, and left the town on February 6, 1221. From Nīshāpūr he reached Zūzan (on the frontier of Khurāsān and Quhistān, three days' journey from Qāyin), and wished to fortify himself in the citadel of this town, but was forced to leave, according to Juwaynī, owing to the hostile attitude of the inhabitants[4]. Nasawī's account is that he himself renounced his intention, influenced by the advice of the commander of the citadel, that the sovereign should act in the open field and not
473 shut himself up | in fortresses; no matter how strong the fortress might be the Mongols would find means to capture it. From here Jalāl ad-Dīn made his way to Bust[5] through the Herāt province. According to Nasawī's[6] account he joined here Amīn al-Mulk's division of 10,000 men, which was operating in Sijistān, with this force defeated a Mongol division which was besieging Qandahār at the time, and thereafter arrived at Ghazna, the chief town in his fief. In no other source is there any mention of the battle near Qandahār (unless the passage refers to the victory of Amīn al-Mulk, on which see below); if any Mongol force had already at this early date penetrated so far south, it could only have been an extremely insignificant one; otherwise there would have been some information about it in Juwaynī or Rashīd ad-Dīn.

Chingiz-Khān finally brought his army across the Amu-Darya in the spring of 1221, and occupied Balkh. Ibn al-Athīr[7] says that the town surrendered voluntarily and was spared, Juwaynī[8] that Chingiz-Khān accepted the submission of the inhabitants, but afterwards broke his promise and ordered them to be killed; those who concealed themselves at the time of this massacre were exterminated by the Mongols on their way back. The town was still in ruins in the time of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa[9], but from Ibn al-Athīr's account it may be inferred that its destruction took place later, as the result of a revolt by the inhabitants. Tūluy was sent to Khurāsān, Jaghatāy and Uguday to Kho-

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 62, trad., p. 105.
[2] Juwaynī, II, 133.
[3] *Ibid.*, texte, p. 64, trad., p. 108.
[4] II, 134: با سلطان مناقشت نمودند.
[5] Juwaynī does not mention the movement on Bust, but Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 287) mentions it as well as Nasawī.
[6] Nesawi, texte, pp. 64–5, trad., pp. 109–10.
[7] Ibn al-Athīr, XII, 255. V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p 28.
[8] I, 103 sq. (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, II, 141–2).
[9] *Voyages d'Ibn-Batoutah*, III, 58–62.

rezmia, and the remainder of the army was occupied in besieging the mountain fortresses in the northern spurs of the Paropamisus and the Hindu-Kush. Chingiz-Khān himself besieged the fortress of Nuṣrat-Kūh[1], in the neighbourhood of Ṭālqān[2], and the Mongol camp occupied the "hillock of Nu'mān" and the "steppe of Ka'b[3]," between Ṭālqān and Balkh. The siege lasted, according to Ibn al-Athīr, ten months (the first six of which were before the arrival of Chingiz-Khān), according to Rashīd ad-Dīn seven months; during this time Tūluy, Jaghatāy, and Uguday succeeded in carrying out their tasks, and returned to their father. | The Muslims were unable to take advantage of 474
this period to do the Mongol army any real damage. One of the chief causes which impeded the movements of Jalāl ad-Dīn was the quarrelling between the Turks and Ghūrs, which had begun before his arrival.

Jalāl ad-Dīn's representative at Ghazna[4] was Karbar-malik, who in 1220 abandoned the province entrusted to him and went to Sijistān at the invitation of Amīn al-Mulk, who was in action there. Advantage was taken of his absence by the governor of Peshāwar, Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī Kharpūst, to occupy Ghazna. According to Jūzjānī (whose sympathies, on account of his origin, are wholly on the side of the Ghūrs), Kharpūst came to Ghazna by order of Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad. The same historian maintains that Kharpūst collected an army of 130,000 men, with which he prepared to attack Chingiz-Khān, while Juwaynī puts the total of his forces at 20,000. Amīn al-Mulk made a proposal of alliance to him on the basis of a division of rule between them both, but received the answer that Ghūrs and Turks could not live together[5]. This decision was unsatisfactory to the commander of the citadel, Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn Muḥammad Nasā'ī, and the civil governor, Shams al-Mulk Shihāb ad-Dīn Alp Sarakhsī, the wazīr of Jalāl ad-Dīn, who came to the conclusion that "the Ghūrs intend to revolt against the sultan, seeing that they remove his relatives

[1] Thus in Juwaynī, i, 104 (in Schefer's edition نغره کوه by mistake). In Ibn al-Athīr, Manṣūr-Kūh, and in Jūzjānī Nāṣir-Kūh.

[2] As Raverty has already proved (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1008 sq.) this is the Tālqān in Khurāsān (on which see above, p. 79), not that in Ṭukhāristān. As regards the site of Nuṣrat-Kūh, it is quite possible that the citadel of the town of Ṭālqān is meant.

[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1009. Other sources for the siege, Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 255; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 29; Juwaynī, i, 104 sq. (Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 142); *Trudy*, xv, 75–6; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 273.

[4] On the events in Ghazna before the arrival of Jalāl ad-Dīn see Nesawi, texte, pp. 79–80, trad., pp. 131–3; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1012–16; Juwaynī, ii, 192 sq.; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 297–300.

[5] Juwaynī, ii, 193: ما مردم غوری ایم وشما ترك باهم زندگانی نتوانیم کرد.

from all participation in the administration of Ghazna[1]." It is difficult to say whether this is the view of the historian alone, or whether the persons mentioned really invented this motive to explain their actions, a very strange motive considering the inimical relations between the sultan and his relatives on his
475 mother's side. Ṣalāh ad-Dīn himself killed | Kharpūst with a dagger at a banquet (according to Nasawī in the maydān), and seized the town before the Ghūrs could hear of it, their camp being at a distance of half a farsakh from Ghazna. The Ghūrs did not venture to besiege the town, and scattered; the representatives of their party in the town were persecuted, and Kharpūst's nephew was executed by Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn. Two or three days after this, Amin al-Mulk arrived and took matters into his own hands, imprisoning the wazīr Shams al-Mulk in the fortress. At this time Chingiz-Khān was besieging Nuṣrat-kūh, and small Mongol forces were operating in other places. Amīn al-Mulk destroyed one of these divisions (numbering between 2,000 and and 3,000 men), and pursued it, leaving Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn in Ghazna. With regard to the subsequent events we find extremely contradictory accounts among the historians. Juwaynī says that the Ghūrs took advantage of the absence of Amīn al-Mulk to revolt and kill Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn, and the power passed into the hands of two brothers, the qāḍī Raḍī al-Mulk and 'Umdat al-Mulk, who came from Tirmidh, the former of whom proclaimed himself king. In Peshāwar a large number of Khalajis and Turkmens from Khurāsān and Transoxania joined forces under the leadership of Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq-malik. In a battle with them Raḍī al-Mulk was defeated, and perished with a large portion of his army. In Ghazna 'Umdat al-Mulk was proclaimed ruler. A'zam-malik, the son of the 'Imād ad-Din of Balkh[2] mentioned above (see p. 352), and Malik-Shīr, the ruler of Kābul, marched against him, rallied the Ghūrs around them, and occupied Ghazna; 'Umdat al-Mulk shut himself up in the citadel, which was taken after a forty days' siege. At this point Jalāl ad-Dīn released the wazīr Shams al-Mulk from the fortress in which he was imprisoned, and sent him to Ghazna, where he brought news of the sultan's approach. A week later Jalāl ad-Dīn himself arrived, and received the submission of all the army commanders.

Jūzjānī and Nasawī make no mention whatever of 'Umdat al-

[1] Juwaynī, II, 193: غوریان عصبان سلطان در دل دارند که یمین ملك‌را که خویش سلطانست در ملك غزنه راه نمی دهند.

[2] It is not known how he succeeded in evading the fate which overtook his father and brother on the flight of Turkān-Khātūn from Khorezmia (Nesawi, texte, p. 39, trad., p. 66). Probably Nasawī confuses him with his brother, when in one passage (texte, p. 21, trad., p. 38) he mentions "Malik A'ẓam (or 'the chief prince') the ruler of Tirmidh" among the princes held captive in Khorezmia.

Mulk; according to the former, Raḍī al-Mulk on his defeat by Aghrāq was seized by A'zam-malik, and killed soon after Jalāl ad-Dīn's arrival. | According to Nasawī, Raḍī al-Mulk had pre- 476
viously held the office of mushrif of the dīwān (see above, p. 378) in Ghazna; Ṣalāh ad-Dīn entrusted the whole civil administration to him, but was displeased with him for embezzlement of state moneys, whereupon Raḍī ad-Mulk persuaded the division of Sijistānīs to kill Ṣalāh ad-Dīn. Raḍī al-Mulk continued to govern the city until the arrival of Jalāl ad-Dīn, and Jalāl ad-Dīn himself only determined to remove him on his victorious return to Ghazna after the battle near Parwān. He was accused of embezzlement, and died under torture. It is, however, more probable in view of the coincident testimonies of Juwaynī and Jūzjānī that at the time of Jalāl ad-Dīn's arrival, Ghazna was in the hands of A'zam-malik.

Jalāl ad-Dīn arrived at Ghazna together with Amīn al-Mulk and an army of 30,000 men, and was joined there, according to Nasawī [1], by another army of the same size; approximately the same figures (60–70,000) are given by Juwaynī [2], who, however, states elsewhere [3] that there were 50,000 men under the command of Amīn al-Mulk and 40,000 under the command of Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq [4]. Besides the three leaders already named (A'zam-malik, Amīn al-Mulk, and Aghrāq) Nasawī names two more, Muzaffar-malik, the leader of the Afghāns, and Ḥasan, the leader of the Qarluqs [5]. Jalāl ad-Dīn married Amīn al-Mulk's daughter.

With this heterogeneous army of his Jalāl ad-Dīn marched out to meet the Mongols, and took up his position at Parwān [6]. From here he first of all defeated a Mongol force which was besieging | the fortress of Wāliyān (or Walishtān) in Tukhā- 477
ristān [7]. The Mongols [8] lost 1,000 men killed, crossed the river

[1] Nesawi, texte, p. 80, trad, p. 134 The author states that four chiefs at Ghazna had each an army of 30,000 men, and another army of the same size came with Jalāl ad-Dīn and Amīn al-Mulk. The whole force would thus amount to 240,000, which is hardly possible.

[2] Juwaynī, II, 195: قرب شصت هزار بل هفتاد هزار; 60,000 also in Ibn-Athīr (XII, 258; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 33).

[3] *Ibid.*, II, 135; Rashīd ad-Dīn also gives 40,000 in the first case (*Trudy*, XV, 78: Persian text, p. 117)

[4] Nasawī calls him Bughrāq; so also Ibn al-Athīr (XII, 259).

[5] He is mentioned again in the history of the reign of Uguday (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p 1119).

[6] On the basis of Jūzjānī's statement (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1042) which places Parwān between Ghazna and Bāmiyān, and of certain other indications, Raverty (*ibid.*, pp. 288, 1021) argues, probably correctly, that this refers not to the well known Parwān in the valley of the Panjshir (see above, p. 67) but to another, situated not far from the sources of the Lugar river (a tributary of the Kabul river).

[7] On this battle Juwaynī, II, 136 sq; *Trudy*, XV, 80; *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1016.

[8] The names of their commanders are given in the various MSS. and editions as follows: Juwaynī, MS. iv, 2, 34 كمجاك and بلغور, in the Khanykov MS. بكجاك and ملعور, in the printed ed. (II, 136) تكجاك and ملغور; Juwaynī, f. 173 بكاجاك, printed

(probably the Panjshir) and destroyed the bridge; by this means they delayed their enemies long enough to enable them to return safely to Chingiz-Khān. Immediately afterwards Shiki-Qutuqu-noyon was sent against Jalāl ad-Dīn with an army which Juwaynī puts at 30,000, and Jūzjānī[1] at 45,000 men. Jalāl ad-Dīn advanced to meet this army, and a battle was fought at a distance of one farsakh from Parwān; the Muslim right wing was commanded by Amīn al-Mulk, and the left wing by Aghrāq. The Muslims fought on foot, holding the reins of the horses in their hands[2]. The battle lasted two days; according to Juwaynī's account Shiki-Qutuqu-noyon, on the second night, ordered his soldiers to prepare dummies of horsemen made of felt, so that the enemy should imagine that the Mongols had been reinforced. This stratagem was at first successful, but Jalāl ad-Dīn succeeded in heartening his soldiers. When the Mongols were exhausted by the struggle, Jalāl ad-Dīn mounted his troops and made a general attack, which decided the issue of the battle. Shiki-Qutuqu returned to Chingiz-Khān with only the insignificant remnant of his army[3].

The battle near Parwān was the heaviest reverse experienced by the Mongols in this war. Its immediate result was that they temporarily suspended the siege of the fortress of Walkh, which before this had been invested by Arslān-Khān's Qarluq division, 6,000 strong, and the Mongol division of Tulun-cherbi[4] (who had evidently returned by now from Khorezmia). Besides this,
478 in some of the towns occupied earlier by the Mongols | the inhabitants revolted and killed the Mongol governors. The Muslims took no further advantage of their victory than to revenge themselves on their Mongol prisoners. Nasawī[5] recounts with enthusiasm how "the prisoners were brought before Jalāl ad-Dīn, and their ears pierced with stakes in order to appease his thirst for vengeance; Jalāl ad-Dīn was delighted, and his countenance beamed. They were tortured in this life; but the torment of the next life is sharper and more prolonged." The army commanders quarrelled with each other over the booty.

ed. (ii, 197) تكاجك; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 142–3 تكجك, printed ed., i, 105 تكجوك. Prof. Berezin reads Mukājik and Mulghār (from the manuscript reading of Rashīd ad-Dīn, see *Trudy*, xv, Pers. text, p. 121).

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1006.

[2] Thus according to Juwaynī (ii, 137: فرمود تا تمامت لشكر پياده شدند واسپان كرفتند وتن بر مرك نهادند (in the printed text بر دست (در دست). According to Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 80, Persian text, p. 122), they fastened the horses' reins to their belts; so also in Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, p. 96).

[3] Thus in Juwaynī (ii, 138); cf. *Trudy*, xv, 80–81.

[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1004.

[5] Nesawi, texte, p. 81, trad., p. 135. The extent to which the Muslims exaggerated their victory is shown by Nasawī's tale that Tūluy fell in the battle.

These dissensions evoked national passions with which Jalāl ad-Dīn was unable to cope; Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq, A'zam-malik, and Muzaffar-malik abandoned their sovereign, and he was left with none but Amīn al-Mulk and his Turks[1].

If Rashīd ad-Dīn[2] is to be believed, Chingiz-Khān gave no sign of his vexation on receiving news of the defeat, but remained perfectly calm. He remarked only that "Shiki-Qutuqu was always accustomed to being the victor, and so far had never experienced the cruelty of fate; now, when he had felt it, he would be more cautious." Ṭālqān was at this time already in the hands of the Mongols, and Chingiz-Khān could therefore march against the enemy with all his forces. After the defection of his generals Jalāl ad-Dīn could not give open battle to his adversaries, but he would probably have been able to harass their movements through the passes of the Hindu-Kush. We do not know why he did not adopt this plan, but merely retreated before the Mongols to the very banks of the Indus. On the movements of the Mongols the original sources give us no very clear statements. Juwaynī in his account of the Mongol invasion[3] says that Chingiz-Khān received news of the defeat at Wāliyān after the capture of Ṭālqān, immediately set out on the march and reached Bāmiyān through Guzarwān[4], where he spent a whole month owing to the opposition of the inhabitants. | At the siege of Bāmiyān Chingiz-Khān's favourite 479
grandson Mutugen, Jaghatāy's son, was killed; for this reason orders were given when the town was taken to destroy every living thing in it, and it was given the name of Mobāliq ("evil town"). In the next chapter Juwaynī[5] makes Chingiz-Khān go direct to Ghazna after the defeat of his generals so hurriedly that "no one was able to prepare food for himself." In the chapter on Jalāl ad-Dīn there is no mention whatever of the advance on Bāmiyān, nor in the chapter on Amīn al-Mulk and Aghrāq, where he adds a statement not found in the other passages, that part of the army of Shiki-Qutuqu, to the number of 10,000 to 12,000 men, pillaged Ghazna, which was then without an army, burning the cathedral mosque and killing many of the inhabitants, before their encounter with Jalāl ad-Dīn[6]. Rashīd ad-Dīn[7] says that after the capture of Ṭālqān,

[1] On this Juwaynī, ii, 139 and 196; Nesawī, texte, pp. 81–2, trad., pp. 136–7; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 303.

[2] *Trudy*, xv, 81; Persian text, p. 123.

[3] Juwaynī, i, 104 sq.: Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 142–3.

[4] In Schefer's text and MS., iv, 2, 34, (f. 46) كروران, in the Khanykov MS. كردوان, in the printed ed., i, 105, كرزوان. The place in question is probably the fortress of Rang in Gurziwān (Guzarwān) where the commander was Ulugh-Khān (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1003).

[5] i, 106. [6] Juwaynī, ii, 196; cf. *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1021.

[7] *Trudy*, xv, 76–7, 82–3; Persian text, pp 115–17, 124–5.

the siege of which lasted seven months, Chingiz-Khān went to Bāmiyān; after the destruction of this town he returned, and together with his sons "spent the summer in the hills of Ṭālqān," moving thence on Ghazna in the autumn, "when the men had rested and the horses were fed." The historians who do not depend on Juwaynī (Ibn al-Athīr, Jūzjānī, and Nasawī) have not a word to say on the capture of Bāmiyān, and make Chingiz-Khān go direct from Ṭālqān to Ghazna, without giving any details of his route. In one passage Jūzjānī[1] notes that Chingiz-Khān went through Gharjistān, and left all his heavy baggage in camp under the guard of a small force, as there was no wheel road across the mountains. It is not known from what source Mīrkhwānd[2] borrowed his information that Chingiz-Khān passed from Ṭālqān through Andarāb, the siege of which lasted a full month, thence through Bāmiyān, and after taking this town through Kābul to Ghazna. Of the European investigators, D'Ohsson[3] makes Chingiz-Khān march in the autumn from Ṭālqān to Gurziwān and Bāmiyān, and in the latter town receive the news of the defeat of his generals Raverty[4] comes
480 to the conclusion | that the siege of Bāmiyān never took place, and that Wāliyān should be read everywhere instead of Bāmiyān. If, however, Ṭālqān and Parwān were situated where this scholar locates them, there is nothing improbable in the fact that Chingiz-Khān chose the route from the present Maymana south to the river Mak, thence through Shahar, Bai, the Haftād-Girdish pass, and the provinces of Balkhāb, Yakvalan, and Firuzbagar to Bāmiyān[5]. It is difficult to say whether Bāmiyān was only captured then, or had already been captured in the summer; in the second case it must be admitted that Chingiz-Khān marched from Ṭālqān to the Hindu-Kush to avoid the summer hot weather before the fortress had fallen, leaving a force to prosecute the siege, and that the capture of the fortress occurred in the autumn, after his return. There is of course nothing impossible in this.

According to Rashīd ad-Dīn's account Chingiz-Khān inspected the battlefield of Parwān, and reprimanded his generals on the unfortunate choice of position. Chingiz-Khān himself met with no opposition from Jalāl ad-Dīn's army, and occupied Ghazna, where he learnt that the sultan had abandoned the town fifteen days before. According to Juwaynī, Chingiz-Khān appointed Māhā-Yalavāch[6] (apparently not Maḥmūd-Yalavāch) as governor

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1071–2.
[2] Mirkhond, *Kharezm*. pp. 97-9.
[3] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 294–6.
[4] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 290, 1020–21, 1025.
[5] The statement quoted below, that part of the baggage was left at Baghlān, makes it necessary to assume that another Mongol division marched from Ṭukhāristān via Andarāb and the valley of the Panjshir.
[6] So Schefer (*Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 143); printed ed., i, 106: ماما يلواج.

of the town: but after the flight of Jalāl ad-Dīn he sent Uguday to Ghazna, who by his father's orders took the most severe measures against the town, which had already submitted (nothing is said of a revolt of the inhabitants); the inhabitants were driven into the fields and massacred, with the exception of the artisans, who were made prisoners[1]. Jūzjānī[2] also mentions the massacre of the inhabitants, without however any mention of the preliminary occupation of the town. Jalāl ad-Dīn had already retreated to the Indus, and ordered boats to be made ready for the crossing. At this time an encounter took place between the sultan's rearguard, under the command of Ūrkhān, and the Mongol vanguard, in which the Muslims were defeated[3]; but according to Nasawī, Jalāl ad-Dīn himself made an attack on the Mongol vanguard at Gardīz (one day's journey east | of 481 Ghazna), and completely defeated it. Whatever may have been the issue of this encounter it did not delay the main Mongol forces, which reached the bank of the Indus even before the boats were ready; only one boat arrived, in which it was intended to place the women of the sultan's family, but it too was broken by the waves. Jalāl ad-Dīn also failed of success in his second plan, to attract his former generals once more to his side[4].

The decisive battle on the bank of the Indus took place, according to Nasawī, on Wednesday, November 24th[5], 1221. As regards its site we possess only the testimony of Jūzjānī[6] that Jalāl ad-Dīn retreated to Peshāwar (reading doubtful), Nasawī's story[7] that after his crossing Jalāl ad-Dīn was attacked by the ruler of the mountain province of Jūdī, and Sharaf ad-Dīn Yazdī's account of the campaign of Timūr[8]. The latter is said to have reached the bank of the Indus at the site of Jalāl ad-Dīn's battle with the Mongols, and after crossing entered a steppe which bore in remembrance of Jalāl ad-Dīn the name of Chuli Jalālī (according to Raverty[9] this name has been preserved to the present day), and received the submission of the princes of the mountain province of Jūdī. Raverty[10] considers it possible to take as the site of the battle the landmark Ghoṛā-trap (literally "the horse's leap"), which, in his opinion, may

[1] Schefer, *ibid.*, ii, 144; Juwaynī, i, 108; D'Ohsson, i, 310.
[2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1042-3.
[3] For this Juwaynī, ii, 140; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 306.
[4] Nesawi, texte, pp. 82–3, trad., pp. 138–9.
[5] According to Nasawī the 8th of Shawwāl; in Juwaynī and the other sources the month of Rajab is given (August-September; in Mīrkhwānd (*Kharezm*, p. 101) incorrectly 620). Raverty (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1049–50) pointed out the improbability of these dates, though he had not read Nasawī's history.
[6] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 291–2.
[7] Nesawi, texte, p. 86, trad., p. 142.
[8] Pétis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, iii, 45–7. *Zafar-Nāmah*. Calc. ed., ii, 47.
[9] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 293.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 292.

have received this name after the sultan's crossing. The landmark is situated somewhat below the Nīlāb crossing, and the whole of this reach presents vast and impassable rapids. Raverty[1] admits that this point does not entirely correspond to the site of Timūr's crossing, which was made at Dīnkot.

According to Nasawī's[2] account the centre of the Muslim
482 army under the command | of Jalāl ad-Dīn in person spread confusion amongst the Mongols, and Chingiz-Khān himself had already turned in flight (?), but the battle was decided by the attack of the 10,000 Mongol bahādurs (see above, p. 384), who had till this moment been lying in wait, on the Muslim right wing, commanded by Amīn al-Mulk. Jalāl ad-Dīn's son, aged seven or eight years, was taken prisoner and killed; and his mother, wife, and other women were thrown into the water by order of Jalāl ad-Dīn himself to prevent their falling into the hands of the Mongols. The sultan himself crossed the river on a horse, which he afterwards kept with him until the conquest of Tiflis, but never again rode. Four thousand of the soldiers reached the bank along with him; and three days later he was joined by 300 cavalry who had been carried a long way down the river by the current.

Chingiz-Khān did not consider it necessary to cross the Indus immediately after Jalāl ad-Dīn; in the following year a division of 20,000 men was sent in pursuit of the sultan, but it reached no further than Multān, and in consequence of the summer heat returned without capturing the town[3]. The military activities of 1222 were confined almost exclusively to the investment and capture of mountain fortresses, an account of which does not lie within our province[4]. It remains still to give some account of the events which occurred in 1221 in Khurāsān, and which exerted some influence also in Transoxania.

At the beginning of 1221 Chingiz-Khān sent Tūluy from Ṭālqān to occupy the cities of Khurāsān, for which, if Juwaynī[5] is to be believed, he gave him only a tenth part of his army. The number of the forces which he recruited from the towns which submitted was considerably greater, as before reaching Merv he had already 70,000 men[6], according to the same historian. In Khurāsān, after the departure of Muḥammad, matters followed the same course as in Khorezmia and Ghazna; the power fell into the hands of individual ambitious men and adventurers, some of whom dreamed of a royal throne; such dreams were entertained in Merv by the former civil adminis-

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 291. [2] Nesawi, texte, pp. 83–5, trad., pp. 139–41.
[3] Juwaynī, i, 112; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 147.
[4] The fullest details are given by Jūzjānī (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1043 sq.).
[5] i, 117; Schefer, *C. P.*, ii, 151.
[6] i, 125; Schefer, *C. P.*, ii, 157. Cf. Zhukovsky, *Razvaliny Star. Merva*, p. 51.

trator of the town (ḥākim and wazīr), Mujīr al-Mulk Sharaf ad-Dīn Muzaffar[1]. With such conditions prevailing Tūluy | was 483
able to carry out his task—the subjugation of the three largest cities of Khurāsān (Merv, Nīshāpur, and Herāt) and many less important ones—in the space of less than three months. Merv was taken on February 25, 1221[2], the inhabitants, except for 400 artisans, being massacred. A member of the local aristocracy, the amīr Ḍiyā ad-Dīn 'Alī, and the Mongol commander Bārmās were appointed governors of the town, and were entrusted with the task of gathering those of the inhabitants who had escaped from the slaughter; the latter, however, suffered a fresh attack on the part of other Mongol forces. Still more grievous was the fate of Nīshāpūr, which was taken by the Mongols on Saturday, April 10. The inhabitants were requited for the death of Toquchar in November, 1220, from an arrow on their city walls. In consequence of this Tūluy refused to accept their appeal for mercy, and on the capture of the town its inhabitants were massacred, all except 400 artisans; the town was destroyed to its foundations and its site ploughed over. A Mongol amīr with 400[3] tajiks was left among the ruins to exterminate the remnants of the inhabitants[4]. Herāt suffered least of all; none of the inhabitants were killed except the Khwārazm-shāh's army, which numbered 12,000 men, and Mongol and Muslim governors were appointed over the town[5].

In the second half of 1221 rumours of Jalāl ad-Dīn's victories caused revolts in some of the cities of Khurāsān, in Merv and Herāt amongst others; the rebellion in Merv[6] broke out in the middle of November. Ḍiyā ad-Dīn 'Alī had gone to Sarakhs at this time to put down a movement which had broken out there, and Bārmās removed the artisans and other prisoners from the town in order to send them to Bukhārā. The inhabitants, coming to the conclusion that the governor had received news of some movement of the sultan and was preparing to flee, rose in revolt. In vain Bārmās went to the gate of the town and summoned the members of the aristocracy; no one appeared. Bārmās killed some persons whom he found at the gate, and left | for Bukhārā with his entourage, amongst 484

[1] On him see Zhukovsky, *ibid*, pp. 49–50.

[2] Juwaynī, i, 125 (1st Muḥarram 618). Prof. Zhukovsky does not give the exact date

[3] In Schefer (*Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 169) the word ... is omitted; cf. Juwaynī, i, 140.

[4] On the fate of Nīshāpūr Juwaynī, i, 133–40; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 163–9; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 288–91. Nasawī relates the fate of the city in approximately the same words, but according to him it was not taken till the end of 618, after Jalāl ad-Dīn's flight to India (Nesawi, texte, p. 54, trad., p. 92).

[5] D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 292.

[6] In Prof. Zhukovsky's account (*Razvaliny Star. Merva*, p 52) there are some inaccuracies Cf. Juwaynī, i, 128 sq.; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 160–3.

whom is mentioned the Khwājah Muhadhdhib ad-Dīn Bāstabādī[1]. Bārmās died at Bukhārā, and the inhabitants of Merv whom he had brought with him remained there. On his return to Merv Ḍiyā ad-Dīn divided his booty amongst the inhabitants, and sent them the son of Bahā al-Mulk (one of the former leading men of Merv), but he avoided entering into too intimate relations with the leaders of the rebels, at the same time busying himself with the repairing of the city walls and citadel. When a Mongol force appeared before the town Ḍiyā ad-Dīn met them with honours and kept them with him, but immediately afterwards Kushtagīn-Pahlawān[2], one of the leaders of Jalāl ad-Dīn's guard, appeared with a large troop and invested the town. Some of the "bad characters of the town" went over to him and abandoned Ḍiyā ad-Dīn, who together with the Mongols retired to the fortress of Marāgha[3]. Kushtagīn occupied the town and took measures for the repairing of the walls, and the restoration of agriculture. The opposition party invited in Ḍiyā ad-Dīn, who came back in consequence as far as the city gate. On hearing of this Kushtagīn ordered him to be seized and demanded money from him, to which he replied that he had already given it to "dishonourable people," namely, to those who yesterday were fighting for him, and now were with Kushtagīn. The latter ordered his opponent to be killed, and began to occupy himself with still greater zeal in the reorganization of agriculture, amongst other measures restoring the dam on the Murghāb. According to Nasawī[4], Kushtagīn became so strong that he was able to march from Merv to Bukhārā and kill the Mongol governor[5] left there; the latter statement, however, is open to doubt, as the Nūshā-basqāq mentioned in Juwaynī is probably identical with the governor Būqā-Būshā (or Nūshā) mentioned in Waṣṣāf[6], although Waṣṣāf also says that Būqā-Būshā was appointed governor in Uguday's time. The revolt was put down by the Mongols during 1222, probably at the end of the summer. Qarāja-noyon[7] arrived at Sarakhs, and Kushtagīn abandoned Merv at night with 1,000 soldiers. The Mongols overtook his forces near the village of Sangbast[8]

[1] In the printed ed., i, 129 باسنابادی.

[2] More correctly Kuchtagīn (as in Nasawī كوج تكين; Juw. كشتكين).

[3] مرغه in the printed ed., i, 129.

[4] Nesawi, texte, p 68, trad., p. 115.

[5] "Garnison" by mistake in the translation (شحنة in the text).

[6] Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte Wassafs*, 1, 25.

[7] Or Qarācha-noyon; in the printed ed., 1, 130, قراچه نوين.

[8] In the printed ed., i, 130, erroneously سنك پشت. It is a well-known locality with a ribāt built by Arslān-Jādhib, the contemporary of Sultan Maḥmūd Ghaznawī; cf. Rāwandī, *Rāḥat aṣ-Ṣudūr*, ed. Mīrzā Iqbāl, p. 92, and the description of the ruins by E. Diez, *Churasanische Baudenkmäler*, p. 52 sq. It lies one day's march to the S.E. of Meshhed.

(between Sarakhs and Nīshāpūr according to Prof. Zhukovsky), and exterminated a large part of it; Kushtagīn himself escaped, as we know from | Nasawī's account, fled to Sabzawār, and 485
thence to Gurgān, where he joined the army of Ināñch-Khān, who was at that time ruler of some of the towns of Khurāsān. Three or four days later a body of 200 horsemen from Qutuqu-noyon's army reached Merv; of these 100 men stayed near the walls of Merv and communicated the situation to the generals Tūrbāy[1] (or Tūrtāy) and Qabāy[2] (or Qatāy)-Ilchi, who were stationed at Nakhshab (Nasaf). Five days (?) after this Tūrbāy had already arrived at Merv with a force of 5,000 men, amongst whom was the local commander (sipahsālār) Humāyūn, who bore the title of Āq-malik. The town was immediately taken and the inhabitants massacred. On this occasion 100,000 men are said to have perished. Āq-malik was left among the ruins to exterminate the remnants of the population, and carried out his task with even greater zeal than the Mongol leaders; the unfortunates were shut up in the Shihābī madrasah and afterwards thrown from the roof. In spite of this the town was again restored after the departure of the Mongols, and the leadership was assumed by a certain Arslān, "a son of an amīr." After this a certain Turkmen arrived in Merv from Nasā; the inhabitants submitted to him, and he succeeded in collecting an army of 10,000 men, and ruled for six months. According to Nasawī[3] his name was Tāj ad-Dīn 'Omar b. Mas'ūd, and he governed Abīward and Kharqān as well as Merv; according to Juwaynī he even undertook a pillaging expedition on the Mongol baggage lying at Marwarrūd, Panjdīh, and Ṭālqān. At the same time he invested Nasā, where a descendant of the local dynasty, Nuṣrat ad-Dīn Ḥamza b. Muḥammad, was then ruling. Here Tāj ad-Dīn's forces were suddenly attacked from the direction of Yāzir (see above p. 430); the governor of the citadel simultaneously made a sortie, and Tāj ad-Dīn himself was killed. Qarāja-noyon with 1,000 men marched on Merv from Ṭālqān, and began to plunder, apparently without meeting any opposition. Directly afterwards Qutuqu-noyon appeared with an army of 100,000 (?) men, | which included Khalajīs and Afghāns, who 486
began to treat the inhabitants with even greater cruelty and violence, and destroyed the last remnants of Merv.

---

[1] Judging from the spelling this is the same person who in the spring and beginning of the summer of 1222 was in command of a Mongol division in India. His name is given in the printed ed. i, 112 as تورباى تقشى, i, 130 as تربای, in Schefer's text (*C. P.*, ii, 147 and 162) ترتای, in MS., iv, 2, 34 and the Khanykov MS. تربای and تورباى, in Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, Pers. text, pp. 128, 130) دربای and دوربای, and by Prof. Berezin (*ibid.*, xv, 85, 86) as Durbay.

[2] In the printed ed., i, 130, قبار.

[3] Nesawi, texte, p. 99, trad., p. 165.

After the destruction of Balkh and Merv the disorders which broke out in the provinces south of the Amu-Darya could no longer affect the tranquillity of Transoxania. In this country the refractory elements appeared only in the form of robber bands, and were not in a position to seize towns and districts. Some information on the condition of the country during these years, and on Chingiz-Khān's return journey, is given in the description of the journey of the Chinese hermit Ch'ang-Ch'un compiled by one of his disciples [1].

The fame of the holy life of the Taoist Ch'ang-Ch'un reached Chingiz-Khān, who in the summer of 1219, while he was still on the bank of the Irtysh, summoned him before him. From the questions which Chingiz-Khān subsequently put to Ch'ang-Ch'un it is evident that the conqueror hoped to receive from the philosopher "the medicine of immortality," [2] having taken in its literal sense the Taoist teaching on Tan (the philosopher's stone), although the school to which Ch'ang-Ch'un belonged sought this treasure in the psychic world alone, and endeavoured only to attain undisturbed philosophic calm. From some of Ch'ang-Ch'un's expressions it is evident that in complying with Chingiz-Khān's desire he dreamed also of exerting his influence on the conqueror for the cessation of bloodshed [3].

Ch'ang-Ch'un travelled through Mongolia, Uighuria, the Kulja district, and Semiryechye to Sayrām, where he arrived in November, 1221. The roads had been repaired by the Mongols at the time of their advance, and were in a better condition than now; the travellers crossed the river Chu by a plank bridge, and the river Talas by a stone bridge [4]. It is evident from the description of the journey that the lands to the north of the Syr-Darya which had been devastated by the Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad were now re-populated; everywhere as far as
487 Samarqand itself only native officials are mentioned [5], | and there were no Mongol governors or garrisons anywhere. The name Sayrām is found here for the first time, so far as is known [6], and mention is made of a small tower as one of the buildings in the town; on the return journey [7] the author already speaks of Sayrām as a large town. The travellers say that on November 20 they witnessed here the celebration of the New

[1] Russian translation by Arch. Palladius, *Works of the Peking Mission*, vol. iv; English trans. by Dr. Bretschneider in *Mediaeval Researches*, i, 35 sq; in the latter the dates are given according to the Christian calendar.

[2] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 320; Bret., i, 86.

[3] *Ibid.*, iv, 329 (not in Bret.).

[4] *Ibid.*, iv, 307–8; Bret., i, 72 sq.

[5] *Ibid.*, iv. 308–10; Bret., i, 74 sq

[6] With the sole exception of the work of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (in the reign of the Caliph Muqtadī, 1075–94), who already identifies Sayrām with Isfījāb (*Dīwān lughāt at-Turk*, i, 78).

[7] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 336; Bret., i. 98 (where nothing is said as to he size of the town).

Year; as a matter of fact the feast celebrated was that of Bayrām, which began in 1221 on November 18. As they still do, the natives on this day "were walking in parties congratulating one another." Over the Syr-Darya there was a floating bridge, and between Sayrām and the river bank two other towns are mentioned, the first three days' journey from Sayrām, the second one day's journey further on and two days from the Syr-Darya. Beyond the river stretched the Hunger Steppe for a distance of about seventy miles ("more than 200 li"), and south of the steppes, before reaching Samarqand, the travellers passed five more towns. Everywhere the Muslim authorities came to meet the travellers and accorded them a ceremonial reception.

The condition of Samarqand, which the travellers entered by the north-eastern gate, having crossed the Zarafshān on December 3, was somewhat worse. After the Mongol massacre the number of the inhabitants had fallen to one quarter; Muslims were allowed to manage fields and gardens only conjointly with Chinese, Qarā-Khiṭāys, and others, and the chiefs also were appointed from different nations. Ahai, the governor of the town, belonged to the Qarā-Khiṭāys, and bore the title of taishi; he was acquainted with Chinese culture, since he served as interpreter during the conversation between Ch'ang-Ch'un and Chingiz-Khān. Ahai lived at first in the unfinished palace of the Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad (*cf.* above, p. 366), but afterwards crossed to the northern side of the river, as robber bands were infesting the neighbourhood of the town, "owing to the difficulty of finding subsistence."[1]

Not long before the arrival of Ch'ang-Ch'un at Samarqand "rebels" had destroyed the floating bridge over the Amu-Darya. This was evidently the work of Muslim insurrectionists after the victory of Jalāl ad-Dīn. Ch'ang-Ch'ūn stayed at Samarqand till April 26, 1222, and thereafter for a second time from the middle of June to September 14, and for a third time | from 488
the beginning of November to December 29; therefore he and his companions were in a position to collect accurate information on the city and its inhabitants. From their description it is evident that life there, notwithstanding the devastations caused by the Mongols, went on its way. At the call of the mu'adhdhins both men and women hastened to the mosques (at that time women still had access to common worship), and those who failed to carry out this duty were severely punished. During Ramaḍān night feasts were held as usual. In the bazaars there was much merchandise; in Ch'ang-Ch'un's verses it is said that "the whole town is full of copper

[1] *Ibid.*, iv, 310–11, 410; Bret., i. 78 f. (no mention of the difficulty of finding subsistence).

vessels shining like gold."[1] In the spring of 1222 the Chinese took pleasant walks in the suburbs; the western outskirts of the town, probably the same locality that Bābur calls "Kul-i Maghāk,"[2] now Kuli-Magiyan in the volost of Anhār, were especially beautiful. Here "we saw everywhere terraces, lakes, towers, and tents;" in some places there were orchards, and not even the Chinese gardens could compare with those here[3]. On the other hand, in September, 1222, a robber band some 2,000 strong, probably composed of the Zarafshān mountaineers, appeared to the east of the town; every night the inhabitants of Samarqand saw the sky red with fires[4]. During his last stay in the town in November and December, Ch'ang-Ch'un fed the hungry peasants with the remains of the provisions supplied to him, and besides this prepared gruel for them. The numbers of those who took advantage of this free table were very large[5].

At the end of April, 1222, Ch'ang-Ch'un went to meet Chingiz-Khān. Communication between both banks of the Amu-Darya had been re-established some time before, as at the beginning of the year Jaghatāy restored the floating bridge and exterminated the rebels[6]. Chingiz-Khān was informed of the hermit's arrival in March, when his tents were to the south of the Hindu-Kush. On April 26 Ch'ang-Ch'un left Samarqand,
489 and four days later passed through Kish. On | his journey through the Iron Gate he was escorted on Chingiz-Khan's order by the commander Bughurji himself, with a convoy of 1,000 Mongol and Muslim warriors. After passing through the gorge, the Chinese struck south, and the escort moved northwards against the "brigands;" the mountaineers therefore who lived on the upper tributaries of the Surkhān had not yet been completely subdued. Further on the way the Chinese crossed the Surkhān and Amu-Darya in boats; both banks of the Surkhān were at that time covered with dense woods. On the 16th of May they arrived at the Khān's encampment, then situated but four days' journey from the place where they crossed the Amu-Darya.

To the Khān's question on "the medicine of immortality" Ch'ang-Ch'un answered, "There are means for preserving life, but no medicines for immortality." The Khān gave no sign of his disappointment, and only lauded the sage for his sincerity. He appointed May 25 for the hearing of the hermit's doctrines, but subsequently, on receiving intelligence of the activities of the "Muslim rebels" in the mountains he postponed the inter-

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 326–7 (not in Bretschneider).
[2] Baber-Nameh, ed. Ilminski, p. 60; *Ref. bk. Samarkand prov.*, Pt. iv, Section iv, p. 36; Memoirs of Bābur, facs. A. S. Beveridge, f. 48 b; trans., p. 82.
[3] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 316; Bret., i, 80 sq.
[4] *Ibid.*, iv, 328 (not in Bretschneider).
[5] *Ibid.*, iv, 332; Bret., i, 96 (much shorter). [6] *Ibid.*, iv, 315; Bret., i, 80.

view to November. In consequence of this Ch'ang-Ch'un returned to Samarqand. Chingiz-Khān had already begun to advance towards the "snowy mountains," owing to the approach of the summer heats, and Ch'ang-Ch'un accompanied the Mongol army for some days. On the return journey an escort of 1,000 horsemen, with a Muslim leader at their head, accompanied the teacher by another road through a mountain "barrier passage" occupied not long before by the army. According to Ch'ang-Ch'un's description this defile, situated to the south of the Amu-Darya, was a much more difficult road than that through the Iron Gate. On their way the Chinese met a Mongol division returning from a campaign in the west, and for two *yi* (Chinese pounds) of silver purchased fifty coral branches from the soldiers.[1]

In September, on his journey from Kish across the Amu-Darya, Ch'ang-Ch'un received a still more considerable escort, 1,000 men on foot and 300 horsemen. He went by a new road, not through the Iron Gate, which, however, he approached afterwards from the south-western side, and on the way saw a salt spring and deposits of red rock salt. They crossed the Amu-Darya as before by boat, and travelled on, passing the ruins of Balkh, "the inhabitants of which had revolted not long ago and fled; 490
the barking of dogs was still heard in the town." Ch'ang-Ch'un arrived in the Mongol camp, then situated somewhat to the east of Balkh, on September 28, and for a while accompanied Chingiz-Khān, who at this time was on the return journey from the Muslim lands to his native land.[2]

We know from Jūzjānī's account[3] that after Jalāl ad-Dīn's flight, Chingiz-Khān spent other three months on the Indus in order to destroy the armies of Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq and A'zam-malik. He wished to make the return journey through India, the Himalayas, and Tibet, and with this object in view sent envoys to Delhi to the Sultan Shams ad-Dīn Iltutmish. The historian gives no details of this embassy nor of the reception accorded to the envoys. The road through the mountains was blocked by snow; Chingiz-Khān meanwhile received news of the revolt of the king of the Tangut and therefore decided to return by the same road that he had come by; besides this the fortune-tellers advised him not to go to India. If Chingiz-Khān spent three months on the Indus, then the journey from Peshāwar to Kābul was undertaken by him at the end of February or beginning of March, 1222. On his orders the passes were cleared of snow by labourers. Of Chingiz-Khān's further route

[1] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 318–323; Bret., i, 82–8.
[2] *Ibid.*, iv, 328–30; Bret., i, 91–3.
[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1043–7, 1081.

Jūzjānī had a very confused idea, as he makes him travel through Kāshghar, which Chingiz-Khān never visited.

Juwaynī [1] also relates that at first Chingiz-Khān wished to go to India but afterwards returned by the same road; before leaving the banks of the Indus he ordered all the prisoners to be killed, after they had gathered together a certain amount of rice. The details of the story (as is well known the same tale was subsequently recounted of Tīmūr) [2] evoke some doubt, the more so that Jūzjānī, who was not in the habit of concealing the cruel actions of the Mongols, says not a word of this action, of which he could not have been ignorant. Juwaynī before this [3] says that the command of the prisoners and artisans was given to
491 Qutuqu-noyon; a heterogeneous force | under the command of this general was, as we have seen, still operating in Merv in 1222 and 1223, and in these operations prisoners were certainly of some use. Chingiz-Khān was undoubtedly kept informed of all that occurred in Khurāsān and Afghānistān and knew that there were still towns and mountain fortresses to be besieged; he was obliged therefore to spare the prisoners, if not out of humanity, at least in order to make use of their labour.

According to Juwaynī Chingiz-Khān marched through the "mountains of Bāmiyān" and arrived at Baghlān, where he had previously left part of his baggage; he spent the summer in the pastures of this locality and did not cross the Amu-Darya till the autumn. In regard to this Juwaynī's account is entirely confirmed, as we have seen, by that of Ch'ang-Ch'un. We saw that as early as May Chingiz-Khān was very near the banks of the Amu-Darya, but later, nevertheless, he chose as his summer quarters a locality nearer to the Hindu-Kush, and not the neighbourhood of Nasaf, where he passed the summer of 1220 and where, if he was really hastening to Mongolia, it was more natural to make for. We have no information as to what precise events induced him to act thus; nor do our authorities speak of any military operations of 1222 in which Chingiz-Khān himself took part. The task of his generals consisted in the destruction of the mountain fortresses, the maintenance of communications and of the baggage trains; that on the whole they carried out this task successfully, and that the main Mongol forces, in such country as the northern part of Afghānistān, were not once placed in a difficult position, provides one of the best proofs of the military genius of Chingiz-Khān. The heaviest losses in this respect were experienced by the Mongols at Ṭālqān, where, as we saw, Chingiz-Khān left his baggage train on his

[1] i, 109 sq; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 144–7; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, ii, 319–23.

[2] Pétis de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, iii, 90; *Ẓafar-Nāmah*, Calcutta ed., ii, 92.

[3] i, 108.

advance to Ghazna. The chief of the mountain fortress of Ashiyār, in Gharjistān, the amīr Muḥammad Maraghanī,[1] made an attack on this baggage, carried away as many cartloads of gold and other goods as he could, seized a large number of horses and liberated a good many prisoners. His fortress was taken by the Mongols at the beginning of 1223, after a fifteen months' siege, and during 1222 and 1223 all the other fortresses of Gharjistān were captured as well[2].

In the autumn of 1222 Chingiz-Khān crossed the Amu-Darya and | spent the winter in Samarqand. Jaghatāy and Uguday 492
were quartered at this period at Qarā-kul near the mouth of the Zarafshān, where they occupied themselves in bird hunting and sent Chingiz-Khān every week fifty camel loads of birds. On the return journey they proposed to carry out a hunting expedition on a still grander scale (probably for the replenishment of their provisions), all the princes taking part, and Jūchī was ordered to drive up wild asses from Qipchāq. In the spring of 1223 Chingiz-Khān continued his march; on the bank of the Syr-Darya he had an interview with Jaghatāy and Uguday and held a qurultay (diet), and in the Qulān-bāshī plain[3] (to the north of the Alexander mountains) a meeting with Jūchī, who had carried out his father's command with regard to the wild asses, and brought in addition 20,000 white horses as a present. The Mongols passed the whole summer of 1223 in these steppes, and here too a court was held on some Uighūr amīrs, who were condemned to death; nothing is said of the nature of their crimes.

Ch'ang-Ch'un's account[4] on the whole confirms that of Juwaynī, but enables us to follow Chingiz-Khān's route somewhat more accurately. The army crossed the Amu-Darya on a floating bridge on October 6, 1222. Three times, on the 20th, 24th, and 28th of October, the Khān listened to the teachings of the sage, making use of Ahai as interpreter, and ordering his words to be written down. At the beginning of November they arrived in Samarqand where the sage took up his quarters as before in the former palace of the Sultan; the Mongol camp was about ten miles (thirty li) to the east of the town. Chingiz-Khān's stay in Samarqand was not so prolonged as might be inferred from Juwaynī's statements. We have no exact information on the

[1] In the Calcutta ed. of 1864 (ed. Nassau Lees) Marghazī.

[2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp 1072–7.

[3] On the Qulān steppes, cf. *Protokol Turk. Kruzhka, &c.*, May 5, 1897, supp., p. 2. The locality Qulān-Bāshī is mentioned by Juwaynī again in the account of Arghūn's journey (ii, 251 قلان تاشی also بقلان تاشی i, 111). The name of the landmark where the hunt took place is given in Juwaynī as اوتوقا (Ūtūqā?).

[4] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 330–36; Bret., i, 94–7.

departure of the Mongols, as Ch'ang-Ch'un requested permission for himself to "travel as he liked either in advance or behind,"[1] but it is evident from his account that by the end of January 1223 the Khān's tents were already on the right bank of the Syr-Darya. In any case both Juwaynī's account and that of Ch'ang-Ch'un show that Chingiz-Khān, contrary to the account
493 of an unknown author quoted in Mīrkhwānd[2], | did not touch Bukhārā on the return journey.

From Ch'ang-Ch'un's account it is evident that the place where Chingiz-Khān awaited his sons in the spring of 1223 was situated on the bank of a large river, three marches from Sayrām, probably on the bank of the Chirchik. Here, on March 10, near the "eastern mountains," Chingiz-Khān fell from his horse while hunting and was nearly killed by a wild boar. Ch'ang-Ch'un took advantage of this occurrence to persuade the Khān to refrain from the chase owing to his advanced age; Chingiz-Khān agreed, but said that he could not at once give up the practice; after this he ceased hunting for the space of two months. On the 11th of April Ch'ang-Ch'un finally took leave of Chingiz-Khān, without awaiting the arrival of the princes.

Of Chingiz-Khān's journey from the Qulān-bāshī steppes to Mongolia, Juwaynī[3] says only that he left in the autumn and reached his ordu in the spring. According to the unanimous testimony of Rashīd ad-Dīn[4], the Chinese history[5], and the *Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi*[6], Chingiz-Khān returned to Mongolia only in 1225, in the spring, according to the Chinese history and Rashīd ad-Dīn, in the autumn according to the Mongol epic. It is very probable that, agreeably to the testimony of the Mongol epic, he spent the summer of 1224 on the Irtysh.

Chingiz-Khān abandoned the Western countries before he had succeeded in subduing them definitely to his rule; but in Transoxania and Khorezmia the rule of the Mongols from 1223 onwards was challenged by none. Ibn al-Athīr[7] and Juwaynī[8] concur in witnessing to the fact that in consequence of this, the cities of Transoxania recovered far more rapidly from the devastation than the cities of Khurāsān and 'Irāq; historical facts prove that the calamities borne by the inhabitants of Transoxania during the disorders of the second half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries left more

[1] In Bret., I, 95 "to travel henceforth alone, in advance or behind."
[2] Mirkhond, *Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, p. 166.
[3] I, 111; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 147.
[4] *Trudy*, xv, 94, 118. In the second passage the translator (in the sixth line) has incorrectly inserted the word "summer," which is not found in the text (p. 175).
[5] Iakinth, *Istoriya chetyr. Khanov*, p. 127.
[6] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 149.
[7] Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 323; V. Tiesenhausen, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 38.
[8] I, 75; Schefer, *Chrestomathie persane*, ii, 118–19.

prolonged and deeper traces than the devastation caused by the Mongol invasion. Even Khorezmia, which had suffered most of all during the invasion, | was able to recover to some extent. 494
After the conquest of the country Jūchī appointed as ruler (basqāq) of Khorezmia the Chīn-Tīmūr mentioned above (p. 415), the appointment being intended to cover Khurāsān and Māzandarān as well[1]. Jūchī evidently supposed that these provinces also would be incorporated in his appanage. He had been unable to carry out his wish and prevent the destruction of the capital of Khorezmia, but Ibn al-Athīr[2] testifies that within a short time a large new city had arisen near the ruins of Gurgānj. The name Gurgānj was changed by the Mongols to Urgench[3] and has been preserved in this form to the present day. We saw that in the tenth century the town was situated on the left bank of the Amu-Darya; at the beginning of the thirteenth century, when it became the capital of a vast empire, it was situated on both banks of the river or a channel interconnected by a bridge; the new town, as is apparent in many passages of Abu'l-Ghāzī's work[4], was built on the right bank of another branch of the river which flowed to the Caspian. The present Kunya-Urgench dates only from the nineteenth century[5]. Urgench became one of the most important commercial centres on the road from Europe to Asia[6], but in spite of this the recovery of Khorezmia was slow; the dams remained for long unrestored, and for three centuries the Amu-Darya could flow to the Caspian Sea. How different the Khorezmia of Mongol rule was from the Khorezmia of the Sāmānid epoch is best seen from Ibn-Baṭṭūṭa's statement[7], that between the capital of Khorezmia (Urgench) and Bukhārā there extended a steppe, in which there was but one populated spot—the small town of Kāth.

Chingiz-Khān's sons all returned eastwards with their father except Jūchī, who remained in his extensive territories. His

[1] Juwaynī, II, 218. [2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Trudy*, XV, 69; Persian text, p. 104. From Juwaynī's text in the printed ed. (I, 96) and as edited by Schefer (*Chrestomathie persane*, II, 136) it might be inferred that the term Urgench existed prior to the Mongols; but in several manuscripts the reading here is كركانج.

[4] Especially clear on p. 225 (p. 241 of the trans.); cf. also *Zapiski*, XV, 296 sq., from a sixteenth-century work. The ruins of the town destroyed by the Mongols are mentioned separately from the town existing at that time.

[5] Galkin, *Etnograf. i astronom. materialy po Srednei Azii i Orenburgskomu krayu*, St. P., 1868, p. 161. According to the official history of Khiva Kunya-Urgench was founded in 1831; cf. my *Oroshenie Turkestana*, p. 99. On the ruins of the old town cf. also A. Kuhn, *Statisticheskie materialy dlya Turkestana*, IV, pp. 211–16 (from Hilālī to Kunya-Urgench) and pp. 216–18 (from Kunya-Urgench to Khojeili). The account of the ruins given by Landsdell, *Russian Central Asia*, II, 341–8, is taken from this work.

[6] Yule, *Cathay and the way thither*, II, 287–8.

[7] *Voyages d'Ibn-Batoutah*, III, 19–20.

495 evident endeavour to found a kingdom | independent of the centre of the Empire was the cause of a dispute between son and father. According to Jūzjānī[1] Jūchī was so fond of Qipchāq that he determined to save the country from devastation; he told his suite that Chingiz-Khān had lost his senses, thus to ruin so many countries and peoples; therefore he, Jūchī, intended to kill his father while he was hunting, and conclude an alliance with the Muslims. Jaghatāy learned of this plan and repeated it to his father, who ordered Jūchī to be secretly poisoned. Of the other original sources, Rashīd ad-Dīn[2] alone speaks of a conflict between father and son; in Juwaynī[3] it is related only that after the meeting at Qulān-bāshī Jūchī returned to his territories and died soon afterwards. According to Rashīd ad-Dīn Jūchī was entrusted with the subjugation of the "Northern provinces," *i.e.* those countries through which Jebe and Sūbuday had only passed, but he did not carry out the mandate. On his return to Mongolia Chingiz-Khān summoned his son before him; the latter made answer that he could not set out in consequence of an illness. Meanwhile a certain Mongol who had arrived from the western countries said that he had seen Jūchī hunting; Chingiz-Khān then decided that his son had intentionally disobeyed his father's order, and sent Jaghatāy and Uguday against him, preparing to follow them immediately, but at this moment the news of Jūchī's death arrived.

Rashīd ad-Dīn adds that according to one source of information Jūchī was only 20, according to another 30 to 40 years old; as, however, the third son Uguday already had a son[4] in 1206, Jūchī, the eldest, could not in 1225 have been less than 40 years of age. The date of Jūchī's death is not given in Rashīd ad-Dīn; according to later sources[5] he died six months before his father, *i.e.* in February, 1227; if so, the news of his death was received by Chingiz-Khān when he was already at Tangut, where he arrived, according to Rashīd ad-Dīn[6], in the autumn of 1225, according to the Chinese history[7], in the spring of 1226, after
496 which he never again | returned to Mongolia. The poetical tale of how Chingiz-Khān was informed of his son's death[8] has, of course, no historical value.

---

[1] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1101.

[2] MS. Public Library v, 3, 1. f. 187–8: ed. Blochet, pp. 132 sq; D'Ohsson, *Hist. des Mongols*, I, 353–4.

[3] Juwaynī, I, 221.

[4] Iakinth, *Istoriya chetyr Khanov*, p. 298.

[5] Thus in the abridged history of Ulugh-beg (MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 26, 190 f. 108; Miles, *The Shajrat ul Atrak*, p. 196); also in Raverty, Rabī' I (*Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1102).

[6] *Trudy*, xv, 94, 118.

[7] Iakinth, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

[8] *Texts*, pp. 163–4 (from the *Shajarat al-Atrāk*).

Chingiz-Khān died in August, 1227[1], seventy-two years of age, leaving to his successors not only a vast empire, conquered by arms, but also the guiding principles of its construction. To draw faithfully and fully the character of the redoubtable conqueror with the information we possess is a task of great difficulty. We are more favourably placed for dealing with his descendants in this respect, as in them some historians have found grounds for seeing not devastators but builders. Thus Bātū in the eyes of the Russian chroniclers was only a "ferocious brute,"[2] while he not only received from the Mongols themselves the title of "Good Khān" (sain khan), but is celebrated for his mildness, justice, and wisdom by Muslim[3] and Armenian[4] authors, who are not at all inclined to praise the Mongols. As of historic characters, so of nations we can justly judge only when we have information on their lives in their varied aspects; to pass judgements on individual actors and nations based on isolated facts and separate aspects of their activities is a totally unscientific process, which is unfortunately to be met with even in the latest historians. The meeting between Ch'ang-Ch'un and the Mongols[5] shows that even the Mongols of the thirteenth century sometimes appeared as hospitable and good-natured nomads as the present day Kirghiz, though that in no way hindered them from rousing the horror of the whole world by their cruelty under other circumstances. Yet the comparison of the peaceful scenes of contemporary nomad life with their recent sanguinary past leads | some travellers to infer a complete 497
"metamorphosis" which these peoples are supposed to have undergone.

The most detailed information on Chingiz-Khān's appearance is given by Jūzjānī and Meng-Hung. The persons with whom Jūzjānī conversed[6] saw the Khān during his invasion of Khurāsān, when he was already sixty-five years of age; he was distinguished by his lofty stature and strong constitution, had "cat's eyes," and at that time but a small amount of grey hair on his head. According to Meng-Hung[7] Chingiz-Khān was distinguished from other Mongols by his great size, wide forehead, and long beard. Of his moral qualities the most striking was his unusual self-control and utter absence of one-sided impulses under all

[1] In Juwaynī, i, 144, 4th Ramaḍān (Aug. 18); so also in D'Ohsson (*Histoire des Mongols*, i, 381), in Jamāl Qarshī (*Texts*, p. 136) 10th Ramaḍān (Aug. 24). From the words of Rashīd ad-Dīn (*Trudy*, xv, 119; Pers. text, p. 177) it may be inferred that the death of Chingiz-Khān occurred somewhat earlier, as on the 14th Ramaḍān (Aug. 28) the body had already arrived in Mongolia.

[2] Karamzin, *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiiskavo*, iv, p, 12.

[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp. 1171–2.

[4] Patkanov, *Istor. mongolov inoka Magakii*, p. 18.

[5] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 288, Bret., i, 52.

[6] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1077.

[7] *Trudy*. iv, 217.

circumstances. Like all conquerors Chingiz-Khān could calmly exterminate people by thousands if he considered it necessary for the consolidation of his rule; but in none of his actions of which we have at all reliable information is there any sign of useless or stupid cruelty, such as the tortures to which Mongol prisoners were subjected by order of Jalāl-ad-Dīn. Travellers have often noted the contrast between the natural liveliness and passions of the savage and his endeavour to show no feeling in the presence of strangers, in order not to lessen his dignity. Chingiz-Khān's descendants, to whom no pleasures were unattainable and before whom all men bowed down, easily went to extremes both in the pleasures of life and in consideration for their dignity. We find amongst them sovereigns who never allowed a smile to cross their features and who inspired their subjects only with terror (Jaghatāy and Guyuk)[1]. Others gave way to the natural vivacity of the nomad, manifested most strikingly in the desire to live and let live; meeting every subject affably, by their manner and their liberality attaching all hearts to them, they, like Byron's Sardanapalus, allowed themselves to enjoy, before all eyes, a gaiety which passed into debauch, and degraded the dignity of the throne (Uguday and to some extent the Jaghatāy-Khān Tarmashirīn)[2]. Chingiz-Khān was stranger
498 alike | to both extremes. Stifling by his personality every will foreign to his own, subjecting his army to such severe discipline that theft and lying, according to the testimony of Jūzjānī[3], an enemy of the Mongols, was quite inconceivable in it, Chingiz-Khān at the same time satisfied the ideal of a generous hero; they said of him: "This prince Temuchin takes off the clothes he was wearing and gives them away; gets off the horse he was riding and makes a present of it."[4] Chingiz-Khān's interview with the qāḍī Waḥīd ad-Dīn Būshanjī, reported in Jūzjānī[5], shows that he knew how to master the wrath evoked by speeches which he disliked. He shared the infatuation of his people for wine, and even in his precepts could not make up his mind to speak out too severely against it[6]; the scene related in Meng-Hung[7] of how Chingiz-Khān "mulcted" the Chinese envoy of "six beakers" recalls the stories of the banquets of Peter the Great. The same Meng-Hung speaks of a choir of maidens which accompanied the Mongol Khan everywhere, and there is mention of girls in the account of Ch'ang-Ch'un's[8] travels as well.

[1] On the character of Guyuk cf. Plano Carpini, Hakl. Soc. Extra Series, i, 127; Juwaynī, i, 213; Rashīd ad-Dīn, ed. Blochet, pp. 252 sq.
[2] See on him Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (*Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, iii, 33–9).
[3] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1079.
[4] *Trudy*, xiii, 98; Persian text, p. 160.
[5] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, pp 1041–2.
[6] *Trudy*, xv, 125–7.
[7] *Ibid.*, iv, 234.
[8] *Works of the Peking Mission*, iv, 273; Bret., i, 43 sq.

Like everything else in the Empire, the supply of concubines for the army, for its leaders, and for the Khān himself, was strictly organized[1]. The advanced age reached by Chingiz-Khān with the full preservation of his intellectual faculties proves that he was more limited in his indulgences than most of his descendants.

The great organizing faculties of Chingiz-Khān deserve all the more attention in that, to the end of his life, he remained a stranger to all culture, spoke no language but Mongolian[2], and of course considered the organization of the empire only from the point of view of the dominion of nomad conquerors over civilized peoples, whom God Himself had delivered into Mongol hands in order that they should derive revenues from the labours of the conquered and for this object alone should protect them[3]. If in the precepts of Chingiz-Khān which have come down to us | there 499 are no categorical commands, as in the precepts ascribed by the first Osmanlis to Oghuz-Khān[4], "always to wander, never to remain settled," yet there can be no doubt that such was his desire; at any rate Chingiz-Khān's[5] Yāsā (law) was still quoted in such a sense in the fourteenth century. Agriculturists and artisans were to form the raw materials from which it would be possible for their owners, *i.e.* the Mongols or, more correctly, the Mongol leaders, to derive advantage. Chingiz-Khān worked only for himself, his descendants, and his closest adherents; there is no evidence of any sort that he was open to the idea of labouring for the good of the whole nation, even in the form in which this idea found expression in the Orkhon inscriptions[6]. On the other hand intellectual culture itself already represented a force which could not be left entirely in subject hands. The policy of reconciling two incompatible things—nomadic life and intellectual culture—was the weakest spot in Chingiz-Khān's system, and the principal cause of its fall; but the organization which he gave to the empire proved sufficient to maintain its unity for forty years after the death of the founder, and the dominion of Chingiz-Khān's family for a further period of several generations in the states which had been formed after its division. This is the more remarkable that not one of his sons and grandsons

[1] Juwaynī, i, 24; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, i, 416–17.

[2] *Tabakat-i Nasiri*, p. 1114.

[3] Patkanov, *Istoriya mongolov inoka Magakii*, p. 11.

[4] Tawārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq, MS. As. Mus. 590 ba, p. 28: دایم کوچ ایده‌لر اوتراق اولیالر (not in the Persian original, of course).

[5] Ta'rīkh-i Guzīdah MS. Petr. Univ. No. 153, p. 472: مغول‌را در شهر نشستن قاعده نیست وخلاف یاساق چنگز خانست (not in the facs. ed. by E. G. Browne).

[6] *Zapiski*, xii, 70 (the great inscription of Kül-tegin, lines 26 and 27; W. Radloff, *Die alttürk. Inschriften der Mongolei*, p. 17; V. Thomsen, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, pp 106, 107).

inherited his high abilities. Chingiz-Khān chose his successor during his own lifetime, and the choice gives fresh proof of his sagacity and breadth of outlook. Untempted by the military talents of Tūluy or the unbending severity with which Jaghatāy carried out the basic principles of his father's system, Chingiz-Khān fixed his regard on Uguday, by whose magnanimous and affable character all hearts were attracted. As the father's strong will was not inherited by any of the sons, after his death there necessarily followed a joint dominion of all the members of
500 the Khān's | family, and the unity of the empire could be preserved only if the supreme power were in the hands of a man who could unite them all, if not by his intellectual influence and will power, then by his attractive moral qualities. In what light these considerations presented themselves to Chingiz-Khān himself it is difficult to say. In any case, according to all accounts, Uguday was proclaimed heir during his father's lifetime, and the rare unanimity with which the members of the dynasty exercised their rights during his reign, together with the comparative prosperity of his subjects, prove that Uguday fully justified the hopes of his talented father.

To investigate how the organization of the Mongol empire affected the history of Central Asia, and what traces of its structure were preserved in the states which rose upon its ruins, would undoubtedly be of great interest; but a complete answer to these questions may serve as the theme of an independent work.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVENTS[1].

681–683	Salm b. Ziyād in Khurāsān ; Arabs winter in Transoxania for the first time.
683	Civil War in Khurāsān. 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim.
689	Irruption of Eastern Turks into Transoxania.
689–704	Mūsā b. 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim in Tirmidh.
691/2	Restoration of Umayyad rule in Khurāsān.
791	Fresh irruption of Eastern Turks.
705 (704)–715	Qutayba b. Muslim in Khurāsān.
705	Conquest of the Surkhān valley by the Arabs.
711	Muḥammad b. Qāsim in India. Eastern Turks conquer the western part of Central Asia.
712	Arab conquest of Khorezmia and Ṣaghāniyān. Occupation of Samarqand by the Eastern Turks.
713	Retreat of the Eastern Turks from Soghdiana. Qutayba's expedition to Shāsh and Farghāna. Construction of the first mosque in Bukhārā
716–737 (738)	The Western Turkish Khān Sūlū (Abū Muzāḥim).
717–720	'Omar II, Caliph : solicitude for piety ; beginning of the Shi'ite movement in Khurāsān.
720/1–721/2	Sa'īd b. 'Abd-al-'azīz in Khurāsān ; weak administration ; rise of the dihqāns into prominence.
721/722	Sa'īd b.'Amr al-Ḥarashī in Khurāsān ; emigration of the Soghdians to Farghāna.
724	Battle of Barūqān between North and South Arabs.
725	Restoration of the city of Balkh.
727–729	Ashras b. 'Abdallāh as-Sulamī in Khurāsān ; construction of rabāts.
728	Muslim propaganda in Soghdiana ; treachery of the governor and revolt of the inhabitants.
729	Restoration of Arab rule in Bukhārā.
730 (731)	Struggle between the governor Junayd b. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān and the Turks and Soghdians.
733	Famine in Khurāsān.
734	Revolt of Ḥārith b. Surayj.
735–738	Asad b. 'Abdallāh in Khurāsān.
735 (736)	Asad's expedition to Waraghsar.
736	Temporary transference of the seat of government to Balkh.
737	Struggle with the Turks in Ṭukhāristān ; death of the Khān.
738–748	Naṣr b. Sayyār in Khurāsān.
739	Pact between Nasr and the rulers of Ushrūsana, Shāsh and Farghāna.
739 (740)	Death of Kūrṣūl ; final fall of the Western Turkish empire.

[1] Those dates which are less probable but still possible are placed in brackets. Together with the years of his rule are shown the provinces which each viceroy or ruler governed, with the exception of those practically independent rulers whose predominance in the Eastern part of the Muslim world was undisputed.

741 Restoration of the Soghdians to their native land.
742 Construction of the cathedral mosque in Balkh.
743 Revolt of the 'Alids in Khurāsān; death of Yaḥyā b. Zayd.
744 Revolt of the Yamanites in Khurāsān.
745 Return of Ḥārith b. Surayj to Merv and his renewed revolt.
746 Death of Ḥārith.
747 Arrival of Abū Muslim in Khurāsān.
748–755 Government of Abū Muslim in Khurāsān.
748 Destruction of Sūyāb by the Chinese.
750/1 Rising in Bukhārā.
751 Victory of the Arabs over the Chinese on the Talas.
752 Embassy of the prince of Ushrūsana to the Chinese.
752/3 Revolt of the governors Sibā' b. an-Nu'mān and Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ in Transoxania. Construction of the gates and towers of Samarqand.
755–757 Abū Dāwud Ibrāhīm b. Ṣāliḥ in Khurāsān.
757–759 'Abd-al-Jabbār b. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān in Khurāsān.
757/8 Execution of the governor of Bukhārā, Mujāshi' b. Ḥuiayth al-Anṣārī.
759 Revolt of 'Abd-al-Jabbār and Barāz.
766 Occupation of Sūyāb by the Qarluqs.
767 Revolt of Ashnās in Bādhghīs.
776 (?) Construction of the wall north of the Chirchik.
777 (?) Revolt of Yūsuf al-Barm at Bukhārā.
780–783 (782) Musayyab b. Zuhayr in Khurāsān; suppression of Muqanna's revolt; coinage of Musayyabī dirhams.
783 (782)–787 Abu'l-'Abbās Faḍl b Sulaymān aṭ-Ṭūsī in Khurāsān; construction of the long walls in Bukhārā district.
792–793 Ghiṭrīf b. 'Atā al-Kindi in Khurāsān; expulsion of the Qarluqs from Farghāna; coinage of Ghiṭrīfī dirhams.
794–795 Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī in Khurāsān; subjugation of Ushrūsana; construction of the new Cathedral Mosque at Bukhārā. Formation of the "'Abbāsid" corps.
796–806/7 (808) 'Alī b. 'Īsā in Khurāsān.
806–810 Revolt of Rāfi' b. Layth in Samarqand.
809 Withdrawal of the Turks allied to Rāfi'.
809–818 Ma'mūn in Khurāsān.
811 Ma'mūn's war with Amīn; campaign of Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn.
816/7 Famine in Khurāsān.
819–821 Ghassān b. 'Abbād in Khurāsān; Nūḥ b. Asad in Samarqand.
820–821 The Toqūz-Oghuz (Tughuzghuz) in Ushrūsana.
821 Revolt of the "Volunteers" in Khurāsān.
821–822 Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn.
822–828 Ṭalḥa b. Ṭāhir.
822 Expedition of Aḥmad b. Abū Khālid to Ushrūsana.
828–830 'Alī b. Ṭāhir.
830–844 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir.
830 Termination of the construction of the long walls in Bukhārā district.
832 (?) Death of the Bukharan sage Abū Ḥafṣ.
839 Earthquake in Farghāna[1].
840 Conquest of Isfījāb by the Sāmānids.
841 Execution of Afshīn.
842–846 Aḥmad b. Asad in Transoxania.
844–862 Ṭāhir b. 'Abdallāh.
848–870 Dāwud b. 'Abbās in Balkh.

[1] See *Texts*, p. 3.

849/850 Construction of the city walls of Bukhārā.
851–867 Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh, governor of Baghdād.
855 Death of Yaḥyā b. Asad.
856/7 Death of Ilyās b. Asad at Herāt.
859 Massacre of several thousand people in Shāwdār[1].
861–879 Ya'qūb b. Layth in Sijistān.
862–873 Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir.
864–892 Naṣr b. Aḥmad b. Asad in Transoxania.
864–884 (with interruptions) Ḥasan b. Zayd in Ṭabaristān.
867 (871) Conquest of Herāt and Būshang by Ya'qūb.
869 Conquest of Kirmān and Fārs by Ya'qūb. Death of Muḥammad b. 'Alī Tirmidhī.
870 Conquest of Balkh, Kābul, and Ghazna by Ya'qūb.
871 Confirmation of Ya'qūb as viceroy of Balkh and Ṭukhāristān.
873 Conquest of Khurāsān by Ya'qūb.
874 Isma'īl b. Aḥmad in Bukhārā. Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir in Marw ar-Rūdh. Edict of the Caliph against Ya'qūb.
876 Defeat of Ya'qūb at Dayr al-'Āqūl.
877 Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir in Merv.
879–900 'Amr b. Layth.
882 Rāfi' b. Ḥarthama in Nīshāpūr.
885 Edict of the Caliph against 'Amr.
888 Struggle between Naṣr and Isma'īl.
889 Edict of the Caliph in favour of 'Amr.
890 Edict of the Caliph against 'Amr.
892 Confirmation of 'Amr as viceroy of Khurāsān.
892–907 Isma'īl b. Aḥmad in Transoxania.
893 Isma'īl's diploma from the Caliph. Conquest of Ushrūsana and Talās by Isma'īl.
898 Appointment of 'Amr as viceroy of Transoxania and deposition of Isma'īl.
899–900 War between 'Amr and Isma'īl.
901 Confirmation of Isma'īl as viceroy of Khurāsān.
902 Extension of the cathedral mosque at Bukhārā.
904 Incursion of the Turks into Transoxania.
907–914 Aḥmad b. Isma'īl.
913/4 Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Uṭrush in Ṭabaristān.
914–943 Naṣr b. Aḥmad b. Isma'īl.
914 Suppression of the revolt of Isḥāq b. Aḥmad.
918 Suppression of the revolt of Ḥusayn b. 'Alī Marwazī.
918/9 Construction of the new minaret at Bukhārā.
918/9–920/1 Mīkā'īl b. Ja'far in Samarqand.
919 Suppression of the revolt of Aḥmad b. Sahl in Khurāsān.
922 Suppression of the revolt of Ilyās b. Isḥāq in Farghāna.
929 Fire in Bukhārā.
930 (?) Revolt of Naṣr's brothers.
937 Devastating fire in Bukhārā.
938 Abū 'Alī Jayhānī, wazīr.
940 Death of the former wazīr, Abu'l-Faḍl Bal'amī.
941/2 Death of the wazīr Abū 'Alī Jayhānī.
942 Capture of Balāsāghūn by heathen Turks. Shi'ite movement in Transoxania. Withdrawal of Naṣr from the government of the kingdom.
943–954 Nūḥ b. Naṣr.
944 Rising in Khorezmia.
945 Revolt of Abū 'Alī Chaghānī.

[1] See *Texts*, p. 49 (Qandīya).

946 Murder of Aḥmad b. Ḥamūya and the wazīr as-Sulamī (al-ḥākim ash-shahīd).

947 Entry of Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad and Abū 'Alī Chaghānī into Bukhārā. Return of Naṣr; blinding of the rebel princes; defeat of Abū 'Alī.

948 Death of Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr; appointment of Manṣūr b. Qarātagīn as governor of Khurāsān. Reconciliation of the government with Abū 'Alī and his allies.

951 Death of Manṣūr b. Qarātagīn.

951/2 Construction of the new edifice of the mosque of Bukhārā.

952 Abū 'Alī Chaghānī, governor of Khurāsān.

954-961 'Abd-al-Malik b. Nūḥ.

954 Bakr b. Mālik al-Farghānī in Khurāsān. Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr, wazīr,

955 Death of Abū 'Alī Chaghānī. Death of Satūq Bughrā-Khān (?).

956 Murder of Bakr b. Mālik.

957 Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī in Khurāsān.

959 Abū Manṣūr Yūsuf b Isḥāq, wazīr.

960 Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Abd-ar-Razzāq in Khurāsān. Conversion to Islam of the Turks of Semiryechye.

961 Abū 'Alī Bal'amī, wazīr. Alptagīn in Khurāsān.

961-976 Mansūr b. Nūḥ. b. Naṣr.

961 Sack and burning of the palace at Bukhārā.

962 The palace again burnt. Alptagīn in Ghazna. Revolt of Abū Manṣūr b. 'Abd-ar-Razzāq in Khurāsān. Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī in Khurāsān.

963 Death of Alptagīn; Isḥāq b. Alptagīn in Ghazna.

964 Flight of Isḥāq b. Alptagīn to Bukhārā.

965 Return of Isḥāq b. Alptagīn to Ghazna.

971 Construction of a new place for festival prayers at Bukhārā.

974 Death of the wazīr Abū 'Alī Bal'amī and the wazīr Yūsuf b. Isḥāq.

975/6 Abū 'Abdallāh Aḥmad Jayhānī, wazīr.

976-997 Nūḥ b. Manṣūr.

977-997 Sabuktagīn in Ghazna.

977 Abu'l-Ḥusayn 'Utbī, wazīr.

982 Deposition of Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī: Tāsh in Khurāsān. Victory of the Būyids over the Sāmānids at Gurgān. Murder of the wazīr 'Utbī.

985 Saljūqids in the neighbourhood of Bukhārā.

986 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr, wazīr.

987 Victory of Abu'l-Ḥasan and Fāiq over Tāsh.

989 Death of Abu'l-Ḥasan Sīmjūrī.

990 Confirmation of Abū 'Alī Sīmjūrī as governor of Khurāsān.

992 Bughrā-Khān at Bukhārā; his retreat and Nūḥ's return. Death of Bughrā-Khān. 'Abdallāh b. 'Uzayr, wazīr.

994 Victory of Nūḥ and Sabuktagīn over Abū 'Alī and Fāiq.

995 Victories of Abū 'Alī and Fāiq over Mahmūd. Their defeat in the neighbourhood of Ṭūs. Fāiq in Turkestan. Abū 'Alī in Khorezmia and Bukhārā. Fall of the dynasty of the original Khwārazm-shāhs.

996 Qarā-Khānids and Sabuktagīn in Transoxania; treaty between them. Deposition of the wazīr 'Abdallāh b. 'Uzayr; appointment of Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad. Death of Abū 'Alī.

997 Death of the wazīr Abū Naṣr; appointment of Abu'l-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Barghashī. Death of the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn b. Muḥammad; accession of his son 'Alī b. Ma'mūn.

997–999 Manṣūr b. Nūḥ b. Manṣūr.
997–998 Isma'īl b. Sabuktagīn at Ghazna.
998–1030 Maḥmūd b. Sabuktagīn at Ghazna.
998 Victory of Begtūzūn over Abu'l-Qāsim Sīmjūrī. Flight of the wazīr Barghashī. Death of Arslān-Khān 'Alī.
999 'Abd-al-Malik b. Nūḥ b. Manṣūr. Victory of Maḥmūd and his ceremonial accession to the throne. Death of Fāiq. Occupation of Bukhārā by the Qarā-Khānids.
1000 Return of Isma'īl Muntaṣir to Bukhārā.
1001 Maḥmūd's embassy to the Īlak Naṣr at Ūzgand.
1003 Muntaṣir in Transoxania for the second time; his victory at Samarqand; retreat.
1004 Failures of Muntaṣir at Nasā and Abīward; his victories at Dabūsiya and Būrnamadh, defeat in the Hunger Steppe. Unsuccessful operations in Bukhārā district.
1005 Death of Muntaṣir.
1006 Invasion of Khurāsān by the Qarā-Khānids.
1007–1008 Fresh invasion by the Qarā-Khānids.
1008 Defeat of the Qarā-Khānids at Sharkhiyān.
1010/1 Famine in Khurāsān.
1011/2 Reconciliation of the Īlak Naṣr with Ṭughān-Khān of Kāshghar; their embassy to Maḥmūd.
1012/3 (?) Death of the Īlak Naṣr; the Īlak Aḥmad b. 'Alī; Muḥammad b. 'Alī (Arslān-Khān) in Bukhārā.
1013/4 Death of the wazīr Abu'l-'Abbās Faḍl b. Aḥmad al-Isfarāyinī. Qadir-Khān Yūsuf in Yārkand.
1014 Request made by the wazīr Maymandī to the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn b. Ma'mūn concerning the khuṭba.
1014/5 Qadir-Khān Yūsuf in Kāshghar.
1015/6 Marriage of the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn with Maḥmūd's sister.
1016 Civil war among the Qarā-Khānids; mediation of the Khwārazm-shāh.
1016/7 (?) Death of the Īlak Aḥmad b 'Alī.
1017 Death of the Khwārazm-shāh Ma'mūn; conquest of Khwārazm by Maḥmūd; Altūntāsh appointed Khwārazm-shāh.
1017/8 (1012/3) Defeat of the heathen Turks in Semiryechye. Death of Ṭughān-Khān.
1024/5 Death of Arslān-Khān Muḥammad b. 'Alī.
1025 Maḥmūd in Transoxania; meeting with Qadir-Khān.
1026 Conquest of Balāsāghūn by Qadir-Khān; Ṭughān-Khān in Akhsīkath. Embassy of Qayā-Khān and Bughrā-Khān (?) to Maḥmūd. Envoys of the Caliph Qādir.
1030 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd in Ghazna.
1030–1041 Mas'ūd b. Maḥmūd in Ghazna.
1031 Mas'ūd's embassy to Kāshghar; the Caliph's embassy to Mas'ūd.
1032 Death of Qadir-Khān; Arslān-Khān Sulaymān. Expedition of Altūntāsh to Bukhārā and his death.
1032–1035 Hārūn b. Altūntāsh in Khorezmia.
1034 Death of 'Alītagīn. Irruption of the Kumījīs into Khuttal and of the Turkmens into Quwādhiyān. Revolt of Hārūn. The Saljūqids in Khorezmia. Return of Mas'ūd's envoys from Kāshghar; arrival of Bughrā-Khān's envoys.
1035–1041 Isma'īl Khandān b. Altūntāsh in Khorezmia.
1035 Saljūqids in Khurāsān. Descent on Saghāniyān and Tirmidh by 'Alītagīn's son's; their embassy to Mas'ūd.
1036 Fresh embassy of 'Alītagīn's sons to Mas'ūd; Mas'ūd's embassy to Transoxania.

1037 Mas'ūd's embassy to Turkestan; envoys from Turkestan at the court of Mas'ūd.
1038 Revolt of Burītagīn Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr in Transoxania. Despatch of diploma for Khorezmia to Shāh-Malik of Jand.
1038–1039 Winter expedition of Mas'ūd into Ṣaghāniyān.
1039 Successes of Burītagīn in Transoxania.
1040 Battle at Dandānqān. Transfer of Khurāsān to Saljūqid rule.
1041 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd (for the second time) in Ghazna. Conquest of Khorezmia by Shāh-Malik.
1041–1048 Mawdūd b. Mas'ūd in Ghazna.
1041/2 (?) Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr in Bukhārā.
1043 Conquest of Khorezmia by the Saljūqids.
1044/5 Shi'ite movement in Transoxania.
1046/7–1068 Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b Nasr in Samarqand.
1059 Treaty between the Ghaznevids and the Saljūqids.
1061 Embassy of Ṭamghāch-Khān to Baghdād.
1064 Alp-Arslān's expedition to Khuttal.
1065 Alp-Arslān's expedition to Jand and Sawrān.
1068–1080 Shams al-Mulk Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm in Samarqand.
1068 Cathedral Mosque at Bukhārā burned.
1069 Restoration of the mosque at Bukhāra. Execution of the imām as-Ṣaffar.
1072 Alp-Arslān's expedition to Transoxania; his death. Shams al-Mulk in Tirmidh and Balkh.
1073 Failure of Ayāz at Tirmidh.
1074 (1073) Capture of Tirmidh by Malik-Shāh; conclusion of peace with Shams al-Mulk.
1078/9 Construction of the "Rabāṭ of the King."
1080– ? Khiḍr b. Ibrāhīm in Samarqand.
? –1095 (with an interval) Aḥmad b. Khiḍr in Samarqand.
1089 Conquest of Transoxania by Malik-Shāh.
1090 Revolt in Transoxania and fresh campaign by Malik-Shāh.
1095 Execution of Aḥmad-Khān.
1097 Submission of Transoxania to the sultan Barkyāruq. Death of the Khwārazm-shāh Ikinchī b. Quchqār.
1097–1127 (1128) Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad Khwārazm-shāh.
1099 (?)–1102 Qadir-Khān Jibra'īl in Transoxania.
1102 Defeat of Qadir-Khān Jibra'īl at Tirmidh.
1102–1130 Arslān-Khān Muḥammad b. Sulaymān.
1103 Revolt of Sāghir-Beg in Transoxania.
1109 Fresh revolt of Sāghir-Beg.
1115/6 Death of the shaykh Namad-pūsh.
1119 Construction of a place for festival prayers in Bukhārā.
1121 Construction of the new cathedral mosque in Bukhārā.
1127 End of the building of the minaret in Bukhārā.
1127 (1128)–1156 Atsiz b. Muḥammad, Khwārazm-shāh.
1130 Conquest of Samarqand by Sinjar.
1132 Revolt of Qadir-Khān Aḥmad in Transoxania.
1132 (?)–1141 Rukn ad-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad in Samarqand.
1137 Victory of the Qarā-Khiṭāys over Maḥmūd-Khān.
1138 Revolt of Atsiz; Sinjar's expedition to Khorezmia. Defeat of Atsiz; Sulaymān b. Muḥammad in Khorezmia.
1139 Return of Atsiz to Khorezmia; flight of Sulaymān.
1139/40 Expedition of Atsiz to Bukhārā.
1141 Submission of Atsiz to Sinjar. Defeat of Sinjar at Qaṭwān; conquest of Transoxania by the Qarā-Khiṭāys. Expedition of Atsiz into Khurāsān. Invasion of Khorezmia by the Qarā-Khiṭāys.

1142 Conquest of Nīshāpūr by Atsiz. Sinjar's rule re-established in Khorāsān.
1144 Expedition of Sinjar to Khorezmia; incursion of the Ghuzz on Bukhārā.
1147–1148 Third expedition of Sinjar to Khorezmia.
1152 Conquest of Jand by Atsiz. Death of Sultan Mas'ūd; restoration of the temporal power of the Caliph.
1153 Sinjar taken prisoner by the Ghuzz.
1153–1154 Khorezmians in Bayhaq.
1156 Murder of Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Sulaymān. Expedition of Atsiz to Khurāsān. Liberation of Sinjar from captivity.
1156–1163 Chaghrī-Khān Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Ḥasan in Samarqand.
1156–1172 (1170, 1173) Īl-Arslān b. Atsiz, Khwārazm-shāh.
1157 Death of Sultan Sinjar.
1157–1162 Rukn ad-Dīn Maḥmūd in Khurāsān.
1158 Expedition of Īl-Arslān into Transoxania.
1161 Plundering of Dihistān and Gurgān by the Ghuzz.
1162–1174 Mu'ayyid ad-Dawla Āy-Āba in Khurāsān.
1163 Mu'ayyid's diploma from the Saljūqid sultan Arslān.
1163–1178/9 Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd b. 'Alī in Samarqand.
1165 War between Mu'ayyid and Īl-Arslān. Invasion of Balkh and Andkhūd by the Qarā-Khiṭāys. Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn in Ūzgand. Restoration of the city walls of Bukhārā.
1171–1172 (1169–1170) Invasion of Khorezmia by the Qarā-Khiṭāys.
1172 Sulṭān-Shāh, Khwārazm-shāh; his deposition.
1172–1200 Takash b. Īl-Arslān, Khwārazm-shāh.
1173/4 Conquest of Ghazna by the Ghūrids.
1174 Defeat of Mu'ayyid at Subarlī.
1174–1185 Ṭughān-Shāh in Nīshāpūr.
1175–6 Conquest of Herāt by the Ghūrids.
1178/9–1201 (?) Ulugh-Sulṭān Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn in Samarqand.
1181–1193 Sulṭān-Shāh in Merv, Sarakhs, and Ṭūs.
1181 Embassy of the Ghūrid sultan to Khorezmia. Alp-Qarā-Ūrān with the Qipchāqs in Khorezmia.
1182 Takash in Khurāsān; siege of Sarakhs; expedition to Bukhārā. Successful operations of Alp-Qarā-Ūrān.
1183 Victory of Sulṭān-Shāh over the Ghūrid Ghiyāth ad-Dīn.
1185–1187 Sinjar-Shāh in Nīshāpūr.
1187 Conquest of Nīshāpūr by Takash; Malik-Shāh b. Takash in Nīshāpūr.
1192 First expedition of Takash to 'Irāq.
1193 Death of Sultān-Shāh; Malik-Shāh in Merv, Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad in Nīshāpūr.
1194 Conquest of 'Irāq by Takash; death of the Saljūqid sultan Ṭughrul.
1195 Expedition of Takash to Sighnāq.
1196 Victory of the Khorezmians over the army of Baghdād.
1197 Death of Malik-Shāh b. Takash.
1198 Campaign of Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥammad and Alp-Darak in the steppes.
1199 Expedition of Qāyir-Tūqū-Khān against Alp-Darak.
1200–1220 'Alā ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Takash, Khwārazm-shāh.
1200/1 (?)–1212 "The Sultan of sultans" 'Othmān b. Ibrāhīm in Samarqand.
1203 Restoration of Khorezmian rule in Khurāsān. Victory of Chingiz-Khān over the Keraits.
1204 Conquest of Khorezmia by the Ghūrs. Defeat of the Ghūrid Shihāb ad-Dīn near Andkhūd.
1205 Descent of Tāj ad-Dīn Zangī on Marw-ar-Rūdh, his defeat and execution Conquest of Tirmidh by the Ghūrs.

1206 Death of the Ghūrid Shihāb ad-Dīn. Submission of Balkh, Herāt and Ghūr to the Khwārazm-shāh. Unification of Mongolia under the rule of Chingiz-Khān.

1207 Return of the Khwārazm-shāh to Khorezmia. His conquest of Bukhārā. His defeat in battle with the Qarā-Khiṭāys. Revolts in Nīshāpūr and Herāt.

1208 Restoration of Khorezmian rule in Khurāsān. Flight of Kūchluk and the Nāimāns to the territories of the Qarā-Khitāys.

1209 Embassy of the Qarā-Khiṭāys to Khorezmia. Expedition of the Khwārazm-shāh against the Qipchāqs. Revolt of the Uighūr Īdīqūt against the Qarā-Khiṭāys and his submission to the Mongols. Revolt of Kūchluk.

1210 Capture of Samarqand by the Qarā-Khiṭāys. Successes of Kūchluk; withdrawal of the Qarā-Khiṭāys from Samarqand; victory of the Khwārazm-shāh in the plain of Ilāmish.

1211 Deposition of the Gūrkhān; transfer of power into the hands of Kūchluk. Submission of the northern part of Semiryechye to the Mongols.

1212 Rising in Samarqand against the Khwārazm-shāh; destruction of the Qarā-Khānid dynasty.

1213 (1214) Conquest of Eastern Turkestan by Kūchluk.

1215 Conquest of Ghazna by the Khwārazm-shāh.

1215–1216 Expedition of the Khwārazm-shāh against the Qipchāqs; collision with the Mongols. Embassy from the Khwārazm-shāh to Chingiz-Khān.

1216 Murder of Majd ad-Dīn Baghdādī.

1217 Abolition of the khuṭba in name of the Caliph Nāsir. Unsuccessful expedition of the Khwārazm-shāh to Baghdād.

1218 Envoys of Chingiz-Khān at the court of the Khwārazm-shāh. Murder of the merchants at Utrār. Conquest of Eastern Turkestan by the Mongols.

1219 Chingiz-Khān on the Irtysh. Plan to construct long walls in Samarqand district.

1220 Conquest of Transoxania by the Mongols. Invasion of Persia by Mongol divisions.

1220–1231 (with an interval) Jalāl ad-Dīn b. Muḥammad, Khwārazm-shāh.

1221 Conquest of Khorezmia, Khurāsān and Afghanistan by the Mongols. Victory of Jalāl ad-Dīn at Parwān. His defeat on the bank of the Indus and flight into India. Destruction of Ghazna by the Mongols.

1222 Kushtagīn in Merv; his attack on Bukhārā. Suppression of the revolts in Merv and Herāt. Return of Chingiz-Khān to Samarqand.

1222–1223 Tāj ad-Dīn ʿOmar b. Masʿūd in Merv, Abīward and Kharqān.

1223 Final destruction of Merv by the Mongols. Chingiz-Khān in the valley of the Chirchik and in the Qulān-Bāshī steppe; meeting with his sons.

1224 Chingiz-Khān on the Irtysh.

1225 Return of Chingiz-Khān to Mongolia.

1227 Death of Jūchī. Death of Chingiz-Khān.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

'Abd al-Karīm: Abdoul Kerim Boukhary, *Histoire de l'Asie Centrale*, texte et traduction, publiés par Ch. Schefer (Publ. de l'école des langues orient. viv. i, ii).

'Abdallāh-Nāmah: see Ḥāfiz-Tānish.

'Abd ar-Razzāq: *Maṭla' as-Sa'dayn wamajma' al-baḥrayn* (see p. 56).

Abel-Rémusat: *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, 2 vols.

—— *Recherches sur les langues tartares.*

Abhandlungen der Phil.-hist. Classe der Kon.-Sächs. Ges. der Wiss., viii.

Abū'l-Faraj: *Abulpharagii Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. Bruns.

—— *Abul-Pharajii Historia compendiosa dynastiarum.*

Abū'l-Fidā: *Abulfedae Annales moslemici.*

Abū'l-Ghāzī: Aboul-Ghâzi, *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares*, publiée, traduite et annotée par le baron Desmaisons.

Abū Ḥanīfa ad-Dīnawarī: *Kitāb al-akhbār aṭ-ṭiwāl*, ed. V. Guirgass (see p. 6). See also under Kratchkowsky.

Abū'l-Ma'ālī: *Bayān al-adyān* (see p. 26).

Abū Ṭāhir Khōja: *Samarīya*, ed. N. E. Veselovsky, trans. by W. Vyatkin, Справоч. книж. Самарк. обл., вып. vi.

'Ajab-Nāmah: A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge, 1922.

Alberuni: see al-Bīrūnī.

Anīs aṭ-Ṭālibīn, MS. Petrog. Univ. 386.

"*Anonym of Iskandar*": (see p. 54 n.).

Arandarenko, G. A.: Досуги въ Туркестанѣ.

'Aṭṭār, Farīd ad-Dīn: *Tadhkirat al-Awliyā*, ed. R. A. Nicholson.

'Awfī, Muḥammad: *Jawāmi' al-Ḥikāyāt wa Lāmi' ar-Riwāyāt* (see p. 36).

—— *Lubāb al-Albāb*, ed. E. G. Browne.

Bābur: *Memoirs of Baber*, transl. by Erskine.

—— *Bābar-Nāmah*, facs. ed. A. S. Beveridge (Gibb Mem. Ser. I), transl. by A. S. Beveridge.

al-Baghdādī, Muḥammad ibn Mu'ayyad: *at-Tawassul ilā't-tarassul* (see p. 33).

Baḥr al-asrār fī mānākib al-akhyār (see p. 313 n.).

Bakrān, Muḥammad b. Najīb: *Jahān-nāmah* (see p. 36).

al-Balādhurī: Beladsori, *Liber expugnationis regionum*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (see p. 6).

Bal'amī, see under aṭ-Ṭabarī.

Banākathī: *Rawḍat ulī 'l-albāb fī tawārīkh al-akābir wa 'l-ansāb* (see p. 49).

Barakāt b. Mubārak: *Lam' at-Tawārikh* (see p. 27).

Barbier de Meynard: Article in *J.A.*, 5, xvi.

Barthold, W.: "Die altturkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen" (in Radloff, *Die alttürk. Inschr. der Mongolei*, Zweite Folge).

—— "Die Persische Šu'ūbija" (in *Zeitsch. für Assyriologie* xxvi, *Festschrift Goldziher*).

—— История орошения Туркестана.

—— Историко-географический обзор Ирана.

—— Мусулманский Міръ

Barthold, W.: Нѣсколько словъ объ арійской культурѣ въ Средней Азіи (Среднеаз. Вѣсти., June, 1896).
—— О христіанствѣ въ Туркестанѣ въ домонголскій періодъ (Записки, &c., viii); Enlarged German ed. (tr. R. Stube): *Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur Mongolischen Eroberungen.*
—— Отчетъ о поѣздкѣ въ Среднюю Азію (Записки Имп. Ак. Наукъ по Ист.-Фил. Отд. I, No. 4).
—— Очеркъ исторіи Семирѣчья (Памятн. книж. Семир. Обл. Стат. Ком. 1898).
—— Персидская надпись на стѣнѣ мечети Мануче.
—— Свѣдѣнія объ Аральскомъ морѣ и низовьяхъ Аму-Дарьи; German trans.: *Nachrichten uber den Aral-See und den unteren Lauf des Amu-Darja.*
—— Улуг-бег и его время.
—— "Zur Geschichte der Saffariden" (in *Festsch. Noldeke*, i).
—— Articles and Reviews in Журн. Мин. Нар. Просв.
—— Articles and Reviews in Записки, &c.
—— Articles and Reviews in Міръ Ислама.
—— Articles in *Bull. de l'Acad.*, &c.
—— Articles in *Encyclopaedia of Islām* (q. v.).
—— Article in *Die Geisteswissenschaften*, 1914.
—— Review in Русск. Истор. Журн. vii (1912).
Bayhaqī, Abū'l-Faḍl: *Tarikh-i Baihaki*, ed. Morley (see pp. 22–4).
—— ibid., Teheran edition.
Bayhaqī, Abū'l-Ḥasan: *Ta'rīkh-i Bayhaq* (see p. 31, n. 8).
Becker, C. H.: Article in *Der Islam*, v.
Berezin, I.: Очеркъ внутренняго устройства улуса Джучіева.
—— Русскій энциклопедическій словаръ.
Berzhe: Краткій каталогъ тифлисской публичной библіотеки.
Biberstein-Kazimirski: *Menoutchehri, poète persan du IIme siècle.*
Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, ed. M. J. de Goeje:
I. al-Iṣṭakhrī.
II. Ibn Ḥawqal.
III. al-Maqdisī.
IV. Indices and Glossary.
V. Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī,
VI. Ibn Khūrdādhbih and Qudāma.
VII. Ibn Rusta and al-Ya'qūbī.
VIII. al-Mas'ūdī: *Kitāb at-Tanbīh wa'l-Ishrāf.*
al-Bīrūnī: Alberuni, *Chronologie Orientalischer Volker*, herausg. von E. Sachau; *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, trans. by E. Sachau.
—— *Alberuni's India*, trans. by E. Sachau.
Blochet, E.: *Catalogue de la collection des manuscrits orientaux . . . formée par Ch. Schefer.*
—— *Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols par Fadl Allah Rashid ed-Din* (Gibb Mem. Ser. xii).
—— *Les inscriptions de Samarkand.*
—— *Liste géographique des villes de l'Iran* (*Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et l'archéologie égypt. et assyr.*, tome xvii).
Bretschneider, E.: *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources.*
Brianov, A.: Article in Проток. Туркест. кружка, iv.
Brockelmann, C.: *Das Verhältniss von Ibn-el-Atîrs Kâmil fit-ta'rîḫ zu Ṭabarîs Aḫbâr errusul wal mulûk.*
—— *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* (Weimar, 1898–1902).
Browne, E. G: *A Literary History of Persia*, vols. i and ii; vol. iii published under title of *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, vol. iv of *Persian Literature in Modern Times.*
—— "The Sources of Dawlatshah", *J. R. A. S.*, 1899.

Browne, E. G.: See under Nizāmī-i Arūḍī and Qazwīnī, Ḥamdallāh.
Budagov: Сравнительный словарь турецко-татарския нарѣчій.
Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences (St. Petersburg).
Bulletin de la classe hist.-philol. de l'Acad. Imp. (St. Petersburg).
Bulletin du Comité russe pour l'exploration de l'Asie Centrale.
Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies (London).
Bundārī, see 'Imād ad-Dīn.
Burnes, A.: *Travels into Bokhara.*

Cahun, L.: *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie. Turcs et Mongols des origines à 1405.* Reviewed by W. Barthold, in Журналъ Мин. Народн. Просв., June, 1896.
Carpini, Plano: *Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires*, iv, 1839.
—— Trans. by W. W. Rockhill, Hakluyt Society Extra Series, i, 1903.
Carra de Vaux: *Les Penseurs de l'Islam.*
Castagné, J.: Article in Проток. Турк. круж., xviii and xxi.
Catalogus codicum orientalium bibliothecae Academiae Lugd. Batav.
Centenaire de l'école des langues orientales vivantes. Recueil de mémoires publié par les professeurs de l'école.
Chavannes, E.: *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux.*
Chavannes, E. and Pelliot, P.: "Un Traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine" (*Journal Asiatique*, 11, 1).
Christensen, A.: *Abu'l-Ma'āli. Fremstilling af Religionerne*, oversat af Arthur Christensen (Studier fra sprog- og oldtidsforsning udgivne af det Filologisk-historiske Samfund, N. 101).
Chwolson, D. (Хвольсонъ): *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus.*
—— Извѣстія о Хозарахъ, Буртасахъ, Болгарахъ, Мадьярахъ, Славянахъ и Руссахъ Ибнъ-Даста.
Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des langues orientales.

Dawlatshāh: *Tadhkiratu'sh-Shu'arā*, ed. E. G. Browne.
Deguignes, J.: *Histoire générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols et des autres Tartares occidentaux.*
Dieterici, F.: *Mutanabbi und Seifuddaula; aus der Edelperle des Tsaâlibi.*
Diez, E.: *Churasanische Baudenkmaler.*
Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa: see Abū Ḥanīfa.
Donner, O.: "Sur l'origine de l'alphabet turc du nord de l'Asie" (*Journal de la Société Finnoougrienne*, xiv, 1).
Dorn, B.: *Catalogue des manuscrits et xylographs orientaux de la Bibl. Imp. Publ.*
—— Articles in *Mélanges asiatiques*, viii, ix.
Douglas, R. K.. *The life of Jenghiz Khan.*
Dozy, R.: *Essai sur l'histoire de l'islamisme.*
Dvořak, R.: *Abû Firâs.*

Edwards, E.: *Catalogue of Persian printed books in the British Museum.*
Elliot, H.: *History of India.*
Encyclopaedia of Islām, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, &c. (proceeding).
Erdmann, F.: *Temudschin der Unerschutterliche.*
Ethé, H.: *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library.*
Evarnitskii, D. (Эварницкій): Путеводитель по Средней Азіи отъ Баку до Ташкента.

Fakhr ad-Dīn Marwarrūdī: see p. 31 and *'Ajab-Nāmah.*
Fakhrī: *Elfachri, Geschichte der islamischen Reiche von Ibn etthiqthaqa*, herausg. von W. Ahlwardt.
Farīd ad-Dīn 'Aṭṭār: see 'Aṭṭār.

Faṣīḥ, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad: *Mujmil-i Faṣīḥī* (see p. 55).
Ferrand, G.: *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks, relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIII au XVIII siècles.*
Fihrist: *Kitāb-al-Fihrist*, herausg. von G. Flugel (see p. 4).
Fischer, A.: Articles in *Z. D. M. G.*, lx and lxxii.
Fleischer, H. O.: *Catalogus codicum MSS. orient. Bibl. Reg. Dresdensis.*
Flugel, G.: *Die arabischen &c. Handschriften des Kais.-Konigl. Hofbibliothek zu Wien.*

Galkin, M. N: Этнографическіе и астрономическіе матеріалы по Средней Азіи и Оренбургскому краю.
Gardīzī, 'Abd al-Ḥayy b. aḍ-Ḍaḥḥāk: *Zayn al-Akhbār* (see p. 20).
Gauthiot, R.: see under Ross, E. D.
Geiger, W.: *Die Pamir-Gebiete* (Geogr. Abhandl. herausg. von Prof. Dr. A. Penck).
Gharnātī, Aḥmad: *Tuḥfat al-albāb wa nukhbat al-a'jāb* (see p. 34).
Gibb, H. A. R.: *The Arab Conquests in Central Asia.*
—— Article in *Bull. Sch. of Oriental Studies*, II.
Goeje, M. J. de: *Das alte Bett des Oxus.*
—— *Fragmenta historicorum arabicorum.*
—— Article in *Z. D. M. G*, xxv.
—— Note in *Journ. Asiat.*, 9, xiv.
—— see also *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*
Goldziher, I.: *Muhammedanische Studien.*
—— Article in *Der Islam*, III.
—— Articles in *Encyc. of Islām* (q. v.).
Grenard, F.: Article in *Journ, Asiat*, 9, xv.
Grigor'ev, V. V.: Караханиды въ Мавераннагрѣ (Труды Вост. Отд. Арх. Общ., xvii).
Grum-Grzhimailo, G. E.: Историческое прошлое Бэй-шаня.
Grundriss der iranischen Philologie.

Ḥāfiz-i Abrū: see p. 55.
Ḥāfiz Tānish: *'Abdallāh-Nāmah*, MS. Asiat. Mus. 574 age.
Ḥājjī-Khalīfa: Hajı-Khalfa, *Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum*, ed. Flugel.
Hamadhānī, Ibn al-Faqīh: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vol. v (see p. 7).
Hammer-Purgstall, J.: *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde.*
—— *Geschichte der Ilchane.*
—— *Geschichte Wassafs.*
Hamzae Ispahanensis Historiarum, libri x, ed. Gottwaldt.
Handbook of Semiryechye: see Памятная книжка.
Hartmann, R.: Articles in *Encyc. of Islām* (q. v.).
Ḥaydar, see Rāzī.
Ḥaydar, Muḥammad: The *Tarikh-i Rashidi*, English version ed. by N. Elias, the translation by E. D. Ross.
Hermann, A.: *Alte Geographie des unteren Oxusgebiets*; reviewed by W. Barthold in Записки xxii.
Herzfeld, E.: Article in *Der Islam*, IV.
Ḥilāl as-Sābi': *Kitāb al-Wuzarā*, ed. Amedroz.
—— see also under Margoliouth.
Hirth, F.: "Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk" (Radloff, *Die Alttürk. Inschriften der Mongolei*, Zweite Folge).
Hiuen-Tsiang: Hiouen-Thsang, *Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales*, trad. par Stan. Julien.
Horn, P.: "Asadi's neupersisches Wörterbuch" (*Abhandl. der Konigl. Ges. der Wiss. zu Gottingen*).
Houtsma, M. Th.: *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides*, 3 vols.

Houtsma Reviews in *Gotting. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1896 and 1899.
Howorth, Sir H.: *History of the Mongols.*
—— "The Northern Frontagers of China" (*J.R.A.S.*, 1875-98).
Ḥudūd al-'Ālam, Tumansky MS. (see p. 13).
Ḥusaynī, 'Alī b. Naṣīr: *Zubdat at-Tawārīkh* (see p. 28).
Ḥusaynī, Muḥ. b. Muḥ.: *'Arāḍat fi 'l-ḥikāyat as-saljūqīya* (see p. 30, n. 7).
Hyacinth: see Iakinth.

Iakinth, [Bichurin]: Исторія первыхъ четырехъ хановъ изъ дома Чингисова.
—— Собраніе свѣдѣній о народахъ, обитавшихъ въ Средней Азій въ древн. времена.
—— see also Сборникъ геогр. . . . матеріаловъ по Азіи.
Ibn Abi Useibia, *'Uyūn al-anbā,'* ed A. Muller.
Ibn 'Arabshāh: *'Ajā'ib al-Maqdūr* (ed. Cairo).
—— *Fākihat al-Khulafā.*
Ibn al-Athīr: *Chronicon quod perfectissimum inscribitur*, ed. Tornberg (see pp. 2-3).
Ibn al-Athīr, Ismā'īl: *Kitāb 'Ibrat ūlī 'l-absār*, MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 7914.
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa: *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, texte et traduction par C. Defrémery et le Dr. Sanguinetti.
Ibn al-Faqīh Hamadhānī: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, v (see p. 7).
Ibn Ḥawqal: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, ii (see p. 11).
Ibn Ḥazm: *Kitāb al-Milal wa 'n-Niḥal*; cf. Schreiner.
Ibn Khaldūn: *Kitāb al-'Ibar*, Bulaq edition.
—— *Les Prolégomènes*, ed. Quatremère and trans. de Slane. Notices et Extraits, vols. xvi-xxi.
Ibn Khallikān: *Vies des hommes illustres de l'islamisme*, publ. par le baron MacGuckin de Slane.
—— *Ibn Challikani vitae illustrium virorum*, ed. Wustenfeld.
—— *Biographical Dictionary*, trans. by Baron MacGuckin de Slane, (see p. 3).
Ibn Khūrdādhbih: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi (see p. 7).
Ibn Miskawayh, see Miskawayh.
Ibn Mu'in, Khusraw b. 'Abīd: *Firdaws at-Tawārīkh*, (see p. 55).
Ibn al-Qalānisī: *Dhayl ta'rīkh Dimashq*, ed. Amedroz.
Ibn al-Qiftī: *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā*, ed. Lippert.
Ibn Qutayba: Ibn Coteiba's *Handbuch der Geschichte*, ed. Wustenfeld (see pp. 4-5).
Ibn Rusta: *Bibl. Geog. Arab*, vii (see p. 7). See also under Chwolson.
Ibn Yūnus: *Kitāb az-zīj al-kabīr al-Ḥākimī*, MS. Leyden, No. 143.
Idrīsī: *Géographie d'Edrisi*, trad. par A. Jaubert.
'Imād ad-Dīn Isfahānī: *Kharīdat al-Qasr wajarīdat al-'Asr* (see p. 28).
—— see Houtsma, *Recueil*, &c., ii, and pp. 27-8.
Isfizārī, Muhammad: *Rawḍat al-Jannāt fī awṣāf madīnat Harāt* (see p. 57).
Islamica (Leipzig)
Iṣṭakhrī: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, i (see p. 11).
Ivanin, M. J. О военномъ искусствѣ и завоеваніахъ монголо-татаръ и средне-азіатскихъ народовъ при Чингизъ-ханѣ и Тамерланѣ.
Извѣстія Имп. Ак. Наукъ 1898, т. ix, No. 2, &c., see Zaleman.
Извѣстія Имп. Русск. Геогр. Общества.
Извѣстія Русск. Комитета для изученія Сред. и Бост. Азіи.
Извѣстія Туркестанскаго Отдѣла Имп. Русск. Геогр. Общества.

J.A.: *Journal Asiatique* (Paris).
J.R.A.S.: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London).
Jacob, G.: *Welche Handelsartikel bezogen die Araber des Mittelalters aus den nordisch-baltischen Landern?*

Jahān-nāmah, see Bakrān.
Jāḥiẓ: *Manāqib al-Atrāk*, ed. G. van Vloten, trans. Harley Walker (*J.R.A.S.*, 1915).
Jamāl Qarshī: *Mulḥaqāt as-Ṣurāḥ* (see p. 51).
Jannābī: *Ta'rīkh* (see p. 52).
Journal, see *J.A.*, *J.R.A.S.*, and Журналъ.
Justi, F.: *Geschichte der Orientalischen Volker in Altherthum.*
—— *Iranisches Namenbuch.*
Juwaynī: *Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-gushāy*, ed. Mīrzā Muḥ. Qazwīnī (Gibb Mem. Series, vol. xvi (incomplete)), see p. 39.
Jūzjānī: *al-Jawzjani*, *The Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri*, ed. by W. Nassau Lees (see p. 39).
—— *The Tabaḳāt-i Nāṣirī*, trans. by Major Raverty.

Kal', E.: Персидскія, арабскія и тюркскія рукописи Турк. Публ. Библ.
Kallaur, V.: Article in Проток. Турк. круж. v.
Kalmikov, A.: Article in Проток. Турк. круж. xii.
Karabacek: Article in *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus des Erzh. Rainer*
Karamzin: Исторія государства Россійскаго.
Karavayev: Голодная Степь; Reviewed by W. Barthold in Записки xxiii.
Karmīnagī: see Muḥammad Wafā.
Kāshānī, 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī: *Zubdat at-Tawārīkh* (see p. 46, n. 7).
—— *Ta'rīkh-i Uljāytū*, see Centenaire.
Kāshgharī: see Maḥmūd.
Katanov, A.: Article in Записки xiv.
al Kātib as-Samarqandī: *A'rāḍ as-Siyāsa fī aghrāḍ ar-Riyāsa* (see p. 18)
Kāzim, Muḥammad: History of Nādir-Shāh (see article by W. Barthold in *Bull. de l'Acad.*, &c., 1919).
Khanykov, N. V.: Описаніе Бухарскаго ханства.
Khwāndamīr: *Ḥabīb as-Siyar* (Teheran edition).
Khwārizmī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf: *Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm*, ed. G. van Vloten (see p. 32).
Kindī: *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, ed. Rhuvon Guest (Gibb Mem. Series, xix).
Kostenko, L.: Туркестанскій край.
Kratchkowsky, T.: Prélace, Variantes et Index à Abū Ḥanīfa ad-Dīnawerī, Kitāb al-Akhbār aṭ-Ṭiwāl; reviewed by C. Seybold, *Z.D.M.G.*, lxvii.
Kremer, A. von: *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chaliben.*
—— *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzuge auf dem Gebiete des Islam.*
Kuhn, A.: Article in Матеріалы для статистики Туркестанскаго края.
Kushakevitch, A.: Article in Изв. Русск. Геог. Общ. iv.

Lane-Poole, S.: *The Mohammadan Dynasties.*
Lansdell, H.: *Russian Central Asia.*
Laufer, B.: *Sino-Iranica.*
—— See under Pelliot.
Lerch, P.: Археологическая поѣздка въ Туркестанскій край.
—— "Sur les monnaies des Boukhâr-Khoudahs" (*Travaux de la 3-me session du Congrès international des Orientalistes*, ii).
—— Article in *Russische Revue*, 1875, vii.
—— Article in Русск. Энцикл. Словарь Березина (отд. iii, т. i).
—— Article in Труды Вост. Отд. xviii (unfinished).
Lestrange, G.: *Baghdād under the Abbasid Caliphate.*
—— *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate.*
Logofet, D.: Въ горахъ и на равнинахъ Бухары.
—— На границахъ Средней Азіи.

Mafātīh al-'Olūm: see under Khwārizmī.
Mahdī Khān: *History of Nādir Shāh.*
Maḥmūd Kāshgharī: *Dīwān lughāt at-Turk* (see p. 36, n. 7).
Makīn: *Elmacini Historia Saracenica.*
Maqdisī: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, iii (see p. 11).
Maqrīzī: see under Sacy and Berezin.
Margoliouth, D.: *The Eclipse of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate* (see p. 32, n. 1).
—— Article in *Bull. Sch. Or. Studies*, i.
Markov, A. K.: Инвентарный каталогъ мусулманскихъ монетъ Имп Эрмитажа.
Marquart, J.: *Chronologie der altturkischen inschriften.*
—— *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Pr. Moses Xorenac'i.*
—— "Historische Glossen zu den altturkischen Inschriften" (*W.Z.K.M.*, xii).
—— *Osteuropaische und ostasiatische Streifzüge.*
—— *Ostturkische Dialektstudien.*
—— *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran.*
—— Article in *Z.D.M.G.*, xlix.
Masalsky, V.: Туркестанскій край.
Mas'ūdī: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, viii: trans. by B. Carra de Vaux, *Maçoudi, Le livre de l'avertissement et de la revision.*
—— *Maçoudi, Les prairies d'or*, trad. par C. Barbier de Meynard et Pavet de Courteille.
Mélanges Asiatiques: cf. Dorn.
Melioransky, P.: Арабъ-Филологъ о турецкомъ языкѣ.
Miles: *The Shajrat ul Atrak.*
Minaev: Свѣдѣнія о странахъ по верховьямъ Аму-Дарьи.
Міръ Ислама (St. Petersburg).
Mīrkhwānd: *Rawḍat as-Ṣafā* (Teheran ed.) (see pp. 57–8).
—— *Mirchonds Geschichte der Sultane aus dem Geschlechte Bujeh*, ubers. von Fr. Wilken.
—— *Mirchondi Historia Gasnevidarum*, ed. et latine vertit Fr. Wilken.
—— *Mirkhond, Histoire des Samanides*, texte et. trad. par M. Defrémery.
—— *Mirkhond, Histoire des sultans du Kharezm*, publ. par Defrémery.
—— *Mirkhond, Vie de Djenghiz-Khan*, publ. par Jaubert.
Miskawayh: *Tajārib al-Umam*, ed. Caetani (Gibb. Mem. Ser. vii), (see p. 32, n. 1).
—— see Margoliouth.
—— see de Goeje, *Fragmenta.*
Mittheilungen, &c, see under Karabacek.
Morley, W. H.: *A descriptive catalogue of the historical manuscripts in the Arabic and Persian languages, preserved in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
Muḥammad Kāẓim, see under Kāzim.
Muḥammad Wafā Karmīnagī: *Tuḥfat al-Khānī*, MS. of the Asiat. Mus., c 581 b.
Mu'īn al-fuqarā: *Kitāb-i Mullāzāda* (see p. 58).
Mu'izz al-ansāb fī shajarat salāṭīn mughal (see p. 55).
Mujmil at-Tawārīkh wa'l-Qiṣas (see p. 26).
Muller, A.: *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande.*
Musawī: *Ta'rīkhi Khayrāt* (see p. 56).
Mushketov, I. V: Туркестанъ.
al-Muẓaffariya (Сборникъ статей ученниковъ бар. В. Р. Розена).

Nachrichten über die von der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu St. Pet. im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan.
an-Nadīm: see *Fihrist.*
Narshakhī: *Description topographique et historique de Boukhara*, par Mohammed Nerchakhy, suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane, publ. par Ch. Schefer (*P.E.L.O.V.* iii[e] s., vol. xiii) (see pp. 13–14).

Narshakhī: Мухаммадъ Наршахи, Исторія Бухары, пер. Н. Лыкошинъ.
Nasafī, 'Omar b. Muḥ.: *Kitāb al-Qand fī ta'rīkh Samarqand* (*Qandīya*), (see p. 15). Trans. by W. Vyatkin in Справ. книж. Сам. обл. viii.
Nasawī: *Nesawi, Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti*, texte arabe et trad. par O. Houdas (*P.E.L.O.V.*, iii^e s., vols. ix, x), (see p. 38).
Nāṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī: see Ṭūsī.
Nāṣir-i Khusraw: *Sefer Namèh, Relation de voyages de Nassiri Khosrau*, ed. and trans. Schefer (*P.E.L.O.V.*, ii^e s., vol. i).
Nizām ad-Dīn Shāmī: *Ẓafar-Nāmah*, see Тексты.
Nizām al-Mulk: *Nizam oul-moulk, Siasset Namèh*, texte, traduction et supplément par Ch. Schefer (*P.E.L.O.V.*, iii^e s., vols. vii, viii), (see p. 25).
Nizāmī, Ṣadr ad-Dīn: *Tāj al-ma'āsir* (see p. 352, n. 7).
Nizāmī-i 'Arūḍī-i Samarqandī: *Chahār Maqāla*, ed. and trans. E. G. Browne (Gibb. Mem. Series, xi, and *J.R.A.S.*, 1899).
Nöldeke, Th.: *Orientalische Skizzen* (English trans., *Sketches from Eastern History*, by J. S. Black).
—— Review in *Z.D.M.G.*, xlvi.
Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale, &c., Paris.
Nouveaux mélanges orientaux (*P.E.L.O.V.*, ii^e s., vol. xix).

D'Ohsson, le baron C.: *Histoire des Mongols.*
Oppert, G.: *Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und Geschichte.*

P.E.L.O.V.: *Publications de l'école des langues orientales vivantes*, Paris.
Palmer, E. H.: Article in *J.R.A.S.*, 1868.
Памятная книжка Семирѣченского областного статистическаго комитета на 1898 г.
Patkanov, K.: Исторія монголовъ инока Магакіи.
—— Исторія монголовъ по армянскимъ источникамъ.
Pelliot, P.: Article in *J.A.*, 11, xv.
—— Articles in *T'oung Pao*, xiv, xv (the former in collaboration with B. Laufer).
—— See also under Chavannes.
Pertsch, W.: *Verzeichniss der Persischen Handschriften* (*Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Kon. Bibliothek zu Berlin*, iv)
Pétis de la Croix: see under Yazdī, Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī.
Petrovsky, N.: Article in Изв. Русск. Геогр. Общ. xxxiv.
Petrovsky, N. F.: Article in Записки, &c., vii
Poslavsky, I. T.: Article in Среднеазіатскій Вѣстникъ, Dec. 1896.
Pospyelov, F. F.: Article in Справ. книж. Самарк. обл. x.
Pozdnyeev, A. M.: Article in Записки Русск. Арх. Общ. 1883.
Протоколы засѣданій и сообщенія членовъ Закаспійскаго Кружка любителей Археологіи и Исторіи Востока.
Протоколы засѣданій и сообщенія членовъ Туркестанскаго Кружка любителей Археологіи.
Pumpelly, R.: *Explorations in Turkestan.*

Qand, Qandīya: see under Nasafī.
Qazwīnī, Ḥamdallāh: *Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, geographical section ed. and trans. G. le Strange (Gibb Memorial Series, xxiii) (see p. 50).
—— *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīdah*, ed. with abridged trans. E. G. Browne (Gibb Mem. Series, xiv) (see pp. 49–50).
Qazwīnī, Zakarīyā: *'Ajā'ib al-Makhlūqāt*, ed. Wustenfeld (see p. 36).
Qifṭī: *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā*, ed. Lippert.
Quatremère, E.: see under Rashīd-ad-Dīn.
Qudāma: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vi.

Radloff, W.: *Das Kudatku-Bilik.* Theil i. Der Text in Transscription herausgegeben.
—— *Die alttürkischen inschriften der Mongolei*, 2 parts.
—— Къ вопросу объ Уйгурахъ.
Rashīd ad-Dīn: *Jāmi' at-tawārīkh* (for editions and translations see p. 48, n. 2).
Raverty, H. G.: *The Tabakāt-i Nāsirī* (see Jūzjānī).
Rāwandī: *Raḥāt aṣ-Ṣudūr*, ed. Muḥ. Iqbāl (Gibb Mem. Series, New Series, ii) (see p. 29).
Rāzī, Ḥaydar: *Ta'rīkh* (see p. 37).
Recueil de voyages et de mémoires, publ. par la Société de Géographie, iv.
Reference Book of Samarkand Prov.: see Справ. книж. Самарк. обл.
Reinaud, J.-T.: *Fragments arabes et persans inédits rélatifs à l'Inde.*
Rickmers, W. Rickmer: *The Duab of Turkestan.*
Rieu, Ch.: *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts of the British Museum.*
—— Supplement to the *Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the British Museum.*
—— *Supplement to the Catalogue of Persian MSS.*
Rosen, Baron V. R.: *Notices sommaires des manuscrits arabes du musée asiatique.*
—— Articles in Записки, &c., iii, vi.
—— see *Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des langues orientales*, iii.
Ross, Sir E. D. (with F. H. Skrine): *The Heart of Asia, a history of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the earliest times.*
—— Article in *'Ajab-Nāmah* (q v.).
—— (with R. Gauthiot) Article in *J A.*, ii, i.
Rozhevits, R. Yu.: Article in Извѣстія Русск. Геогр. Общ.
Rūdakī: *Dīwān*, MS. School of Oriental Studies, London.
Rudnev, N.: Article in Туркестанскія Вѣдомости.
Ruska, J.: Article in *Der Islam*, v.

Sachau, E.: *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Chwârizm* (2 parts).
—— Preface to Vol. iii of Ibn Ṣa'd, *Ṭabaqāt.*
—— Article in *Mittheilungen des Seminars für orient. Sprachen*, Bd. vii (1904).
—— See also under Bīrūnī.
Sacy, S. de: *Chrestomathie Arabe.*
Sa'dī: *Gulistān*, ed. Platts.
Ṣafī ad-Dīn: *Faḍa'il-i Balkh* (see p. 36).
Salemann, see Zaleman.
Sam'ānī: *Kitāb al-Ansāb* (see p. 34).
Samarqandī, see 'Abd ar-Razzāq and al-Kātib.
Samoylovitch, A: Article in *Bull de l'Acad. des Sciences*, 1917.
Сборник Туркестанскаго Восточнаго Института (Tashkent).
Сборникъ географ., топограф. и статист. матеріаловъ по Азіи, xlvii, lvii.
Schefer, Ch.: *Chrestomathie persane* (*P.E.L.O.V.*, 2e série, vii).
—— Article in *Recueil de textes et de traductions*, publié par les Professeurs de l'école des langues orientales, i (*P.E.L.O.V.*, 3e série, v).
—— see *Nouveaux mélanges orientaux.*
Schreiner, M.: Article in *Z.D.M.G.*, lii.
Schwarz, P.: *Iran im Mittelalter nach den arabischen Geographen.*
Scriptores Orientis Christiani.
Semenov, A.: Article in Проток. Турк. круж. арх. xix.
Seybold, C.: Review in *Z.D.M.G.*, lxvii.
Shabangaraī: *Majma' al-Ansāb* (see p. 46).
Shahristānī: *Kitāb al-Milal wa'n-Nihal*, trans. Dr. Th. Haarbrücker, *asch-Schahrastani's Religionsparteien und Philosophenschulen.*

Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, see Yazdī.
Shcherbina-Kramarenko, N.: Article in Справ. книж. Самар. обл., 1896.
Sitnyakovsky, N. F.: Article in Изв. Турк. отд. Имп. Русск. Геог. Общ. i.
—— Communication in Прот. Турк. круж., Dec. 1896.
—— Communication in Прот. Турк. круж., iii.
Skrine, F. H., see under Ross.
Skvarsky, P: Article in Среднеазіатскій Вѣстникъ, Oct. 1896.
Slane, Baron MacGuckin de: *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibl. Nat.*
—— see also under Ibn Khaldūn and Ibn Khallikān.
Smirnov, E: Дервишизмъ въ Туркестанѣ.
—— Article in Средняя Азія.
Собраніе путешествій къ Татарамъ, изд. Д. Язы[illegible]
Справочная книжка Самаркандской области.
Средная Азія, сборникъ статей.
Среднеазіатскій Вѣстникъ.
Статистическіе Матеріалы для Туркестана.
Stein, Sir M. A.: *Serindia.*
Strabo: *Geographica.*
Stube, R.: Article "Tchingiz-Chan, seine Staatsbildung u.s.w." in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klass. Altertum*, 1908.
Studier fra sprog- og oldtidsforsning, see Christensen.
Sussheim, K.: *Das Geschenk aus der Saldschukengeschichte von dem Wesir Muḥammad al-Ḥusainī al-Yazdī.*
Prolegomena zu einer Ausgabe der im Britischen Museum zu London verwahrten "Chronik des Seldschuqischen Reiches."

Tabakat-i Nasiri, see Jūzjānī.
Ṭabarī: *Annales*, ed. M. J. de Goeje et alii (see p. 2).
—— *Chronique de Tabari*, trad. sur la version persane de Bel'ami par M. H. Zotenberg.
Tāj al-'Arūs.
Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda, see Qazwīnī, Ḥamdallāh.
Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā, see Qifṭī.
Ta'rīkh-i Khayrāt, see Mūsawī.
Тексты по Исторіи Средней Азіи.
Texts: W. Barthold, Туркестанъ въ эпоху монгольскаго нашествія, часть первая, тексты (see p. xiv).
Tha'ālibī, 'Abdal-malik b. Muḥ.: *Lataifo'l-ma'arif*, ed. Jong.
—— *Taalibii Syntagma* (*Specimen e litteris orientalibus*) trans. Valeton.
—— *Yatīmat ad-Dahr* (see p. 9).
Tha'ālibī, Ḥusayn b. Muḥ.: *Kitāb al-Ghurar* (see pp. 18–19).
Thomas, E.: Article in *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3, i.
Tiesenhausen, Baron V. G.; *Notice sur une collection de monnaies orientales, de M. le Cte. Stroganoff.*
—— Сборникъ матеріаловъ относящихся къ исторіи Золотой Орды.
Tomaschek, W.: *Centralasiatische Studien, I. Sogdiana* (Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Classe der kais.-kon. Akad. der Wissensch., Wien, lxxxvii).
Travaux de la 3me session du congrès international des orientalistes, ii, see under Lerch.
Trudy; Труды Вост. Отд. Арх. Общ.
Труды Россійской духовной миссіи въ Пекинѣ.
Tumansky, A. G.: Articles in Записки ix, x.
Tumansky MS., see *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam.*
Ṭūsī, Nāṣir ad-Dīn: *Zīj-i Ilkhānī* (MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 7464), (see p. 39).

Ulughbeg: *Ta'rīkh-i Arba' Ulūs* (see p. 56).

Umnyakov, I.: Article in Сборник Туркест. Восточ. Института, 1923.
'Utbī, Muḥ. b. 'Abd al-Jabbār: Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī (see p. 19).
—— *The Kitāb-i Yamīnī*, trans. by the Rev. J. Reynolds.
'Utbī-Manīnī (see p. 20, n. 1).

Vámbéry, A.: *History of Bokhara.*
—— *Travels in Central Asia.*
Veselovsky, N. I.: Очеркъ историко-географическихъ свѣдѣній о Хивинскомъ ханствѣ.
—— Article in Журн. Мин. Народн. Просв., Dec. 1897.
—— Articles in Записки, ii, viii.
Vivian de Saint-Martin: *Sur les Huns Blancs ou Ephtalites.*
Vyatkin, V. L.: Матеріалы къ исторической географіи Самаркандскаго Вилаета (Справ. кн. Самарк. обл. vii).
—— Articles in Справ. книж. v.

Waqf-nāmah, MS. of the Asiat. Mus. e 574 ag.
Waṣṣāf: Ta'rīkh (see p. 48).
—— See also under Hammer-Purgstall.
Wellhausen, J.: *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz.*
Wolff, J.: *Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara.*
Wolff, O.: *Geschichte der Mongolen oder Tataren.*
Works of the Peking Mission, see Труды Росс. дух. мисс.
Wüstenfeld, F.: *Der Tod des Husein ben Ali.*
—— *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber und ihre Werke* (Abh. der k. Gesell. der Wiss. zu Gottingen, xxviii).
—— *Specimen el-Lobabi sive Genealogiarum Arabum.*
—— *Über die Quellen der Werkes: Ibn Challikani, &c.*

Yāfi'ī: Mīrāt al-jahān fī ma'rifat ḥawādīth al-insān (see p. 51, n. 2).
Ya'qūbī: *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, vii (see p. 7).
—— *Ibn-Wādhih qui dicitur al Ja'qubī Historiae*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma (see p. 6).
Yāqūt: *Jacuts geographisches Worterbuch*, herausg. von F. Wustenfeld (see p. 35).
—— *Irshād al-Arīb fi ma'rifat al-Adīb*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth (Gibb Mem. Ser., vi) (see p. 35, n. 10).
Yate, C. E.: *Northern Afghanistan.*
Yazdī, Ghiyath ad-Dīn: see Тексты.
Yazdī, Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī: *Zafar-Nāmah*, Calcutta ed. (see p. 53).
—— *Pétis de la Croix*, Histoire de Timur-Bec.
Yule, Sir H.: *Cathay and the Way Thither.*
—— *Travels of Marco Polo* (3rd ed., ed. H. Cordier, with supplementary vol.).

Z.D.M.G.: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenland. Gesell.*
Zafar-Nāmah: see under Yazdī.
Zaleman, C.: Articles in *Bull. de l'Acad, &c.*, 1898, 1912.
"Zapiski": Записки Вост. Отд. Арх. Общ.
Записки Имп. Ак. Наукъ, по Ист.-Фил. Отд.; see under Barthold.
Записки Русск. Арх. Общ., see under Pozdnyeev.
Zhukovsky, V.: Развалины Стараго Мерва (Матеріалы по Арх. Россіи, No. 16).
—— Тайны единенія съ Богомъ въ подвигахъ старца Абу-Са'ида.
—— Article in Записки xii.
Журналъ Мин. Народн. Просв., see under Barthold and Veselovsky.
Zimin L.: Articles and Translations in Проток. Турк. круж.
—— Article in Проток. Закаспійскаго Кружка, &c.

GENERAL INDEX

Ābadān-kanj 155
Abāghā (Abāqā, Īlkhān) 44, 387 n.
Abārkath *see* Bārkath
-Abarkūhī *see* Ibn Mu'īn
Abaskūn 426
'Abbās canal 83
-'Abbās 373
Abu'l-'Abbās *see* 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir, Faḍl b. Aḥmad, Faḍl b Sulaymān, Ma'mūn b. Ma'mūn, Ma'mūn b. Muhammad.
Abu'l-'Abbās gate 171
'Abbāsid Caliphs 91, 187, 193–7, 217–20, 224, 226, 227, 230, 231, 286, 293, 332, 344, 345, 346–8, 349, 351, 373–5, 380
"'Abbāsid Corps" 203
Ab-burdan 82 n.
'Abdak (street) 93
'Abd al-'Azīz -Māza 326 n.
'Abd al-'Azīz b. Nūḥ (Sāmānid) 246, 260
'Abd al-'Azīz *see* Burhān ad-Dīn, Burhān al-Milla
'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Ḥusayn -Alma'ī 18
'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Ismā'īl -Fārisī 16
'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān 198, 199, 203
'Abdallāh (ancestor of Ṣadrs of Bukhārā) 326 n
'Abdallāh (Shaybānid) 86
'Abdallāh b. 'Alī ('Alid) 160
'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir (governor) 6, 185 n.
'Abdallāh b. Faḍlallāh *see* -Waṣṣāf
'Abdallāh b. Ḥasan -Jandī 396 n.
'Abdallāh b. Ḥumayd 172
'Abdallāh b. Khāzim 184, 187
Abdallāh b. Ma'mar -Yashkurī 188
'Abdallāh b Muḥammad b. 'Uzayr 253, 259, 263, 264
'Abdallāh Pārsī (Khatīb) 299
'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir 154, 208, 209, 212, 213, 220, 242
Abū 'Abdallāh b. Abū Ḥafṣ 222
Abū 'Abdallāh (Khwārazm-shāh) 263
Abū 'Abdallāh *see* -Bayyi', -Jayhānī, Muḥammad b. Karrām
'Abd al-Malik (Caliph) 184, 187
'Abd al-Malik I b. Nūh (Sāmānid) 10, 110, 249–50, 255
'Abd al-Malik II b. Nūḥ II (Sāmānid) 266–8
'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muslim *see* Abū Muslim
'Abd ar-Raḥmm b. Nu'aynu 188
Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥman *see* Mu'ādh b. Ya'qūb
'Abd ar-Rashīd (Ghaznevid) 23
'Abd ar-Razzāq *see* -Samarqandī
'Abd as-Salām (ra'īs) 299
Abel-Rémusat 40
Abghar 92, 93, 125
-Ābī, Manṣūr b. -Ḥusayn (wazīr) 8 n.
Abīward 261, 270, 449
Abkhāz 348 n.
Āb-i Rahmat 89
Abraham 79
Abūqsha 143
Achaemenid dynasty 64, 75
Adhakhkath 174
Ādharbāyjān 426
Adīb Ṣābir 327
'Adnān, Majd ad-Dīn 131
'Aḍud ad-Dawla (Būyid) 12, 252
Afarīnkath 96
Afārūn 96
Afghāns 291 n., 441, 449
Afrakhshah 115
Afrāsiyāb (mythical hero) 101, 107, 116
Afrāsiyāb (Samarqand) 86, 91, 413 n.
Afrāwa rabāt 154
Afshawān 121
afshīn (title) 211
-Afshīn (Ḥaydar b. Kāwus) 95 n., 167 168, 211
Afshīna (Bukhārā) 119
Afshīna (Samarqand) 87
Afurān 139
Āghdūn (Aghzūn) 121
Aghrāq-malik *see* Sayf ad-Dīn
Ahai (Qarā-Khiṭāy) 451, 455
Ahangarān (Angren) river 169
ahdāth 221 n.
Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-'Azīz (ṣadr) 354
Aḥmad b. 'Alī (Quṭb ad-Dawla, Qarā Khānid) 258 n., 274, 279 n., 281 n.
Aḥmad b. Arslān-khān Muḥammad 320 321, 322 n.
Aḥmad b. Asad (commander) 201
Aḥmad b. Asad (Sāmānid) 164, 209, 210 211, 241
Aḥmad Bālchīch 395–6
Aḥmad b. Farīghūn 224
Aḥmad b. Ḥamūya 247
Aḥmad b. Ḥasan (of Kāshghar) 323
Aḥmad b. Ḥasan *see* -'Utbī (Abū Ja'far)
Aḥmad b. Isma'īl (Sāmānid) 240

Aḥmad -Jāmijī (wazīr) 364 n.
Aḥmad b. Abū Khālid 208, 210–11
Aḥmad b. Khiḍr (Qarā-Khānid) 111, 316–18
Aḥmad -Khujandī 395
Aḥmad b. Manṣūr b. Qarā-tagin 251
Aḥmad b. Muhammad (Abu'l-Fath) 260n.
Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Abū Zayd (Abū Naṣr) 263, 264
Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (Mu'īn al-fuqarā) 58
Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf (governor) 248 n.
Ahmad b. Muhammad *see* Amīrak, Qadir-Khān, -Qubawī, Abu 'Alī -Chaghānī
Ahmad b. Naṣr (Abū Muḥammad, Sāmānid) 248
Aḥmad b. Nūh (Sāmānid) 115, 249
Ahmad b. Sahl 21 n., 241
Ahmad Yasawī 376
Ahmad Zakī Wālidī 47 n.
Ahmad *see* Khīnah
Abū Aḥmad (rabāt) 165
Abū Ahmad b. Sa'īd al-Qāḍī 17
Abū Ahmad *see* -Muwaffaq
Aḥnaf b. Qays, Castle of 80
Āhū-pūsh 328
-Ahwal, Abu'l-'Alā 30
Akharūn 74, 185
Akhshū (? Āq-ṣū) river 68
Akhsīkath, 156, 159, 161–2, 164, 285, 286, 315, 402
Akhsīsak 80
'Alā ad-Dīn ('Alā al-Mulk) (ruler of Qunduz) 420
'Alā ad-Dīn *see* Muhammad (Khwārazm-shāh)
'Alā al-Mulk -Tirmidhī 374
'Alā Ṣa'dī 106
Alai mts. 70
Ibn 'Alamdār 270
Alamūt 8
Alaq-noyon 416, 417, 419
Alexander of Macedon 1 n., 66 n, 76, 84, 167 n, 315, 363
'Alī, village of 81
'Alī (Qarā-Khānid) 274 n
'Alī b. Abū Ṭālib, tomb of 33, 79
'Alī b Ḥusayn *see* 'Alī-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid)
'Alī b. 'Īsā b. Māhān 7, 203
'Alī b. Layth (Saffārid) 216
'Alī b. Ma'mūn (Khwārazm-shāh) 147, 269, 272, 275
'Alī b. Mujāhid (historian) 5
'Alī b. Muḥammad (Qarā-Khānid) 282
Abū 'Alī -Chaghānī 10, 228, 242, 243 n., 246–9
Abū 'Alī *see* -Bal'amī, -Dāmghānī, -Jayhānī, -Sīmjūrī, Ḥasan b. Muḥammad (ra'īs)
'Alī ad Dīn -Khayyaṭī 435
'Alī Durūghī 431, 433
'Alī-khwājah (of Bukhārā) 396, 415
'Alī-Sultān 53
'Alī-tagīn (Qarā-Khanid) 280–2, 284–5, 294–8
'Alī-tagīn, sons of 298–302, 303
'Alī-tagīn b. 'Abdallāh (general) 297, 301
'Alids 119, 193, 195, 198, 214, 225, 242, 374
-Alma'ī *see* 'Abd al-Ghāfir
Almāliq (Almāligh) 401, 403
Alp-Arslān (Saljūqid) 305, 306, 310 n., 313–14, 315 n.
Alp-Darak 343; *and see* Alp-Qarā-Ūrān
Alp-Er-Khān (Alp-Khān) 412, 413
Alp-Qarā (general) 297
Alp-Qarā-Ūrān 340, 341, 343
Alp-tagīn of Bukhārā (ḥājib) 277–9
Alp-tagīn of Ghazna 228, 233, 239, 249–51, 261
Alp-tagīn (ambassador) 299
Alp-tagīn (Qara-Khitāy) 100, 327, 354
'Alqama, Castle of 96
Altai mts, 393
Altan-Khān 394
Altūntāsh (Khwārazm-shāh) 279, '280, 282, 294–6, 298
Altūntāsh, son of (unnamed) 297
Amards 81 n
Amdīza 118, 154
'Amīd al-mulk, Office of 230
Amīn ad-Dīn -Harawī 397
Amīn al-Mulk (Amīn-malik) 423, 439–43, 446
Amīr 149
Amīrak Bayhaqī (Abu'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Muh) 303–4
'Amr b. Jamīl 202
'Amr b. Layth (Saffārid), 21, 216, 219–22, 224–5, 226, 230
Abū 'Amr *see* Muhammad b Asad
Amu-Darya 64, 65, 66, 76, 77, 80, and *passim*
  Bridge of boats over 282, 301, 451, 452, 455
  Changes of course of 146, 150, 150 n, 152, 337 n, 437, 457
  Crossings of 69, 71, 72, 76, 80, 81, 137, 142 n.
  Delta of 151, 152
  Names of 65, 81 n.
  Narrows on 142 n., 143, 154 n., 155 n.
  Provinces in lower course of 142–55.
  Provinces to north of 68–76
  Provinces to south of 66–8
Āmul (Charjuy) 76, 80–82, 117 n., 142, 143, 148, 154, 213, 259, 261, 262, 265, 269, 270, 278, 296, 330, 360 n., 416
Āmul (Māzandarān) 425
Amza 154
Ananda (prince) 436 n.
Anbār 79, 80

Anbarduwān 121
Andadī 139
Andāq 121
Andarāb (Andarāba) 67, 444
Andarastān 146, 155
Andījārāgh (river and village) 68, 69
Andıyār-Kandmān 116
Andkhud (Ankhud, Andkhuy), 80–1, 298, 336, 351, 364, 419
-Andkhudī *see* Yūsuf b. 'Abdallāh
Andukān (Andıjan) 158, 160
Anfuran rabāṭ 175
Angara river 392
Angren *see* Āhangarān
Anıkfardar 121
Anīsūn 121
Anjāfarīn (Anjufarīn) 121
Anonym of Iskandar 54, 56
Anshamīthan 139
Anūdhkath 174
Anūshırwān 315
Anūsh-tagīn Gharja 323–4
Aolo-botzıle (Mongol) 381
Aq-Kutal 315
Aq-malık 449
Aq-ṭabāt pass 68
Aq-Shāh 432, 437–8
Aq-sū river 68
Arabic language 1, 9, 240, 291
Arabs 77, 79, 96 n., 168, 233, 255, 278 n
Conflict with Chinese 3, 185, 188, 195–6
Conflict with Turks 186–7, 188, 190–1, 192
Expeditions into Central Asia, 6, 77, 182–92
Revolts against 'Abbāsids 194–5, 198
Settlements and villages 81, 94–5, 101, 106, 159 n , 185, 270
Tribal conflicts among 182, 184, 189, 193
Arafāt 354, 374
Aral Sea 151, 152, 238
Aral-Payghambar 75, 76, 80 n., 301
Āranj fabrics 235
Arbīlakh 174
Arbınjan *see* Rabınjan
Ardabīl 145, 426
Ardahan 422
Ardakhīwa 149, 150
Ardakhushmīthan 148, 149
Ardakuwā 153 n., 154
Ardlānkath (Farghāna) 163
Ardlānkath (Shāsh) 163, 174
Arfūd 98
Arghān 135
Arghūn 455 n.
Argun river 414 n
Arḥan ford 68, 69, 70
'Āriḍ (army paymaster) 221, 230
ariq 83 n.
Arıs river 176
Arısteıs (tribe) 159
Aristocracy (pre-Islamic) in Central Asia 180–1
Arkand 165 ; *see also* Rukund
Armenian historical sources, 37, 459
Arslān, Sultan (Saljūqid) 335
Arslān (of Merv) 449
Arslān-Īlak *see* Naṣr b. 'Alī *and* 'Alī-tagīn (Qarā-Khānīd)
Arslān-Jādhıb 272 n., 279, 448 n.
Arslān-Khān (Qarluq) 403, 404, 442
Arslān-Khān 'Alī (Qarā-Khānıd) 268
Arslān-Khān Maḥmūd (Qarā-Khānıd?) 328
Arslān-Khān Muḥammad b. 'Alī 275, 280–2
Arslān-Khān Muḥammad b. Sulaymān 319–21, 333
Buildings of, 99, 100, 103, 109, 111, 118, 319
Arslān-Khān Muhammad b. Yūsuf (of Kāshghar) 366
Arslān-Khān Sulaymān b. Yūsuf (Bughrā-tagīn) 295, 296, 299, 300, 303
Arslān-Khān Yūsuf (of Kāshghar) 363
Arslān (Isrā'īl) b. Seljuk 280, 285
Arslān-tagīn *see* 'Alī-tagīn (Qara Khānid)
Arslān-Yālū (hājıb) 269
Arsmanda 168
Arsubānīkat (Arsyānīkat) 167
Artakhushmīthan *see* Ardakhushmīthan
Arū 135
Arwān 115, 116
Aryans 64, 66, 76, 168
Arys river 408
Asad b. 'Abdallāh 5, 77, 78 n , 83, 189, 191, 193, 209
Asad b. Sāmān-Khudāt 209
Asan *see* Ḥasan-hājī
Asangīn arıq 89
Asbās 142
Asfizār 90
Abu'l-Ash'ath b. Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 210
Ashbīnghū 174
Ashıyār 455
Ashnas (religious leader) 198
Ashnās (town) 179, 414
Ashraf b. Muhammad -Samarqandī 320
Ashras b. 'Abdallāh 189–90
Asht 163
Ashur-Ade island 426
Āsīb 302
'Āṣim b. 'Abdallāh 191
Askān 130
Asmand *see* Usmand
Asrūd 134, 135
Assassins *see* Isma'ılites
Āstāna (rabāṭ) 137 n.
Astrābād 15
Atashkhān (?) 164 n.
Ātbāsh 157, 317
Ibn al-Athīr 2–3, 4, 10, 17, 19, 21, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 39

Atmātigīn 327 n., 354
Atsiz (Khwārazm-shāh) 33, 100, 323–31, 332
Avicenna *see* Ibn Sīnā
Awāl 160, 161, 164
'Awfī, Muḥammad 17, 18 n., 36, 50
Awhad ad-Dīn (Shaykh) 379
Awqāf, administration of 231–2
Awshar 120
Awzaj (Ūzaj) ford 71–2
Āyach (ḥājib) 259
Ayāz (Jahān-Pahlawān) 378
Ayāz b. Alp-Arslān 314
'Ayn ad-Dawla (Jikilī) 317
'Āyn ad-Dawla (Qarā-Khānid) 300, 303
Āy-tagīn 335
Āytāq *see* Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn
Aytāsh (ḥājib) 243
Ayvaj ford 72
'Ayyār-beg (Khorezmian) 337
'Ayyār-beg (Qarluq) 336
Ayyūb, tomb of 160
Ayyūb b. Ḥassān 106
A'ẓam-malik 440–3, 453
Azrakyān 255 n.

Bāb (Bukhārā) 121
Bāb (Farghāna) 162, 163
Bāba 121
Bāb Dastān 90
Bābish 121
Bābur 156, 427
Bactrian empire 76; *see also* Graeco-Bactrian kingdom
Badākad 121
Badakhshān 65, 66, 67, 79, 403 n.
Badakhshān ford 69
Bādan 121
Bādghīs 198, 349
Badhīkhūn 121
-Badī' (Muntajab ad-Dīn) 33
Bādiya -i khurdak 97
Badr ad-Dīn 'Amīd (governor) 407, 419
Badr ad-Dīn Qādī-Khān (qāḍī) 410
Badr ad-Dīn (mudarris) 342
Badyāna 140
Bāf 153
Baga 167 n
Baghdād 208, 210, 212, 218, 422
Baghdādak (Baghdād, Bughaydid) 153
-Baghdādī (Bahā ad-Dīn Muḥammad) 33
-Baghdādī (Abu'l-Ma'ālī) 318 n.
-Baghdādī (Majd-ad-Dīn) 33, 375–7, 380
Baghirqān 149, 150
Baghlān 67, 444 n., 454
Baghūnkath 174
Bahā ad-Dīn *see* -Baghdādī
Bahā ad-Dīn -Rāzī 393–4, 396
Bahā ad-Dīn Sām (of Bāmiyān) 344, 352
Bahā ad-Mulk (of Merv) 448
Bāhān rabāṭ 154
Bahrām Chūbīn 206 n., 209
Bahrām Gūr (Varahrān V) 206, 234
Bahrām-shāh 352
Bāichur *see* Bātījūr
Bakār street 111
bakhshī 51, 55 n., 388, 391
Bakr b. Malik -Farghānī 249
Bakr b. Wā'il (tribe) 95
Abū Bakr b. Abū Ash'ath 243
Abū Bakr (of Bukhārā) 242
Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Ishāq (theologian) 289–90
Abū Bakr Muḥammad -Chaghānī 10, 242
Abū Bakr *see* -Ḥusayrī, -Kallābādī
Bakrān *see* Muhammad b. Najīb
-Balādhurī 6
Balāj 177
Bālā-Khān 413
-Bal'amī (Abū 'Alī Muh) 10, 250–1
-Bal'amī (Abu'l-Fadl Muh) 61, 104, 229, 241, 242, 243 n., 245
Bala-Murghab 79
Balāndarān 135
Balāsāghūn 243, 254, 256, 257, 285, 294, 312, 326, 333 n., 358, 363, 364 n., 367, 402
Bālāyān 174
Bālchīch *see* Ahmad Bālchīch
Balghar *see* Burghar
bālish (coin) 396 n.
Baljuan 99
Balkh 66–8, 72, 76–9, 80, 189, 191, 196, 217, 224, 248, 253, 254, 259, 263, 266, 272, 273, 276, 277, 280, 282, 285, 288–9, 291, 291 n., 297, 303, 314, 331, 335, 336, 344, 345, 352, 352 n., 375, 405, 423, 424, 438, 453
Balkhāb 444
Balkhān 137
-Balkhī (Abū Zayd Aḥmad b. Sahl) 11, 246 n
Bamiykath 99
Bāmiyān 68, 191, 338, 443–4, 454
Bamkākhush 160
Bānab 115
Banākath 169, 170, 174, 235, 407, 416, 417, 418
-Banākatī (Dāwud b. Abu'l-Faḍl) 49
Bandīmash 121
Bandūn *see* Bīdūn
Banjhīr *see* Panjshīr
Bānjkhāsh 174
Bānkar 80
Banūnkath 171
Baqirghan 150
Baqirghan, Khōja (canal) 165
Bārāb (Farghāna) 164
Bārāb (Isfījāb) 176–8
Barābīḍ(?) 153
Bārāb-Sār 149
Barāghūd 153
Barākad (Barākadān) 121

Barakāt b. Mubārak (Abu'l-Futūḥ) 27
Barakhshah 115; *and see* Farakhshah
Barākūh (Baiākah) 156 n.
Barang 158, 163
Barangī 74
Barātagīn 146, 151
Barāz 199
Barbān river 68, 69
Bārchinlıghkant (Bārchin) 179, 378, 414, 418.
Bardād 122
Bardha'a 283
Bārdīza 122
Barfakhsh 122
-Barghashī Muḥ. b. Ibrāhīm (wazīr) 264, 265
Bārgīn-i farākh 118
barīd (postal service) 230–1
barīd (measure of distance) 147 n.
Barın (tribe) 391, 416
Bārjīn (Bāıjkand) 179 n.
Barkad 119, 122, 223
Barkanān 135
Bārkath 94, 165, 196
Barkūsh 173
Barkyārūq (Saljūqid) 318, 324
-Barmakī (Abu'l-Qāsım, wazīr) 265
Barmakıds 77, 197
Bārmās (Mongol commander) 447–8
Bārmish arıq 83
Barqān 153
Barrān (Barrānīya) 122
-Barrānī 304 n
-Barsakhī (Abū Bakr Manṣūr) 15
Barsān *see* Barbān
Barsh river 83
Barshūr *see* Pashāwar
Bārskath 175
Barskhān 122
Barskul (Barkul) 175 n.
Barūkat 177
Barūqān 77, 189
Bāsand 74
Bāsār (Bāsara, Bāsarān) 70 n
Basba 122
Bashbashān 163, 164
Bashmīn arıq 83
Bashtān 139
Basıkāyır 122
Baṣra 255 n
Ba-sze-ha (? Akhsīkath) 402
Bātījūr 201
Batık 81, 312 n.
Batkhudān 132
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 78, 79, 92, 132, 426–7, 436 n., 438
Bātū-Khān 459
Bāwurchıq 403
Bāyān 139
Baydūn *see* Bīdūn
Bayhaq 31 n., 259, 304, 330
-Bayhaqī (Abu'l-Faḍl) 20, 21, 22–4
-Bayhaqī (Abu'l-Ḥasan) 22 n., 31, 32 n., 242, 326
-Bayhaqī *see* Amīrak
Bāykar 80
Bāynāl *see* Tāynāl
-Bayyi' (Abū 'Abdallāh) 16, 242, 247
Bazda 136–7.
Begtagīn (Ghaznevid general) 297, 301
Begtagīn (Khorezmian general) 426
Begtūzūn (ḥājıb) 262, 263, 265, 266, 268
Berezın, I. N. 43, 63 n.
Biberstein-Kazımirsky, A. 24, 302 n.
Ibn al-Bībī 29 n.
Bīdūn (Bukhār-Khudāt) 100
Bīgān 164
Bīh-Afarīd 194
Bīk 69
biki 391–2
Bılgā-beg (Bılgā-tagīn) 323
Bılgā-khān *see* Tāj ad-Dīn
Bılgā-tagīn (ḥājib) 285
Bılgutay 383, 385
bilıks 42, 391
Bınkat (Soghd) 122
Binkath (Shāsh) 170–3, 215
Bınqān (province) 72 n
Bīrān 139
Bırmas 122
bīrūn 78
Bīrūn (well) 155
-Bīrūnī (Abū Rayhān) 1, 20, 65 n., 214, 275–6
Bīshbālıq 368
Bıskām mts. 169
Bīskand 156, 177 n.
Bıskath 174
Bıṣṭām 335, 422
Bısur (Bısudar) *see* Yasawur
Bīsutūn (Zıyārid) 251
Bizdūn 128
Bolor 338
Bossu arıq 173
Brahmans 96 n
Brockelmann, C. 2–3, 11 n.
Bud rabāt 155
Budakhkath 164 n.
Buddhism, Buddhısts 51, 71, 77, 102 n., 107, 108, 108 n., 116, 180, 387–90
Būdına 155 n.
Būgh 73
Bughaydid 153
Bughrā *see* Ibn Kafraj
Bughrāchuk (amīr) 263
Bughra-Khān, Satūq 255, 257
Bughrā-Khān 300 n.
Bughra-Khan (heathen) 286
Bughrā-Khān (Bughrā-qārā-Khāqān) Hārūn b Mūsā 254 n., 257–60, 268, 274 n., 280
Bughrā-Khān Hārūn b. Yūsuf 315
Bughrā-Khān Muḥammad (Yaghān-tagīn) 284, 285, 294–6, 299–300, 304, 318–19

Bughrāq 441 n.; *and see* Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq-malik
Bughrā-tagīn Sulaymān *see* Arslān-Khān Sulaymān
Bughurji-noyon 383, 386, 404, 433, 452
Buir-Nor 381
Būkand 163
bukhār 102 n.
Bukhārā—
  as a literary centre 9
  Coinage of 204–7
  Commerce of 235
  Conquest of
    by Arabs 185
    by Chingiz-Khān 406, 407, 409–11
    by Muḥammad Khwārazm-shāh 360
    by Qarā-Khānids 8, 259, 268
    by Qarā-Khiṭāys 326–7
  Description of 100–112
  District of 112–20
  Historical works on 13, 14, 58
  (General references) 80, 82 n., 83, 96, 98, 99, 181, 186, 190, 194–5, 198, 199, 200, 201, 210, 213, 222–3, 229, 235, 239, 242, 247, 248, 251, 253, 254, 258, 260, 262, 263, 265, 266, 269, 270, 271, 275, 280, 285, 296, 304, 314, 315, 316, 317, 320, 325, 334, 336, 341–2, 344, 345–6, 353–5, 358, 359, 360, 363, 370, 372 n., 375, 379, 396 n., 398, 399, 413, 417, 427, 430, 433, 447, 448, 456, 457
Bukhārā, Old 116
-Bukhārī (Abū 'Abdallāh Muh. b. Aḥmad) 13
-Bukhārī (Muh. b. Ismā'īl) 126
Bukhariyān 137
Bukhār-Khudāt (? Najjār-Khudāt) 114, 116
Bū-Layth (street) 111
Bulghān-bige 401
Bulghārs (of the Kama) 33, 235
Būma 116
-Bundārī (Fatḥ b. 'Alī) 28
Buniyāt (Bukhār-Khudāt) 115, 199, 200
Būnjikath (Panjikath, in Samarqand province) 82, 92, 93
Būnjikath (Panjikath, in Ushrūsana) 166–7
Būqā-Būshā (Nūshā) 448
Būrāb 74
Buram 122
Burānā 122
Burāq (Qarā-Khiṭāy) 364
Burghar 82, 168
'Burhān, House of' 326, 353–5
Burhān ad-Dīn ('Abd al-'Azīz II b. 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz) 342, 354
Burhān ad-Dīn (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-'Aziz) 354–5, 379, 430
Burhān al-Milla wa'd-Dīn ('Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Omar-Māza) 326
Būrī-tagīn *see* Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr
Burjan 167
Būrka-noyon 424
Burmādūy 81
Būrnamadh 92, 94, 165, 270
Būrq (? Būruq) 116
Bursān 122
Burtana (amīr) 356, 357, 365
Būsanj 73 n.
Būshang 208, 217, 423, 424
Bust 216, 233, 266, 438
Butanīn (Butayīn) 122
Butkhadān 139
Buttam (Butman) mts. and prov. 72, 82, 134, 168
Buwwah canal 146
Būyids (Buwayhids) 7, 8, 225, 226, 239, 249, 251, 252, 253, 262, 271
Būzār 368, 401
Buzghām 139
Būzmājan ariq 83
Buzmājan district (Kish) 135
Buzmājan district (Samarqand 92, 94

Cahun, L 61
Caliphs, descendants of 258
Carra de Vaux, Baron 63 n.
Caspian Sea 422, 425, 426, 431, 437, 457
Central Asia, pre-Muslim literature of 1; *see also* Transoxania *and* Islām
Chāch 169 n., *see* Shāsh
-Chaghānī *see* Abū 'Alī, Abū Bakr, Abū Mansūr
Chaghāniyān *see* Ṣaghāniyān
Chāghān-rūd 72
Chaghirāq (Chaghrāt) tribe 152
Chaghrī-khān *see* Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī
Chakchak district 138
Chakdālīk river 138
Chakir-oghuz 152
Chākirs 180
Ch'am river 362 n.
Ch'ang-Ch'un 38, 88, 89, 388, 390, 393, 450–3, 455–6, 459
Chārak 193
Charikar 68
Charjuy 80; *see also* Āmul
Charmangān *see* Ṣarmanjān
Chichār 119
Chikils *see* Jikils
China, Chinese—
  Arab conflicts with 3, 195–6
  Colonists in Transoxania 451
  Crafts, influence of 236, 237
  Mongol invasions of 393–4, 404
  Relations with native princes in Transoxania 183 n., 195–6
  Relations with Turks and Mongols 381–2, 394
  Historical records 3, 6, 37, 38, 43–4, 45, 52, 59, 96 n., 97 n., 134 n., 161 n.,

183 n., 195–6, 232 n., 370–2, 381 ff.
(General references) 56, 94, 96 n., 117, 185, 186, 202, 255 n., 286 n., 304, 311, 320 n., 387, 395
Chingay 389, 390
Chingiz-Khān 39, 42, 43, 53, 75, 78, 79, 86, 100, 361–2, 369, 381–462 *passim*
Campaign in China 393–4, 404
,, on Indus 445–6, 453
,, in Khurāsān and Afghanistan 438–9, 443–5, 454–5
Campaign against Mergīts 369–72
,, in Transoxania 403–20
Character of 459–62
Conquest of Bukhārā 409–11, of Samarqand 411–14
Death of 459
Embassies to and from Khwārazm-shāh 393, 394, 396–7, 399
Meetings with Ch'ang-Ch'un 450–3, 455–6
Not instigated by the Caliph 400
Organization, civil 386–7, 461
Organization, court and military 382–6
Quarrel with Jūchī 458
Return from India to Mongolia 453–6; *see also* Mongols.
Chīn-Tīmūr 415, 457
Chirchik river 163, 169, 456
Chopan-ata 86, *see* Kūhak
Chotkal 163, 169, *and see* Jidghil
Christians 94, 106, 214, 224, 255; *see also* Nestorians
Chu river 362 n., 450
Chuli Jalālī 445
Churche 37
Chūr-tagīn (dihqān) 157
Coal 161, 236
Coinage, debasement of 203–7
Commerce and industry of Transoxania 234–40, 451
Commerce, Muslim, in Central Asia 386, 394–6, 399, *see also* Turks, Central-Asian
Confiscations (of property) 218, 221, 291, 292–3; *see also* Requisitions
Copper 164
'Copper city' 117
Curtin, Jeremiah 62
Curtius, Quintus 84
Customs duties 239–40

Dabīq 236
Dabūsiya 96 n., 97, 190, 235, 270, 282, 295, 409, 411
Dād-Ḥabashī b. Altūntāq 324
-Daghūnī, Sahl b. Aḥmad 99
Dahān-i shīr rabāṭ 155
Dahbīd 96 n
Ḍaḥḥāk-i Mārān 136 n.
Dakhfandūn 115, 122; *see also* Farakhshah
Dāmghān 335, 425
-Dāmghānī, Abū 'Alī Muḥ. b. 'Īsā (wazīr) 260
Dandānqān 24, 303
Danfaghānkath 171
dānishmand (title) 232
Dānishmand-ḥājib 407, 430, 431
Dārā b. Qābūs 261, 262 n.
Dār-i Āhanīn 138; *see also* Iron Gate
Darai-Nihan (mts) 72
Darband (Rāsht) 71
Dargham canal (north of Samarqand) 326
Dargham district (south of Samarqand) 92, 93, 125, 127
Dargham river 83, 93 n.
Darghān 142, 155, 270
Darius Hystaspes 76
Darkhās 150, 151
Darsān 151
Darūghān (-atā) 142
darukhachi, office of 401
Darwaz 65
Darwāza-i Kish 86
Darwāzja 103, 106, 111
Dārzangī 74, 298
Darzīw 123
Dashtak, 110
Daskākhān-khās 148
Dawlatābād 422, 425
Dāwud (Dā'ud) (Saljūqid) 297, 300 n., 303–4, 307, 308, 313
Dāwud b. 'Abbās (Bānīchūrid) 77, 78
Dāwud Kūch-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid) 31
Abū Dāwud (Khālid b. Ibrāhīm) 194, 196, 199
Abū Dāwud (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad) 224
Abū Dāwudid dynasty 233
Daylam, Daylamites 213, 214, 242, 318
Dayr al-'Aqūl 218
Deguignes, J. 59
Delhi 453
Denaw (Dīh-i naw) 72, 74
-Dhahabī (historian) 16, 32
Dhakhīnawa 123
Dhakhkath (Adhakhkath) 174
Dhammā 123
Dhar *see* Rūd-i Zar
Dhar'ayna 123
Dhaymūn 114, 117
Dhibadwān 123
dhirā' 84 n., 85
Dhu'l-Kifl 80 n.
Dhu'l-Kifl rabāṭ (Kālif) 80
Dhu'l-Qarnayn rabāṭ (Kālif) 80
Dīdagī 137
Dih-i Azraq 155
Dih-i Buzurg 118 n.
Dīh-i naw *see* Denaw *and* Yanikant
Dihistān 308, 335, 338
dihqāns 180, 181, 226, 307–8

Dijarkard 164
Dīmās 99, 122
Dimashq (Samarqand) 88
-Dimashqī 50
Dīnkot 446
Dirham b. Naṣr 216
Ḍirizdah 137
Dīwān-i arḍ 378
Dīwān aḍ-ḍiyā' 231
Dīwān ar-rasā'il (*Dīwān-i inshā*) 230
Dīwār-i Qiyāmat 88
Ḍiyā ad-Dīn 'Alī (of Merv) 447–8
Dīzak 123, 235, 270; *see also* Jīzak
Donner, O 206
Dualists 180, 200, 246, 255
Dūghāj rabāṭ 154
Dujākan 139
Dungans 436 n.
Dūrbāy *see* Tūrbāy
Durun 430 n.
Duva-Khān 53
Duzbirī (wazīr) 281 n.

Egyptian textiles 236
Emil *see* Īmil
Ephthalites 96, 102 n., 108, 184
Er-Būqā Pahlawān 433
Erdmann 59
European assistants of Rashīd al-Dīn 45
Eutychius (patriarch) 6
Ezekiel 79

Faḍl b. Aḥmad -Isfarāyinī (wazīr) 287–8
Faḍl b. Kāwus (prince of Ushrūsana) 211
Faḍl b. Sahl 202, 208
Faḍl b Sulaymān -Ṭūsī 112, 203
Faḍl b. Yaḥyā -Barmakī 108, 202, 203, 211
Abu'l-Faḍl b. Abū Yūsuf 241
Fāgh 123
Faghāndīza 123
Faghāskūn 102
Faghdīn (Faghdīz) 123
Faghīdiza 90
Faghīfad 123
Faghīṭūsīn 123
Faghkath 167
Faghsadara 101
Fāiq 228, 251, 252–4, 256, 258–263, 264–6, 267.
Fakhr ad-Dawla (Būyid) 8, 253, 262 n.
Fakhr ad-Dīn -Dīzakī -Bukhārī 397
Fakhr ad-Dīn Ḥabash 'Inān -Nasawī 427
Fakhr ad-Dīn (of Khorezmia) 340
Fakhr ad-Dīn Mubārak-shāh -Marwarrūdī 31, 429
Fakhr ad-Dīn Mas'ūd (of Bāmiyān) 338, 351 n., 352 n.
Fakhr ad-Dīn -Rāzī 32, 429
Faknān 167
Fāmīn 123
Fanak 87
Fankad 139
Ibn al-Faqīh -Hamadhānī 7, 77
Farāb (Samarqand) 123
Fārāb 115 n.
Fārāb (Farghāna) 164
Fārāb (Isfījāb) 176, 177, 178, 179
Farab, Farabr (Bukhārā) 81, 82, 117, 118, 240
-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr, 177
Farāchūn (Farājun) 137 n.
Abu'l-Faraj 2
Farakhshah (Afrakhshah) 115, 116, 154, 200; *see also* Dakhfandūn
Farāna 115
Farankath (Shāsh) 174
Farankath (Soghd) *see* Afarīnkath
Faraskad 174
Farātagīn *see* Barātagīn
Farāwa (Afrāwa) rabāt 154, 277, 308
Farāwīz, Lower and Upper 114, 116
Fardad 123
Farghāna—
  Commerce of 236
  Description of 155–165
  Mongol operations in 417
  Muslim invasions of 186, 187, 189, 192, 201, 202, 211, 256
  (General references) 186, 195, 200, 209, 210, 215 n., 241, 285, 315, 317, 366, 369, 402, 419
Farghīdad 116
Farīdūn -Ghūrī 434
Farīghūnid dynasty 79, 224, 233, 254, 338
Fārīza 111
Fārjak 103, 111
Farjayā 123
Farkhān (gate) 175
Farkhūrdīza 139
Farnīfthān 144
Farqad 111 n.
Farrūkh 208 n.
Farrukhshīdh 88
Fārs 217–19, 236 n., 422
Farwān *see* Parwān
Faryāb (Soghd) 138
Fāryāb (Gūzgān) 79, 80
Farzāmīthan 90
Fashīdīza ariq 104
Fashna *see* Afshīna
Fāshūn 104
Fāshūq 123
Faṣīḥ al-Khwāfī 55, 251 n.
Abu'l-Fatḥ *see* Īl-Arslān
Fāṭimid dynasty 271
  propaganda in Central Asia 242–3, 304–5
Abu'l-Fawāris (Buyid, of Fārs) 253
Abu'l-Fawāris *see* Abd al-Malik II
Fawrān *see* Barrān

Fayy 93, 97, 123
Fayzābād (Badakhshān) 66
Fayzābād (Wāshgird) 71, 74
Abu'l-Fidā 2, 50
Fiefs *see Iqṭā'āt*
Fihrist al-'Ulūm 4, 5, 26, 241, 244
Fījkath 139
Fīl (Fīr) (Kāth) 144–5
Fīrabr *see* Farab
Fīrān (?) 340, 341
Fire-worshippers 82 n., 85, 98, 107, 108, 116, 180, 194, 255
Fiscal exactions 246–7, 293
Franks 348 n.
Frederick II 400
Fūmā (Qarā-Khiṭāy) 337, 339
Fūrfāra 123
Fuwaydīn 139
Fuyādhsūn 123

Gāgan 124
Gākhushtuwān 116
Gālūk-Andāz 166
Ganja 227
Gardan-Khāst 147 n.
Gardīz 264 445
-Gardīzī (historian) 12, 17, 20–1, 26, 50, 61
Garkan 71
Garm 71
Gāryāba 67
Gāw-Khwārah canal 144, 150
Gaza 167 n.
Georgians 426
Ghadāwad 87
Ghadhān 124
Ghadrānk 174
Ghandāb 158
Ghārābkhashna (Ghārāmkhashna) 144
Ghardiyān 139
Ghardmān 149, 150
Gharjand 174
Gharjistān 233, 261, 292, 323, 338, 352 n, 444, 455
Gharjistān of Samarqand 131
Gharkard 175
-Gharnāṭī, Shihāb ad-Dīn 34, 79
Gharqand 117
Ghashīd (Ghashīta) 124
Ghashtī 124
Ghassān b. 'Abbād (governor) 208, 209, 210
Ghātfar (Samarqand) 86, 90
Ghāw-Khitfar 114
Ghawshfinj 153
Ghāzān-Khān (Ilkhān) 44–5, 49
Ghazaq (Ghazak) (Shāsh) 174
Ghazaq (Ushrūsana) 167
Ghazīniz 153
Ghāzīs, organization of 215, 239, 242, 287, 295, 312, 345
Ghazna 21, 68, 217, 233, 251, 261, 265–304 *passim*, 325, 338, 351, 352, 374, 405, 420, 438–41, 443–6
Ghaznayān 139
Ghaznevid dynasty—
  Administration of 238, 239, 307
  Foundation of 251, 261–4
  Historical literature under 18–24
  Struggle with Saljūqids 302–4
  (General references) 231, 232, 261–304 *passim*, 338 ; *see also* Maḥmūd
Ghijduwān (Ghujduwān) 119, 124
Ghīshtā (Ghīshtī) 124
Ghiṭrīf b 'Aṭā (governor) 202, 204
ghiṭrīfī dirhams 204–7
Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Maḥmūd (Ghūrid) 352–3, 360
Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Muhammad (Ghūrid) 338, 340–2, 344–6, 349, 352, 429
Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Muhammad (Saljūqid) 332–3
Ghiyāth ad-Dīn Pīr-shāh 422, 429–30
Ghiyāth al-Dīn *see* -Yazdī.
Ghoṛā-trap 445
Ghūbar 83, 95
Ghūbdīn 136, 140
Ghudhashtardar 124
Ghujduwān 119–20, 124
ghulwa, length of 98 n.
-Ghunjār (historian) 13 n., 15
Ghunjīr 124
Ghūr 338, 352 n, 353
Ghūrajk (Ghurashk) 124
Ghūrak (Ikhshīdh of Soghd) 96, 183 n., 185, 189, 190
Ghūrband 68
Ghūrids 330, 331, 338–46, 349–53, 372, 374, 400, 429
  Historical works relating to 30–1
Ghurmīnawā 124
Ghūrs 406, 411, 439–43
Ghūr-Shāh 338
Ghushaj 102, (arīq) 105
Ghushdān 124
Ghuzkard 175
Ghuzz Turks 100, 152, 177, 178, 212, 220, 269, 270, 291 n., 327, 329–31, 335, 339, 339 ; *see also* Oghuz
Gīfar 115 ; *see* Jīfar
Gīra ariq 144
Gīt (Jīt) 151–2
Gobālīq 402 ; *see also* Balāsāghūn
Gold mines 65, 164, 169
Golden Book (Altan-depter) 44
Graeco-Bactrian kingdom 66, 76
  coins of 69 n., 76
Gubdan 94
Gudse-ordo 402 ; *see also* Balāsāghūn
Guftan 74
Gurgān 253, 261, 262, 335, 426, 449 ; *see also* Jūrjān
Gurgānj (Jurjānīya, Urgench) 146–7, 234,

237, 261, 262, 263, 277, 350, 355, 356, 429, 430, 432–7, 457
Siege by Ghūrids 349–50
,, by Mongols 433–7
Gurgānjak (Little Gurgānj) 151 n., 153
Gurjmīn 90, 315
Gūrkhān 409, 410
Guzziwān 79 n., 443, 444
Guyuk 402, 460
Guzār *see* Khuzār
Guzarwān *see* Gurziwān
Gūzgān 79, 80, 193, 198, 224, 233, 248, 254, 261, 263, 265, 302, 338, 344

Ḥabash-'Amīd 431
Ḥabīb b. Muhallab 138
Ḥadshirūn 102
Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, 22, 30, 54 n., 55–6
Ḥafṣ b. Manṣūr -Marwazī 7
Abu Ḥafṣ 101, 102, 106
Haftād-Girdish pass 444
Haftdih (Farghāna) 156, 256
Ḥājib, office of 227, 243 n.
Ibn Ḥājib 436 n.
-Ḥajjāj 147, 184, 393
-Ḥākim (Fātimid Caliph) 271
ḥākim (title) 232
-Ḥakīm (well) 154
Ḥakīm-atā 150 n., 376
-Ḥākim -shahīd 246–7
Halāward 69, 73 n.
Hamadān (Hamadhān) 347, 375, 422, 425, 426
-Hamadānī (Shaykh Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf) 376
-Hamadhānī, Muh. b. 'Abd al-Malik 32 n.
-Hamadhānī *see* Ibn al-Faqīh
Ḥamdallāh Qazwīnī *see* -Qazwīnī
Ḥamdūna 105
Ḥamīd-Pūr 409
Ḥammāl -Marāghī 397
Hammer-Purgstall 59
-Hāmulī, Abu'l-Ḥasan (wazīr) 265
Ḥamūya b. 'Alī, 240, 241, 247
Ḥamza 203
Ḥamza -Iṣfahānī 33 n.
Ḥamza b. Muḥammad *see* Nuṣrat ad-Dīn
Abū Ḥanīfa -Dīnawari 6
Ḥaqq-rāh 101, 106
Ḥarāmkām ariq 99, 114, 118; *see also* Sāmjan ariq
Ḥarāwaz (Harwāz) 150, 153
-Harawī, Sayfī 57 n.
Ḥārith b. Surayj 190–1, 193
Ḥārith *see* Ibn 'Alamdār
Ḥarrūsh 345 n.
Harthama (general) 85
Hārūn b. Altūntāsh 297–9
Hārūn ar-Rashīd 85, 203
Hārūn-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid) 318
Harwāz *see* Harāwaz
Ḥasan (Qarluq) 441
Ḥasan b. 'Alī -Sa'dī 106
Ḥasan b. 'Alī -Uṭrūsh 214
Ḥasan b. Muḥammad (ra'īs) 290
Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ṭālūt 110
Ḥasan b. Tamīm 200
Ḥasan b. Tāq (commander) 270
Ḥasan b. Yūsuf (Namad-pūsh) 320
Ḥasan b. Zayd ('Alid) 214, 218
Abu'l-Ḥasan -Kharaqānī (shaykh) 311
Ḥasan-ḥājī 414
Ḥasan-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid) 322, 333
Hāshim b. Bānīchūr (Māhīchūr) 73 n., 77
Hāshim b Hākim *see* -Muqanna'
Hāshimgird 73, 138
Ḥāsib, office of 230
Ḥassān bridge 103, 104
Abū Ḥātim -Yasārī 223
Ibn Ḥawqal 11
Haylak *see* Siminjān
Haydar b. 'Alī -Ḥusaynī -Rāzī 37
Haydar b Kāwus *see* -Afshīn
(Ibn) Hayṣam b Muhammad -Nābī 31
Haytāl *see* Ephthalites
Ḥayyān -Nabatī 107
Abu Ḥayyān -Tawhīdī 8 n.
Hazārasp 143, 155, 263, 277, 279, 325, 328, 350
Ibn Hazm 26
Hazrat-bovi pass 72
Ḥazrat-Imām 70 n.
Herāt 57, 78, 209, 217, 253, 266, 288, 335, 338, 344, 349, 351, 352, 353, 359, 360–1, 375, 378, 423, 424, 438, 447
Hilāl b. -Muhassin 8
Himalaya mts 453
'Himyarī' inscription 87
Hindū-Khān b. Malik-shāh 349
Hindu-Kush mts. 66, 67, 405, 439, 443, 444, 452, 454
Hisar mts. *see* Buttam
Abū Hishām, Castle of 103
ḥisn 118 n., 341 n.
Historical narratives, character of early 1, 182
Hiuen-Tsiang 1, 70, 74, 77, 84, 180
Ho-sze-mai-li (? Ismā'īl) 401–2, 403
Howorth, Sir Henry 59–60, 62, 282 n.
Ḥudūd al-'Ālam 13
Hūlāgū 40, 49
Hulbuk (Hulbagh) 68, 69, 301
Humām ad-Dīn (amīr) 340
Ḥumār-bek 65
Ḥumayd, well of 170
Ḥumayd b. Qaḥtaba 199
Humāyūn *see* Āq-malik
Hunger Steppe 270, 336, 451
Huns 394
Ḥusām ad-Dawla 304 n; *and see* Shāh-Malik
Ḥusām ad-Dīn 'Omar (ṣadr) 326–7, 354
Ḥusayn (Timūrid) 57

Ḥusayn, well of 170
Ḥusayn (? Ḥasan) (amīr) 396
Ḥusayn (imām) 374
Ḥusayn b. 'Alī -Marwazī 241–3, 246 n.
Ḥusayn b. Kharmīl (ruler of Herāt) 359, 360–1
Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad -Khawārijī 222–3
Ḥusayn b. Mus'ab 208
Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir -Ṭā'ī 218, 219, 222, 223
-Ḥusaynī, Muḥammad b Muḥ 30 n.
-Ḥusaynī, Ṣadr ad-Dīn (historian) 28, 32
-Ḥusaynī *see* Ḥaydar b 'Alī
Ḥusayn-Malik (of 'Iraq) 243
-Ḥusayrī, Abū Bakr 285
-Ḥuṣayrī, Abu'l-Qāsim Ibrāhīm b. 'Abdallāh 294

Ībasan 139
Ibir-Shibir 392
Ibrāhīm (Sāmānid pretender) 269 n.
Ibrāhīm (Ghaznevid) 304
Ibrāhīm Gate (Bukhārā) 102
Ibrāhīm *see* Tamghāch-Khān
Ibrāhīm b Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 242, 247–8
Ibrāhīm b 'Alp-tagīn 250
Ibrāhīm b. Hilāl 8
Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn (governor) 216
Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn (Qarā-Khānid) 353–4
Ibrāhīm b Naṣr b. Rāfi' 216 n.
Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr 246, 248
Iced water 90
Īdhaj (Īdhūj, Idhūkh) xx, 124
Īdīqūt *see* Uighūrs
-Idrīsī (geographer) 305
-Idrīsī (Abū Sa'id 'Abd ar-Rahmā) 15
Ikhshīds of Soghd 93, 95, *see also* Ghūrak
Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Āytāq 335
Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Kushlū 409
Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn *see* Kharpūst
Ikinchī b. Quchqār (Khwārazm-shāh) 324
Īlak-Turkman 333, 334
Ilāl 430
Īlāmish 159, 356, 358
Īlāq (province) 156, 162, 163, 169–75, 200, 206, 210 n., 233, 243, 257 n., 307
Īlāq (Wāshgird) 71
Īlāqā (Īlqah) 362 n.
Il-Arslān (Khwārazm-shāh) 33, 97, 98, 329, 330, 332–7
Ilatgū- (Īlgatū-) malik 417
Ilengir 53
Ili river 393
Īl-khwājah 409
Īlmangū (ḥājib) 263
Īltutmish, Sultan Shams ad-Dīn 453
Ilyās b. Asad (Sāmānid) 209
Ilyās b. Isḥāq (Sāmānid) 240–1
'Imād ad-Dīn (mushrif) 432
'Imād ad-Dīn -Isfahānī 27–8, 29
'Imad ad-Dīn 'Omar (of Balkh) 352, 440
'Imād ad-Dīn ('Alid) *see* 'Alā al-Mulk -Tirmidhī
-'Imādī, Muḥammad b. 'Alī 24
Īmīl 320 n., 362 n, 393, 431
Īnālchik (Īnāl-khān) 398–9, 412
Īnānch-khān Oghūl-ḥājib 409, 432, 433, 434 n., 449
Īnanch-Payghū *see* Yūsuf (Saljūqid)
India 36, 39, 83, 196, 300, 303, 387, 405
Campaigns in (Ghaznevid), 261, 272, 279, 285, 287, 288, 290–1
(Ghūrid) 344, 349, 352
(Mongol) 445–6, 449 n, 453–4
Historical and Geographical works on 5, 20, 26, 45
Indian records of Mongols 45
Indians 291 n., 352
Indus, river 66, 185, 443, 445–6, 453, 454
Iqṭā'āt 238–9, 307, 332, 378
Irān 64
'Irāq 343, 348, 379, 398, 420, 422, 424, 456
'Irāq 'Ajamī 348
Irghiz river 370 n., 372
Iron 164, 169
Iron Gate (Shāsh) 175
Iron Gate (Soghdiana) 73, 138, 186, 299, 452, 453
Irtysh river 178, 361, 392, 393, 403, 450, 456
Isaac 79
'Iṣām b 'Abdallāh 186
Isbaskath (Isbiskath) 87, 124
Isbisk 87
Isfara (Ispara) 160–1, 185
Isfaranj 124
-Isfarāyinī, Fadl b. Aḥmad (wazīr) 287–8
Isfījāb (province and town) 175–8, 201, 211–12, 233, 234, 236, 241 n, 256, 257, 258, 264, 295, 366, 369, 450 n.
-Isfizārī, Mu'īn ad-Dīn 57
Isḥāq 'the Turk' 199
Isḥāq b. Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 232 n., 240
Isḥāq b. Alptagīn (? Ibrāhīm) 251
Ibn Isḥāq, Muḥammad 5
Ishsh 153
Ishtīkhān 94, 95, 96
Ishtīkhān ariq 83, 95
Iskandar (Timūrid) 54
Iskandargham ariq 89
Iskāran 124
Iskīfaghn 135, 136
Iskijkath 99
Islām—
Relations of Mongols to 54, 92, 402, 413, 431, 451, 458
Spread of, in Central Asia 65, 70, 160, 178, 188, 189–92, 254–6, 281, 286, 305, 338, 362, 368, 386–7, 436 n.; *see also* Priesthood ('Ulamā)
Isma'īl b. Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 108, 110, 111, 113, 115, 119, 211, 222–5, 226, 228, 235, 240, 256, 267

Ismā'īl Khandān 302
Isma'īl b. Nūḥ II *see* -Muntaṣir
Ismā'īl b Sabuktagīn 265
Ismā'īl (?) *see* Ho-sze-mai-li
Isma'ilites 25, 40, 41 n., 310, 327, 352, 374; *see also* Alamūt
Ismīthan 124
Irpahān (Iṣfahān) 193, 219, 317
Iṣpīd-bulān 160
Isrā'īl (Arslān) b. Seljuk 280, 285
Istā, Istān 124
-Iṣṭakhrī (geographer) 11
Istalīf 68
Iswāna 119
Ivanin, M. I. 63 n.
'Izz ad-Dīn Ṭughrā'ī 330
'Izz ad-Dīn Ṭughrul 379
'Izz ad-Dīn *see* Ḥusayn b. Kharmīl

Jabghūkath 173
Jābir b. Hārūn 214
Jabūzan 174
Jacob 79
Jacob de Vitry (bishop of Acca) 375 n.
Ja'far 241 n.
Ja'farband 278
Ja'far rabāṭ 154
Ja'far-tagīn 269, 272–3
Jaghatāy 42, 48, 52, 53 n, 391, 393, 412, 417, 431, 433–5, 437, 438, 439, 443, 452, 455, 458, 460, 462
Jaghatāy kingdom 40–1, 51, 52, 53, 54, 157, 393, 417, 427, 428, 460
Jahān-Pahlawān 378
Jājan 124
Jāj-rūd 134, 135
Jākardīza arıq and quarter 89, 413
Jakhzan 124
Jalair tribe 419, 424 n.
Jalāl ad-Dīn (Shaykh, of Samarqand) 379
Jalāl ad-Dīn (Khwārazm-shāh)—
Defeat by Chingiz-Khān on Indus 445-6
Flight from Khorezmia 432, 437–8
Operations in Afghanistan 439–44, 446
(General references) 39, 97, 372, 378, 418, 419, 420, 447, 448, 451, 460
Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Ḥasan (Chaghrī-Khān) 333, 334
Jalāl ad-Dīn 'Alī b. Ḥasan (Ḥusayn) -Zandī (imām) 410
Jalāl ad-Dīn Ḥasan (Isma'ilite) 374
Jalāl ad-Dīn Muhammad b. Mahmūd 335
Jalāl ad-Dīn Qadir-Khān (of Ūzgand) 366
Jalāl ad-Dīn *see* Maḥmūd Khān (Rukn ad-Dīn)
Jalalabad 160
Jalāl-dīza 105
Jamāl ad-Dīn 'Omar (of Wakhsh) 372
Jamāl Qarshī 51–2, 257
Jambalik (Janbalik) 362 n.
Jāmi' at-Tawārikh 44–8; *see also* Rashīd ad-Dīn
-Jāmijī *see* Aḥmad
jamūk (title) 181 n.
Jamuqa 384, 409
Jan water 82
Jand 153, 178, 179, 257, 298, 302, 314, 324, 325, 328–9, 331, 333, 340, 342, 343, 356, 363, 369, 370, 415, 416, 418, 432, 433
jāndār 312 n., 378
Jānids (Uzbegs) 130 n.
Jankākath 169
Jankent 178
-Jannābī 52
Jān-Qal'a 178
Jargh 99, 114, 141
Jarghıyān 141
jarīb (measure) 84 n.
Jar-kurgan 73
Jarm 66
-Jarrāh b. 'Abdallāh 188
Jaryāb (Panj) river 65, 68, 69, 70, 301
Jashīr 153
-Jawharī (lexicographer) 51
-Jayhānī (Abū 'Abdallāh Aḥmad b. Muḥ) 251–2, 265
-Jayhānī (Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad) 12–13, 109, 196 n., 226, 229, 240, 243 n., 245, 246 n, 252
-Jayhānī (Abū 'Alī Muhammad) 12 n., 245 n., 246, 252
-Jayhānī (Abu'l-Faḍl Muh. b Aḥmad) 265
Jayhūn 352; *see* Amu Darya
Jāz 152
Jazza (?) 117
Jebe-noyon 400–3, 419–26, 431, 458
Jelme 383
Jews 289, 388
Jida-noyon 416 n.; *see also* Ulūs-Īdī
Jıdghil 163, 164, 169
Jīfar 115, 132
Jıgarband 142, 155, 278 n.
Jıgarband rabāṭ 154
Jikam 137
Jıkıls 254 n., 317, 317 n.
Jılanuta defile 407
Jīnānjkath 170
Jīrākhasht 124
Jird (Samarqand) 86
Jīt 153; *see also* Gīt
Jīzak 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 173, 315 n.; *see also* Dīzak
Jū-i Mūliyān 110, 111, 259
Jūbaq 139
Jubār *see* Jūybār
Jūchī 52, 370–2, 386, 392, 401, 430–5, 437, 455, 457–8
Syr-Darya campaign 39, 407, 414–16
Juchids 49, 52

Jūchī-Qasar 383, 385
Jūdī 445
Jū-Ghushaj 105
Jumushlāghū 176 n.
Junayd b. 'Abdar-Raḥmān 190
Junayd, Gate of 171
Junqān Akhashsha 153
-Jurbādhaqānī, 20
Jurchits 391, 403
Jurjān 218; *see also* Gurgān
Jurjānīya *see* Gurgānj
Jurjānīya, Lake of 146
Juwāra 178
-Juwaynī (historian) 8, 10, 31, 32, 37, 39–41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 54, 58
Juwīk 140
Juwīqān 151
Jūybār (Nasaf) 140, (Samarqand) 124
Jūybār (Jūbār) Abū Ibrāhīm (Bukhārā) 104, 111, 318
Jūybār al-'Āriḍ (Bukhārā) 105
Jūybār-Bakār (Bukhārā) 104
Jūybār al-Qawārīrīyīn (Bukhārā) 104
Jūzjān *see* Gūzgān
-Jūzjānī 22, 24, 31, 38, 39, 60

Ka'b, steppe of 439
Kabadian *see* Quwādhiyān
Kabak (Jaghatāy-Khān) 136
Kabarna 174
-Ka'bī (Abu'l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh) 11
Kābud 94 n.
Kabūdh 125
Kabūdhanjakath 92, 93, 94
Kabūdjāmah 357
Kābul 68, 217, 440, 444, 453
Kābul river 68
Kābul-shāh 77, 202
Kadāk 174, 175
Kadar 176, 177
Kafirnihan river 70, 71, 72, 74
Ibn Kafraj Bughrā 399
Kafsīsiwān 125
Kahlābād gate (Būnjikath) 167
Kājar 140
Kākh 160
Kākhushtuwān 116, 200 n.
-Kalamālī (Muḥammad b. Sufyān) 255
Kalashjik 174
Kālif 80, 137, 419, 437 n.
Kalka river 395
Kallābādh 102, 103, 327 n., 333
-Kallābādī, Abū Bakr (shaykh) 120
kām (watercourse) 113 n.
Kamāl ad-Dīn (of Jand) 328
Kamalashri 45
Kamara 125
Kamard 125
Kamarja 125
Kāmdad (Kāmdiz) 125
Kānā (Bukhār-Khudāt) 204
Kand (Kan-i Bādām) 157–8, 163, 165
Kandak 137, 138
Kandākīn 183 n.
Kandasarwān 125
Kandukīn 125
Kanjīda 176, 178
Kankrāq 173
Kanwan 90
Kao-hsien-chih 195–6
Kārak-i 'Alawīyān 111
Karategin 70, 71; *see also* Rāsht
Kārbang 70
Karbar-malik 439
Kārdār 153
Kardarān-Khās 143, 147, 148
Karjumīn 90, 315
Karkūh (Kerki) 80, 81
-Karmānī, Juday' b. 'Alī 193, 194
Karmīnīya (Kermine) 97, 98, 113, 114, 116, 222, 235, 248 n., 282
Karmuchīn 140
Karrāmites 267 n., 289–90
Karrān 65
Karwān 163
Kārzan 125
Kasādun 125
Kāsān (Farghāna) 162–3, 202, 211, 318, 369, 402
Kāsan (Nasaf) 140, 142, 437 n.
-Kāsānī, Abū Naṣr (wazīr) 316
Kasba 136–7
-Kāshānī, 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī 46–7
-Kāshānī, Anūshirwān b. Khālīd 27
Kashgaria 401, 402
Kāshghar 18, 52, 66, 71 n., 185, 201, 241, 254, 256, 274, 275, 281, 282, 294, 295, 317, 322, 323, 334, 352 n., 357, 363, 366, 368, 395, 401, 454
-Kāshgharī, Maḥmūd 36 n., 317 n., 450 n.
Kashk 135
Kashk-rūd 134, 135
Kashka-darya 16, 80, 134–42, 189
Kāshkan 125
Kash-kushans 108
Kashmīr 352 n.
Kast province 72 n.
Katāk 175
Kāth (Khorezmia) 144–5, 150, 234, 277, 279, 457
Kathīr b. Raqqāq 216
Kaththa 125
-Kātib -Samarqandī (Muḥ. b. 'Alī) 18
katkhudā 226, (title) 232
Katta-Kurgan 97, 127
Kāwus (king of Ushrūsana) 211
Kāyishkan 125
Kay-Khusraw 116
Kazlī (Kazlik) 359, 361
Kchi-Surkhāb river 68, 69; *see also* Parghār
Kem-Kemchik (Kem-Kemjiyūt) 370
Kempirak 113
Keraits (tribe) 362 n., 381–2, 383, 386

Kerki *see* Zamm
Kermine *see* Karmīnīya
Khabūshān 330, 331
Khājistān 162, 171, 172
Khakanja 125
Khākhsar 125
Khalajis 291 n., 411, 440, 449
Ibn Khaldūn 3–4
Khalījān 152
Khalīl-Allāh 75 n.
Ibn Khallikān 3, 10
Khāma 116
Khandashtar 126
Khān-malik *see* Amīn al-Mulk
Khān-Sālār 99
Khān-Sultān (daughter of Muḥ Khwārazm-shāh) 356, 364–6, 431
Kharāchār-noyon 52, 53
Kharādīn 125
kharāj 188
Kharājar 125
Kharashkath 169
Kharāzmiyān 137
Khargānkat 173
Kharghānkath 98, 114
Kharghūn 125, 213
Kharijites 194, 198, 213, 216, 222
Kharjam 345 n.
Kharjang 248, 259, 315
Khar-Khān 98 n
Kharlukh Turks *see* Qarluq
Kharmaythan 114
Kharpūst, Ikhtiyār ad-Dīn Muḥ. b. 'Alī 439–40
Kharqān (Kharqāna) 125, 165, 166, 167
Kharqān (Khurāsān) 449
Kharqān (bazaar) 108
Kharqān rūd 114, 120
Kharqāna, Lower 114, 116, 120
Kharqāna, Upper 114, 117
Khartang 126, 248
Kharūr 153
Khās 149, 150
Khāsh 174
Khashart (Jaxartes) 155 n.
Khashyandīza 140
khatīb, office of, in Sāmānid period 233
-Khatūnī, Abū Ṭāhir 27
Khātūnkath 173
Khāwak pass 67
Khāwar-rūd 72
Khāwas 166, 169, 270
Khāwus 126
Khaydhashtar 126
Khaylām (Khayrlām) 156, 158, 163
Khaylām river 155
Khayr 79
Khayrābād 179
Khayrākhara (Khayzākhaza) 125
Khazars 238
Khazwān 126
Khiḍr-Khān (Qarā-khānid) 110, 316, 318
Khīnah (Aḥmad) 106
Khisht 167
Khiṭā Turks 320 n., 350 n., 364 n.
Khitāy 17
Khitāy-Khān 330
Khīwa 143, 144, 148, 207
Khīwa ariq 143
Khoja Baqirghan 165
Khojend 157, 164–5, 166, 171, 189, 200 206, 207, 210 n., 315, 323, 407, 419
  Siege of, by Mongols 417–18
Khokand 158, 160, 162
Khorezmia—
  Commerce of 235, 236, 237–8
  Conquest of, by Arabs 1, 181 n., 185
    by Mahmūd of Ghazna 275–9
    by Mongols 416, 426, 433–7
    by Saljūqids 304
  Culture of, under Khwārazm-shāh 428–9
  Defence of, by flooding 154, 325, 337 339, 349
  Description of 142–55
  Historical works relating to 17, 20 30–6, 39
  Invasions of, by Ghūrids 349–51
    by Qarā-Khitāys 327, 336–7, 339 345
  Isolation of 154, 296
  (General references), 195, 200, 213 218, 222, 233–4, 246, 249, 269, 296–8 302, 305, 314, 317, 323–80 *passim* 393–400, 428–32, 456–7; *see also* Khwārazm-shāhs
Khorezmian coinage 204–6
Khorezmians, commercial and intellectua pre-eminence of 238
Khotan 273, 281, 357, 368
Khotanese music 273
Khudābād 126
Khudaynkath 170
Khudaysar rabāt 167
Khudfirān 126
Khudhānd 126
Khudīmankan 98
Khudīsar 126
Khujāda 117
Khujanda 164; *see also* Khojend
-Khujandī 52
Khulm 67, 68
Khumār-tagīn 433, 434
Khumār-Tāsh Sharābī 278–9
Khumīthan 126
Khumkhīsara 126
Khumrak 174
Khunāmata 126
Khunbūn 115 n., 117
Khunuk-Khudāt 115
Khūqand 158; *see also* Khokand
Khurāsān *passim*
  Aristocracy in 307–8
  Divisions of (pre-Islamic) 183 n.

Establishment of Tāhirids in 208
of Saffārids in 217–18, 219
of Saljūqids in 297–8, 299, 302–4
Importance of, in early 'Abbāsid period 197–8
Invasions of, by Qarā-Khānids 272–3, 280, 289, 290
by Qarā-Khitāys 339, 344, 350–1
Operations of Khwārazm-shāhs and Ghūrids in 338, 339, 340, 342, 346, 349, 351, 352–3
Operations of Mongols in 419–26, 437–9, 446–9, 456, 457
Plundered by Ghuzz Turks 329
Ibn Khurdādhbih 7, 12, 13
Khūrlūgh 176 n.
Khurmīthan 114, 126
-Khurramābādī (poet) 406 n.
Khurshāb (town and river) 159, 160
Khushāghar 126
Khushk-rūd 134
Khushminjakath 140
Khushmīthan *see* Ardakhushmīthan
Khushtuwān 201 n.
Khushūfaghn 126, 165
Khushūnanjakath 140
Khushurtā 127
Khusraw b. 'Ābid *see* Ibn Mu'īn
-Khutabī (historian) 8
Khuttal 69, 71, 72, 184, 189, 194, 196, 200, 233, 234, 236, 248, 263, 278, 281 n., 285, 295, 297, 299, 301, 313, 334
Khuttalān 69
khutuww 272 n.
Khuwāra 178
Khuzānd 127
Khuzār (Guzār) 135, 427
Khuzār-rūd 134, 135
Khūzistān 348
Khūzyān 140
Khwājah 'Abdī Bīrūn 88
Khwājah 'Abdī Darūn 88
Khwājah-i 'amid (title) 230
Khwājah-i buzurg (title) 229
Khwāndamīr 56, 57
Khwārazm *see* Kāth, Khorezmia
-Khwārazmī, Maḥmūd b. Muḥ. b. Arslān 32
Khwārazm-shāh, title of 147
Khwārazm-shāhs 185, 219, 233–4, 261, 263, 270, 275–9, 294–9, 305, 323–80
Historical works relating to, 30–6, 39, 40, 49, 58
Struggle with 'Abbāsid Caliphs 346–8, 373–5
Struggle with Ghūrids 338–9, 349–53, 360
See also Muḥammad (Khwārazm-shāh)
Kīmāk Turks 177, 178, 369 n.
Kin dynasty 381, 383, 394
Kirghiz Turks 369–71, 392 n., 459
Kirmān 217, 219
Kish (Kishsh) 16, 134–5, 185, 189, 196, 199, 200, 206, 210 n., 261, 263, 336, 427, 452, 453
Pass of, on road to Samarqand 133 137–8
Province of 111, 135–42
Kīsh (island) 395
Kitāb al-Qunīy 213
Kok-jar 74
Kok-serāi palace 412
Komēdi (tribe) 70
Kong-Khotan tribe 416
Kubindā-Mā'qal 140
Kubrā *see* Najm ad-Dīn
Kūch-bughā-Khān 426
Kūchluk 356–9, 361–3, 366–70, 375 n., 393, 395, 400–3, 406 n.
Kuch-tagīn 366 n.
Kudatku-bilik 312, 323 n.
Kufin 127
Kugart Pass 156
Kūhak 86
Kūhak river 82 n.; *see also* Zarafshān
Kūh-i sīm 172, 174
Kūh-i durūghān *see* 'Alī Durūghī
Kūjāgh 151
Kūk, Kūkshībaghan 99
Kūkar (?) 312 n.
Kulāb 419
Kulāb-darya 68, 69
Kul-i Maghāk (Kuli-Magiyan) 452
Kulja, district of 353, 368, 401, 402, 450
Kum river 70
Kumādh province 70
Kumgānān 74
Kumījis 70, 248, 297, 298, 301
Kum-Kurgan 74
Kum-rūd 72
Kund, Kunda 127
Kunddiram 79
Kundīkath 127
Kungrad 151
Kunya-Urgench 146, 148, 457
Kurān *see* Karrān
Kurdar 146, 150 n., 151
Kurdar canal 146, 150, 152
Kurdistan, Kurds 375
Kurgan-tube 69
Kurkath (Kurdkath) 166
Kurkuz 389
Kūrsūl 191, 192
Kurt kings 57 n., 414
Kushānīya 95, 96
Kushān-shāh 96
Kushans 96, 108, 183
-Kūshī 18
Kushk-i Mughān 108
Kushna ariq 105, 116
Kushtagīn-Pahlawān 448–9
Kūtān 41 n.

Lāchīn-beg (Qarluq) 333
Lāmish 159
Lapis-lazuli mines 66
Lārjān 430
Lāwakand *see* Lēwkand
Layth b Naṣr b. Sayyār 200, 201
Layth (ancestor of Ṣaffārids) 216 n.
Lēwkand 69
Liao (Western) *see* Qarā-Khiṭāys
Li-ta-chi 45
Luristān 422

Abu'l-Ma'ālī *see* -Baghdādī, Ḥasan-tagīn, *and* Muh. b 'Ubaydallāh
Mābā-Yalavāch 444
Ma'bid al-Khayl 101
Ma'bid gate (Bukhārā) 101, 108
Macha 168
-Madā'inī (historian) 5, 6, 14
Madar 68
Madder 71
Madhmīnīya (Madhkamīnīya) 151, 152
Madhyāmjakath 98, 127
Madhyānkan 128
madīna 78
Madrā 144
Madrā-kāth (Madrāmīthan) 144 n.
Madwa 157, 159
Magians *see* Fire-worshippers
Māh-Āfarīd 194
Mahdī rabāt 154
Mahdīya 217 n.
Mahmūd of Ghazna (Yamīn ad-Dawla) 19, 62, 79, 159 n., 258 n., 262, 263, 265, 269–93, 296, 300, 305, 306
Administration of 286–93
Campaigns in Transoxania 280–1, 282–5
Reign of 265–6, 271–86
Seizure of Khorezmia 275–9
Mahmūd (Khorezmian) 396–7; *see also* Mahmud Yalavāch
Mahmūd-bāy 357, 358, 359, 361
Mahmūd -'Imādī 24
Mahmūd -Kāshgharī 36 n., 317 n., 450 n.
Mahmūd -Khan (Rukn ad-Dīn) 322, 323, 326, 330–2, 335
Mahmūd-tagīn (Mahmūd-Khān) 318
Mahmūd -Warrāq 21, 22
Mahmūd Yalavāch 396 n., 444
Mājan 167
Mājandān 127
Mājarm 127
Majbas, Majbast (Majubs, Majubsat) 127
Majd ad-Dīn Mas'ūd b. Ṣāliḥ -Farāwī 379, 410
Majd ad-Dīn, Shaykh *see* -Baghdādī, 'Adnān
Mālh 103, 107
Mākh-rūz 107
-Makīn 2, 6
Makrān 217, 304
Maksūn (?) 45
Ibn Mākūlā 10 n
Malik steppe 248 n.
Malik-A'ẓam *see* A'ẓam-malik
Malik-Khān *see* Amīn al-Mulk
Malik-Shāh (Saljūqid) 305, 308, 310, 322, 323, 360
Invasion of Transoxania 110, 310, 316–17
Malik-Shāh b. Takash 340, 342, 346, 3
Malik-Shāh (ruler of Wakhsh) 372
Malik-Shīr 440
-Ma'mūn (Caliph) 177, 201, 202, 207–12, 228, 237
-Ma'mūn b. -Ma'mūn (Khwārazm-shāh) 147 n., 275–8
-Ma'mūn b. Mūhammad (Khwārazm-shāh), 147, 262, 263, 269, 275
-Ma'mūnī 258
Manchus 381
Mandajān (prov.) 72 n.
Mangishlāq *see* Manqishlāgh
Mangit 150
Manichaeans 387–9; *see also* Dualists
Māṇk 168
Mankath (Bukhārā) 127
Mankath (Isfījāb) 176 n.
Manqishlāgh 324, 325, 330, 331, 432
Mansūr b 'Abdallāh 198
Mansūr b. Ahmad (Sāmānid) 242
Mansūr b. Bāyqarā (ḥājib) 250
Mansūr b Iṣḥāq (Sāmānid) 241
Mansūr I b. Nūh I (Sāmānid) 109, 110, 111, 249, 250 n., 251–2, 261
Manṣūr II b. Nūh II (Sāmānid) 264–6
Mansūr b. Qarā-tagīn 176, 228, 248–9, 251
Mansūr b. Ṭalha (Ṭāhirid) 213
Abū Manṣūr -Chaghānī 243, 249
Abū Manṣūr Muh. b. 'Abdar-Razzāq 250–1
Abū Manṣūr *see* -Māturīdī, Muḥ. b. Ḥusayn, Mūh. b. 'Uzayr, Yūsuf b. Ishāq
Mansūr-kūh 439 n.
-Maqdisī (geographer) 11, 12, 249, 252 n.
-Maqrīzī, Taqī ad-Dīn 42
Maracanda 97 n.
Maṛāgha 448
Marco Polo 65, 66 n.
Mardāwīj (Ziyārid) 225 n
Mardkushān Gate (Akhsīkath) 161
Mardkushān (Mardqusha) Gate (Bukhārā) 102
Mardūs 142
Marghbūn 127
Marghibān 140
Marghīnān (Margelan) 158, 161, 163, 315
Margiana 76
Marquart, J. 4 n , 7 n., 73 n., 292 n., 320 n.
Marsmanda 168
Marw *see* Merv
Marwarrūd 79, 80, 198, 199, 218, 253, 351, 449

-Marwarrūdī *see* Fakhr ad-Dīn
-Marwazī, Sharaf az-Zamān 286 n.
-Marwazī *see* Ḥafṣ b. Manṣūr, Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī
Marzbān (district) 92, 94, 95
Marzbān b. Turgash 95
Masāsān 153
Mash rabāṭ (Māsha) 149, 150, 298
Masjid 119
Masjid ash-Shām (Bukhārā) 110
Maskhā (Maschā) 82, 168
Māstī, Māstīn 117
Masʿūd b. Mahmūd (Ghaznevid) 23, 271, 280, 282, 284, 290 n., 292, 293–303, 305, 306, 326 n., 338.
Masʿūd (Saljūqid) 27, 30, 327 n., 332
Masʿūd *see* Fakhr ad-Dīn, Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān
-Masʿūdī 4, 5, 6
Masʿūd-Khān (Qarā-Khānid) 318
Masus (Maswas) 319 n.
Māturīd 90
-Māturīdī, Abū Manṣūr 90 n., 267 n.
Mawdūd (Ghaznevid) 20, 294, 303–4
Mayāchuk (general) 348
Maymana 80 n., 444
-Maymandī, Abuʾl-Qāsim Ahmad b. Ḥasan (wazīr) 275, 277, 278, 282, 291, 292
Māymurgh (Nasaf) 105, 135, 137, 427
Māynwrgh (Samarqand) 6, 92, 93
Māzandarān 335, 357, 379, 425, 430, 431, 457
Mazārshāh *see* Qutham b. ʿAbbās
Mazār-i Sharīf 79
Mazdākhīn *see* Muzākhīn
Maznawā 128
Mazrankan 127
Mazrīn 128
Mecca 354, 374
Me-chʿue (Khān) 187
Mēla ford 72, 297
Melioransky, P. 286 n.
Meng-Hung 37, 38, 382, 459, 460
Mergīts (tribe) 361–2, 370–2, 392, 393, 415
Meruchak 79
Merv 6 n., 76, 78, 79, 80, 185, 252, 260, 270, 285, 297, 319, 320, 321, 327, 328, 329, 335, 339, 342, 346, 349. 375, 416, 429
Capture of, and destruction by Mongols 446–9, 454
Midhyāmajkath 127
Mīgh 127
Mighān 127
Mijdūn 128
Mikāʾīl b. Jaʿfar 241 n.
Abū Mikhnaf 5
Mīlah *see* Mēla
Mināra 163
Mīnk 168
Minūchihrī 24, 300 n.
Mīrkhwānd 57–8
Mīrkī 256
Miskān 161, 164
[Ibn] Miskawayh 32
Misnān 140
Miyānkal 127
Miyānkāl 137
Miyān-Kish 135
Miyān-rūdān (district) 155, 156, 163
Miyān-shāh rabāṭ 154
Mīz 128
Mīzdākhqān 149, 150, 151
Mīzdākhqān district 146, 149 n.
Mobāliq 443
Monas arıq 83
Mongolia 381–2, 384, 394, 395, 450, 456, 458
Mongolian chronicle 43, 44, 45, 381, 382, 423, 426
language 50, 461
Mongols—
Army of 383–6, 403–4, 419
Campaign against Kūchluk 400–3
Heroic epos of 42–4, 52
Historical works relating to (Oriental) 37–58, 459
Historical works relating to (European) 59–63, 459
Operations in Afghanistan 440–5, 454–5 in Khurāsān 419–26, 437–9, 446–9 in Sind 445–6, 449 n., 453
Pursuit of Muḥammad Khwārazm-shāh 419–26
Relations of, to Chinese, 381–2, 393–4 to Muslims 54, 92, 402, 413, 431, 451, 458
Skirmish with Muḥammad in Qipchāq 369–72
(General references) 229, 312, 348, 365, 381–462 *passim*; *see also* Chingiz-Khān
Muʿādh b. Yaʿqūb 142
Muʿāwiya (Caliph) 77, 228
Muʿayyid ad-Dawla Ay-Aba 335, 337, 338 n.
Muʿayyid ad-Dīn (wazīr) 347–8
-*mubayyiḍa* see *sapid-yāmagān*
Mūdā 140
Mudhyānkan 128
Mudhyānkath 128
Mufaḍḍal b. Muhallab 184
Mugh 163
Mughān 426
Mughkada gate 156
Mughkada-i Panjıkath 82 n.
Mughkān 113, 117, 121
Mughūl-hājib *see* Īnānch-Khān
Muhadhdhib an-Dīn -Bāstabādī 448
Muhallab b. Abī Sufra 138
Muhammad (Prophet) 91, 199
Traditions ascribed to 13, 14, 16

Muḥammad (Khwārazm-shāh) 343, 346, 348, 437, 439, 450
Administration of 377–80
Buildings of 100, 103, 366
Campaigns against Kūchluk 367–9
against Qarā-Khiṭāys 159, 355–60, 363–7, 393
against Qipchāqs 369–71
Collision with Mongols in Qipchāq 369–72
Conquests in Afghanistan and Persia 352–3, 360, 372–3
in Transoxania 360, 363, 365–6
Death of 426
Embassies to and from Chingiz-Khān 393, 394, 396–7, 399
Flight from the Mongols 419–27, 435
Omitted in Mongolian chronicle 426–7
Reign of 349–80, 393–426
Relations with military party 377, 380, 405–6, 407, 428
with priesthood, 373–7, 379, 380, 407
Struggle with Caliph 373–5
Withdrawal from Syr-Darya provinces 369, 402 n.
from Transoxania 404–6
Muhammad b 'Abdallāh (Ṭāhirid) 214
Muhammad b. 'Adnān (Majd ad-Dīn) 17, 18
Muhammad b. Ahmad ('Alid) 242
Muhammad b. Ahmad -Nakhshabī (-Nasafī) 243–4, 245
Muhammad b. Aḥmad b. Farīghūn 254
Muhammad b. 'Alī b. Ma'mūn (Khwārazm-shāh) 277, 279
Muhammad b. 'Alī *see* Arslān-Khān, -'Imādī, -Shabāngarāī
Muḥammad b. Anūsh-tagīn 324.
Muḥammad b. Asad (Sāmānid) 241, 241 n.
Muhammad Bāqir 160
Muhammad b. Bāshār 221 n., 225
Muhammad b. Dahda 205, 207
Muḥammad Ḥaydar 66 n.
Muhammad b. Hilāl 8
Muhammad b. Ḥusayn (Abū Ishāq, ra'īs) 288
Muhammad b. Ḥusayn b. Mut 241
Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn b. Mut (Abū Manṣūr) 264
Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm (Abū Ḥāmid) 30 n.
Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm -A'rābī (-Ṭā'ī) 278
Muhammad b. Jarīr 160
Muhammad b. Karrām (Abū 'Abdallāh) 289–90
Muḥammad b. Kharnāk 345 n.
Muḥammad b. Layth 225 n.
Muḥammad b. Luqmān (Sāmānid) 87
Muḥammad -Maghribī 25
Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd (Ghaznevid) 20, 284, 293, 295, 303
Muḥammad -Maraghanī 455
Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd -Harawī (Niẓām al-Mulk) 378
Muḥammad b. Najīb Bakrān 36
Muḥammad b. Naṣr (Abū Ja'far, Sāmānid) 247–8
Muhammad b. 'Omar (Ṣadr of Bukhārā) 334, 354
Muhammad b. Qarā-Qāsim -Nasawī 367
Muḥammad Pahlawān-jahān (of 'Iraq) 341, 346–7
Muḥammad b. Qāsim 185
Muḥammad Rahīm Khān 75 n.
Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ (Niẓām al-Mulk, wazīr), 378–80, 410, 431
Muhammad -Sulamī (al-ḥākim ash-shahīd) 246–7
Muḥammad b Sulaymān (Abu'l-Ḥusayn) 11 n.
Muhammad b. Sulaymān (Muḥammad-tagīn) *see* Arslān-Khān
Muhammad b. Ṭāhir 95, 99, 212, 214, 217–9
Muhammad b. 'Ubaydallāh (Abū Ma'alī) 26
Muhammad b. 'Uzayr (wazīr) 249, 253
Muhammad b. Yahyā ('Alid) 242
Muhammad b. Yūsuf -Khwārizmī 9 n.
Muhammad b. Zufar 14, 354
Abū Muhammad (Bukhār-Khudāt) 223
muhammadī dirhams 205–6
Muhammad-tagīn *see* Arslān-khān Muḥ. b Sulaymān
Mūhinān 172
Muhra gate (Bukhārā) 101
Muhtājid dynasty (Āl-Muhtāj) 234, 254
Muhtariqa 138
Muḥtasib, office of 231
Ibn Mu'īn (Khusraw b. 'Ābid -Abarkūhī) 54–5
Mu'īn al-fuqarā *see* Ahmad b. Muhammad
Mu'izz ad-Dīn (Ghūrid) *see* Shihāb ad-Dīn
Mujāshi' b. Ḥurayth 198
Mujduwān 140
Mujīr ad-Dīn 'Omar b Sa'd 373
Mujīr al-Mulk Sharaf ad-Dīn -Muẓaffar 447
Mujmil at-Tawārīkh 26–7
Muller, A. 22, 62–3, 287, 288, 289, 305, 405
Multān, 272, 446
Munhī see *Ṣāḥib-barīd*
Munk 69
-Muntaṣir Isma'īl (Sāmānid) 119, 269–70, 272
-Muqaddasī *see* Maqdisī (11 n.)
-Muqanna' 15, 134, 199–200
Muqātil b. Sulaymān 107
Muqtafī II (Caliph) 332
Muqulī 386, 404

Murghāb river 79, 80, 233, 448
Murzīn 128
Mūsā b. 'Abdallāh b. Khāzim 183, 184
Mūsā b. Satūq 257 n.
Mus'ab b. Rāziq 208
-Muṣ'abī (Abu'ṭ-Ṭayyib Muḥ. b. Ḥātim, amīd) 245
-Musawī, Muḥammad b. Faḍlallāh 56
Musayyab b. Zuhayr 200, 201 n., 203, 205, 207
musayyabī dirhams 205–6
Mushrif, office of 231, 377–8
Musk 237
Muslim b. Sa'īd (governor) 189
Abū Muslim 84, 85, 102, 193–9, 208, 212, 217 n.
Party of 197–200
-Mustaghfirī (historian) 15, 16
-Mustansir (Fāṭimid Caliph) 304
mustawfī, office of 229–30, 243 n., 377
Mut 241 n., 264
-Mu'tadid (Caliph) 219
-Mu'tamid (Caliph) 95, 210, 217
-Mu'tasim (Caliph) 95, 208, 212
-Mu'tazz (Caliph) 217
Mūtugen (grandson of Chingiz-Khān) 443
-Muwaffaq 217, 218
Muwān 140
-Muzaffar *see* Mujīr al-Mulk
Muzaffar-malik 441, 443
Abu'l-Muzaffar *see*-Barghashī, Muhammad b. Luqmān, Nasr b. Sabuktagīn, Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān, Ṭamghāch-Bughrā-Khān
Abū Muzāhim *see* Suba' b. an-Naḍr *and* Sulu
Muzākhīn aniq 89
Muzn 123, 128
Muznawā (Muznuwā) 128

Nābādghīn 143
-Nadīm 4; *see also* Fihrist
Nāfakhs 128
Nahl 128
Nāimāns (tribe) 356, 361, 382 n., 384, 386–7, 393, 402, 403
Najākath 169
Najjār-Khitfar 114, 116
Najm 163
Najm ad-Dīn Kubrā 51 n., 376, 436
Najm al-Mulk Lawḥī 330
Nakabūn 128
Nakālik 174
Nakhshab 136, 319, 336, 449; *see also* Nasaf
-Nakhshabī *see* Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
Namad-push *see* Ḥasan b. Yūsuf
Namangan 156
Namik (Nāmiq) 82
Namūdhligh 174
Naqabūn 128
Naqād 160, 161, 164
Naqshband (Bahā ad-Dīn) 129, 137 n.
Narpay 97 n.; *and see* Fayy
Narshakh (Narjaq) 120, 128, 199
-Narshakhī (historian) 14
Nasā 153 n., 154, 238, 245 n., 261, 270, 277, 308, 330, 335, 340, 364, 424, 429, 437, 449
Nasaf 16, 102, 105, 136–42, 185, 189, 199, 200, 203, 210 n., 243, 247, 262, 263, 427, 449, 454; *see also* Nakhshab
-Nasafī (Abū Ḥafṣ 'Omar b. Muḥ.) 15
-Nasafī *see* Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
-Nasawī (historian) 38–9, 429
-Nāṣir (Caliph) 346, 351, 373–5, 400
Nāṣir ad-Dīn *see* Muḥ. b. Ṣālih, Ibn al-Bībī, -Samarqandī (Abu'l-Qāsim), -Ṭūsī
Nāṣir al-Ḥaqq (Qarā-Khānid) 274; *and see* Naṣr b. 'Alī
-Nāṣir-Utrush *see* Ḥasan b 'Alī
Nāsir-Kūh 439 n; *and see* Nuṣrat-Kūh
Naṣr b. 'Abd al-Malik (Sāmānid) 250
Naṣr I b. Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 164, 210, 222–3, 228, 241
Naṣr II b. Aḥmad (Sāmānid) 10, 12, 25, 87, 109, 110, 112, 176, 240–6
Naṣr b. Aḥmad *see* Abū Manṣūr-Chaghānī
Nasr b. Alī (Arslān-Īlak) 257 n., 258, 264, 267–8, 270, 272, 274, 282, 285, 300, 311
Naṣr b. Arslān-Khān Muḥammad 320
Nasr b Ishāq (Abu'l-Ḥasan) 240
Nasr b Nūh (Sāmānid) 249, 256
Naṣr b Sabuktagīn 266, 269, 273, 299
Naṣr b. Sayyār 5, 192–4, 200, 201
Naṣr *see* Shams al-Mulk
Naṣr al-Milla (Qarā-Khānid) 274 n.
Abū Nasi Mishkān 23, 288–9
Abu'n-Naṣr-Sāmānī 256 n.
Abū Naṣr *see* Aḥmad b. Muḥ., -Fārābī, -Kāsānī, -Qubāwī, Manṣūr b. Bāyqarā, -'Utbī
Naṣrābād 163, 164
Naṣrat ad-Dīn Hazārasp 422
Nasyā, Lower 158
Nasyā, Upper 158, 163
Nawa 128
Nawbahār (Balkh) 77, 102 n.
Nawbahār gate (Bukhārā) 102
Nawbahār gate (Samarqand) 85, 86
Nawfar 128
Nawīda 81
Nawjābādh 128
Nawkadak 128
Nawkanda aniqs 105, 115
Nawkhas 128
Nawqad in village names 136 n.
Nawqād-Miskān 164; *see also* Naqād
Nawqad-Quraysh 135, 136
[illegible] he Agriculturists' 116

Nawzābād 128
Naya 386
Naydūn *see* Bīdūn
Nestorians 94, 170, 180, 375 n., 387–90; *see also* Christians.
Nihām province 72 n.
Ṇihām-rūd 72
Nīlāb 446
Nīshāpūr (Naysābūr) 145 n., 219, 229, 241, 242, 255, 261, 262, 266, 272, 287, 289–90, 327, 335, 346, 359, 361, 375, 379, 420 n., 421, 423, 424, 437, 438
  Destruction by Ghuzz 27, 329
  by Mongols 447
  Historical works relating to 16
-Nīshāpūrī (Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Abdar-Raḥmān) 15
-Nīshāpūrī (Zahīr ad-Dīn) 30
Niyāza 140
Niyazbek 143
Nizām ad-Dīn *see* -Shāmī
Niẓām al-Mulk *see* Muḥ. b. Mas'ūd, Muḥ. b. Sālih
Niẓām al-Mulk (Abū 'Alī Ḥasan b. 'Alī -Ṭūsī, wazīr) 25, 216 n., 227–31, 238, 239, 241, 243 n., 244, 250 n., 251 n., 271 n., 286, 287, 291, 306–10, 315, 360
Niẓāmī -'Arūḍī -Samarqandī 316
Niẓāmī, Sadr ad-Dīn (historian) 352 n.
Novgorod annals 430 n.
Nū- *see also* Naw-
Nūbagh (Khorezmia) 149
Nūbāgh al-Amīr (Bukhārā) 115
Nūdiz 71
Nūghkath 174 n
Nūh b. Asad (Sāmānid) 206, 209–11, 256
Nūḥ b. Manṣūr (Sāmānid) 9, 252–4, 258–64
Nūḥ b. Naṣr (Sāmānid) 10, 14, 108, 109, 243–4, 246–9, 259
Nujānīkath 128
Nūjkath (Shāsh) 174
Nūjkath (Ushrūsana) 166 n., 167
Nūkand 128
Nūkath 174
Nūkbāgh (Nūkfāgh) 149, 150
Nūkhās (Khorezmia) 153, 378
Nukkath 174
Nu'mān, hillock of 439
Abū Nu'mān 85
-Numayrī (Abū Zayd 'Omar b. Shabba) 5
Nūr 114, 119, 257, 270, 408
Nūsār 77
Nūshā-Basqāq 427, 448
Nūshākir (Nūshākird) rabāṭ 155
Nūshtagīn 301 n.
Nuṣrat ad-Dīn Ḥamza b. Muḥammad 449
Nuṣrat-Kūh 439, 440
Nūzkāt 149
Nūzwār 148, 155

Obburdan 168
Obi-garm 71
Oghuz Turks 201, 254, 256–7; *see also* Ghuzz
Oghuz-Khān 461
Oghul-beg (atābeg) 332
Oghūl-ḥājib *see* Īnānch-Khān
Oghulmish 374
d'Ohsson, Baron C. 40, 59, 60
Oirats (tribe) 392, 392 n.
'Omān 373
'Omar ('Omayr), Castle of 200
'Omar II (Caliph) 188, 190
'Omar b. Mas'ūd (sadr) 354 n.
'Omar b. Sa'd *see* Mujīr ad-Dīn
'Omar b. Shabba *see* -Numayrī
'Omar *see* Ḥusām ad-Dīn, Tāj ad-Dīn
'Omar -Khwājah -Utrārī 397
Onguts 414 n., 415
Oppert 58
Ordū (Turkish town) 234
Ordū b. Jūchī 392
Orkhon inscriptions 461
Ormuz 395
Orna 437 n.
'Othmān (Caliph) 6, 77, 160, 185 n.
'Othmān b. Ibrāhīm (ruler of Samarqand) 350–1, 353, 355–6, 358, 360, 363, 364–6, 431
'Othmān b. Mas'ūd 75, 184
Otrār *see* Utrār
Ōzār 368

Padyāna 140
Pahlawān of 'Irāq *see* Muḥ. Pahlawān-Jahān
Palghar 168
Palladius (archimandrite) 43 n.
Pāmir province 70
Panj, Panj-rūdak 129
Panj river *see* Jaryāb
Panjāb (in Oxus basin) 72, 420; *and see* Mēla
Panjdīh (Khurāsān) 449
Panjikath *see* Būnjikath
Panjkhīn 90
Panjshīr 67, 441 n., 442, 444 n.
Pāp *see* Bāb
Paper (of Samarqand) 236–7
Parak river 163, 169, 174 n.; *see also* Chirchik
Parchin *see* Bārchinlighkant
Parghar *see* Burghar
Parghār (Parkhār) 69
Parghār river 68, 69, 168
Parkent 175
Parwān 67, 68, 441–2, 444
Pashāwar 351 n., 439, 440, 445, 453
Payghū (Yabghū?) 269, 308
Payghū-Khān (Qarluq) 333
Paykān 114

Paykand 104, 105, 114, 117–18, 120, 181, 223
Paykand, New 119 n.
Payy *see* Fayy
Pechenegs 238
Peking 393–4
Persia, Early literature of 1
Persian language 1, 291
  National and religious movements 194 ff., 291
Pīrī (amīr) 261
Plano Carpini 179 n., 386 n., 388, 392, 421, 423, 437 n.
Poslavsky, I. T. 75
Prester John 58
Priesthood ('Ulamā):—
  Attitude of nomads towards 267
  Opposition to bureaucracy 17, 19
  Relations between, and Ghaznevids 289–90
  Relations between, and Khwārazm-shāhs 349, 373–7, 379, 380, 407
  Relations between, and Mongols 413 and Qarā-Khānids 310–11, 313, 316–18, 320
  Relations between, and Sāmānids 17, 232, 240, 243–4, 258, 264 n., 267
Priesthood (non-Muslim) 1, 180–1, 388–9
Pronunciation of place-names 120 n.
Ptolemy (geographer) 69 n., 70, 159
Pūlād-chink-sank 45
Pumpelly 119 n.
Pūr-tagīn (Būrī-tagīn) 300 n

Qabāy-Ilchi 449
Qāchār-bāshī *see* Quchqār-bāshī
Qāchūlī 53
Qadan-noyon 433
qāḍī, office of 232
-Qādī (historian) 17
-Qādir (Caliph) 266, 271, 272, 275, 281, 286
Qadir-Khān Aḥmad b. Arslān-Khān Muḥ. 320
Qadir-Khān Jibrā'īl 318–19
Qadir-Khān Yūsuf 273, 275, 280–6, 294–5, 315
Qadir-Khān ibn Thaqaftān (Yimek) 369 n.
Qadir-Khān ibn Yūsuf (? Tatar) 356, 369
Qadir-Khān *see* Jalāl ad-Dīn *and* Qāyir-Khān
-Qā'im (Fāṭimid Caliph) 243
Qal'a-i Dabūs (Ziyā ad-Dīn) 97
Ibn al-Qalānisī 281 n.
Qalās steppe 172, 173, 175
Qalāsī 140
Qandahār 438
Qandīya 15, 91 n.
Qanghlī 370, 415
Qara-bagh 136
Qarāchūn 137
Qara-darya 155, 157, 160, 164
Qarāja (ḥājib) 412
Qarāja-noyon 448–9
Qarā-Khān 17, 274 n.
Qarā-Khānids:—
  Chronology of 268, 274
  Conquest of Transoxania 267–8
  Conversion to Islām 254–5
  Invasions of Khurāsān 272–3, 280, 289, 290
  Invasions of Transoxania 234, 257–60, 263–4, 282, 318–19
  Literature under 17–18
  Organization (civil) of 268, 305
  Relations with 'Ulamā 310–11, 313, 316–18, 320
  Vassals of Muḥammad Khwārazm-shāh 355–6, 358, 360
  (General references) 8, 24, 36, 37, 60 n., 88, 111, 254–5, 257 n., 262, 264, 269–86, 293–306, 307, 310–26, 328, 330–6, 353–4, 355–6, 358, 360, 364–6
Qarā-Khāqān 254 n., 274 n
Qarā-Khiṭāys:—
  Auxiliaries with Chingiz-Khān 391, 415 n.
  Defeat of Sultan Sinjar by 326
  Invasions of Khorezmia and Khurāsān 327, 336–7, 339, 344, 345, 350–1
  Occupation of Transoxania 326
  Struggle with Muhammad Khwārazm shāh 159, 355–60, 363–7, 393
  Treasury of, at Uzgand 157
  Uncertainty of historical data relating to 30
  (General references) 17, 37, 58, 320 n., 323, 326–7, 333, 335–7, 339, 344–5, 350–67, 393, 395, 402, 420, 451
Qarā-khoja (village) 362
Qarā-kūl 118, 333, 455
Qarāqorum (Qarāqūm) (Qipchāq) 415, 416
Qarā-ṣū 349, 350 n.
Qaratagh-darya 72
Qarātagīn (governor of Balkh) 176, 228
Qarātagīn rabāṭ 176
Qarātagīn province *see* Karategin
Qarāunās canal 83
Qarluq Turks 70, 177, 200, 201, 202, 224 n., 254, 321, 326, 333–4, 336, 362, 363, 411, 441, 442
qarmat 243
Qarna 138
Qarnīn 216
Qarshī 83, 134, 136, 427; *see also* Nasaf
Qārūn (fortress) 422, 425
-Qaryat -kabīra 118 n.
Abu'l-Qāsim (of Saghāniyān) 298, 299
Abu'l-Qāsim Kathīr 292
Abu'l-Qāsim *see* -Barmakī, -Ḥusayrī, -Maymandī, -Samarqandī, -Sīmjūrī, Maḥmūd of Ghazna

Qātlish 138
Qaṭwān 129
Qaṭwān steppe, 127 n., 129 n., 165, 264, 326, 327, 333
Qaṭwān-dīza 165
Qayā-Khān 286
Qayālīgh 362 n., 403
Qāydū 58
Qāyin 438
Qāyır-Khān *see* Īnālchık
Qāyır-Tūqū-Khān 343
Qaylī rıver 372
Qazwīn 422, 425, 426
-Qazwīnī, Ḥamdallāh 17, 30, 49–51, 54, 311
-Qazwīnī, Zakarīyā b. Muḥammad 36
-Qazwīnī, Zayn ad-Dīn 50
Qıbāb 90
-Qıfıī, 'Alī b. Yūsuf 30
Qılıch-Ṭamghāch-Khān Abu'l-Ma'ālī Ḥasan b. 'Alī *see* Ḥasan-tagīn
Qılıch-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd 18, 103, 334, 336, 353, 354
Qīmach rıver 372
Qıpchāq Turks and dıstrıct 45, 179, 296, 320, 328, 330, 340, 341–3, 349, 356, 357, 358, 361, 363, 369–71, 395, 415, 455, 458
Qobuq 362 n., 393
Quatremère, E. 44 n., 61 n.
Qubā 157, 159, 161–3
-Qubāwī (Abū Nasr Aḥmad b. Muḥ.) 14
Qūbılāy-noyon 365
Qūbılāy-Qā'ān 49
Quchqār-bāshī 260
Qudatku Bılık 312, 323 n.
Qudū-Khān 370 n.
Quhıstān 238, 252, 253, 265, 438
Quıcksılver 164
Qulān (Qulān-bāshī) plaın 455, 456, 458
Qulān (town) 202
Qūl-tughān (Mergīt) 370, 371
Qunduz 67, 420
Qurmıshī 49
Qutayba (Bukhār-Khudāt) 195
Qutayba b. Muslım 1, 5, 74, 106, 107, 108, 119, 138, 168, 181–3, 192
Campaigns in Central Asia 184–7
Tomb of 160
Ibn Qutayba 4–5
Quṭb ad-Dawla *see* Aḥmad b. 'Alī
Quṭb ad-Dīn Muḥ. b. Anūsh-tagīn 324
Quṭb ad-Dīn *see* Muhammad (Khwārazm-shāh) *and* Ūzlāgh-Shāh
Qutham b. 'Abbās 91, 92
Qutlugh-bāliq 408; *see also* Zarnūq
Qutlugh-Bılgā-beg *see* Qılıch-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd
Qutlugh-Īnānch (atābeg) 346
Qutlugh-khān 415, 432
Qutula-Qaghan 381, 382
Qutuqu-noyon *see* Shiki-Qutuqu-noyon
Quwādhiyān province 71–2, 285, 297
Quwādhıyān town 71–2, 278
Quzghund 117 n., 129

rabaḍ 78
Rabāh arıq 105, 110
Rabāt-i malik 248 n., 315
Rabāṭ-ı Sarhang 160
Rabāt-Ṭughānīn (Rabāṭāt) 179, 378
Rabinjan 97, 235, 334
Radī al-Mulk (qāḍī) 440–1
Rāḍrāḍa 90
Rāfi' b. Harthama 219
Rāfi' b. Layth 85, 91, 95 n., 200–1, 208, 209, 216 n.
Rāghın 129
Rāghsırısna 140
ra'īs, office of 234
Rakhīnawā (Rakhīnūn) 129
Rakhushmīthan 148
Rakund 129
Rāman (Rāmanī) 129
Rāmand 117
Rāmīdh rıver 71
Ramıtan (Rāmīthana) 114, 116, 117, 223
Rāmush 116
Rang (fortress) 443 n.
Ranjad 163, 164
Ra's al-Qanṭara 126
Ra's at-Ṭāq 85, 86
Ra's al-Waragh 104, 106
Rashīd ad-Dīn (hıstorıan) 17, 40, 42, 44–8, 49, 50, 52, 54, 58
Chronological ınaccuracy of 371
Rāsht 70, 71, 201, 233, 248
Rāsmāyın 135
Rastaghfar 129
Raverty 13 n., 60–1
-Rāwandī, Muh. b 'Alī 29
Rayy 218, 262 n., 346, 347, 422, 425, 431
-Rāzī *see* Fakhr ad-Dīn *and* Ḥaydar b. 'Alī
Rāzīk rabāt 138
Razīq 208
Razmānākh 129
Razmāz (Razmān) 129
Requısıtions 239, 293, 405; *see also* Confiscatıons
Reynolds 20
Rīghdamūn 129
Rīgıstān (Bukhārā) 101, 107, 108, 110, 111, 147, 229, 263
Rīgistān arıq 105
Rīkdasht 74
Rīkhshan 129
Rishtān 157–8, 163
Rīw 102, 111
Rīwartūn 129
Rīwd 129
Rīwdād 88, 93
Rīwqān 114 n.

Romans 96 n.
Rosen, Baron V. R. 8, 33, 267
Roshan 65
Ross, Sir E. D. 61–2
Rubruk 388, 389, 390, 403
-Rūdakī (poet) 129, 248 n.
Rūd-i Zar 103, 104, 115, 118 n.
Rūdh 135
Rūdhān 153
Rūdhbār 174 n.
Rūdhfaghkad 129
Rufūn 130
Rukhna gate 103
Rukhshabūdh 73 n.
Rukn ad-Dīn Ghūrshānchī 420, 422
Rukn ad-Dīn Imām-zādah 410
Rukn ad-Dīn Kurt 414
Rukn ad-Dīn *see* Maḥmūd-Khān
Rukn ad-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn *see* Qılich-Ṭamghāch-Khān Mas'ūd
Rukund 165, 166
Russia 395
Ibn Rusta 7
Rustam 208 n.
rustāq 69 n.
Rustufaghn (Rustaghfaghn) 130
-Rustufaghnī ('Alī b. Sa'īd) 130
Rutbīl (ruler of Sijistān) 216
Rūyjan 167
Ruzund 148

Sabadhmūn (Sabadhūn) 130
Sabaghduwān 133
Sābāt 165, 166, 336
Sabīra 130
Sablık Mts. 172
Sabrān *see* Sawrān
Sabuktagīn 261–5, 290, 301 n.
Sabzawār 424, 449
Sachau, E. 1 n, 20, 23, 272 n.
Banū Ṣa'd gate (Bukhārā) 101, 106, 111
Ṣa'd rabāt 165
Ṣa'dābād (Bukhārā) 111
Ṣadfar 148
-Sa'dī (poet) 395
-Sa'dī *see* Ḥasan b. 'Alī
Ṣadr-Jahān *see* 'Burhān, House of'
Ṣadr ad-Dīn-Khān (qāḍī) 410
Ṣadr ad-Dīn *see* -Ḥusaynī, -Nizāmī
Ṣadūr (Sadwar) 142 n., 143, 155
Ṣāfardız 148
Safarī 155
-Ṣaffār, Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl (imām) 320
-Ṣaffār, Ismā'īl b. Abū Naṣr (imām) 316
Ṣaffārid dynasty 31, 77, 209, 215–22, 224–6
-Ṣaffārūn 85
Ṣaffron 71
Ṣāfī (ḥājib) 270
Ṣafī'-Aqra' (wazīr) 407
Ṣafī ad-Dīn 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar 36
Ṣaghanāq 179 n.
Ṣaghāniyān (Chaghāniyān) province 72–4, 82, 135, 191, 200, 233, 234, 247, 248–9, 254, 263, 282, 285, 298, 299, 301, 313, 336, 338
Ṣaghānıyān town 72, 73, 74, 138, 139, 301
Ṣaghān-Khudāt 72, 185, 191, 234
Ṣāgharj 96, 130
Sāgharj mts. 95
Sāghdara 179, 329
Sāghir-beg 319
Ṣāḥıb-barīd (*Ṣāḥib-khabar*), office of 230–1, 306
Ṣāḥib-ḥaras, office of 228, 346, 312 n.
Ṣāḥib ash-shurat, office of 228, 230
Sahl b. Ahmad-Daghūnī 99
Abū Sahl rabāt 154
Sā'ıd (qāḍī) 290 n.
Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz 188
Sa'īd b. 'Amr 189
Sa'īd b. Mas'ūd (Ghaznevid) 297, 299
Sa'īd b. 'Othmān 91
Sa'īd, well of 137
Abū Sa'īd (Īlkhān) 46
Abū Sa'īd -Mayhanī (shaykh) 290 n., 311
Ibn Sa'īd 71 n.
Abu's-Sāj Dīwdād (Sājid) 169
Sakākath 174
Sakān 130
Sākbadyāzū 140
Sakbıyān 99, 130
Sakhar 116
Sakmatīn 119
Sal ammoniac 164, 169
Ṣalāh ad-Dīn Muḥammad -Nasā'ī 439, 440, 441
Salāt 156
Salbak-Turkān 401
Sālī-Sarāy 428
Saljūq 257 n.; *and see* Seljuk
Saljūqids:—
Character and organization of 305–10
Establishment in Khurāsān 297–8, 299, 302–4
Historical works relating to 25–30, 31
Invasions of Transoxania 313–15, 316–17, 321, 326.
Origins of 24, 256–7, 285, 293, 295, 297–300, 302.
Relation to Oghuz Turks 254
(General references) 77, 229, 313–15, 319, 332, 338, 339, 346–7, 426; *see also* Sinjar
-Sallāmī (historian) 10, 11, 21, 220, 221
Salm b. Ziyād 183, 184, 208
Salmūya (Salmawayh) 112
Salt mines 162
-Sa'lūkī, Abū Ṭayyib Sahl b. Muḥ. 272
Sām *see* Bahā ad-Dīn
Sāmān (village) 209
Sāmān-Khudāt 209
Samand 132

Sam'ānī 8, 15, 16, 34–5, 120 n.
Sāmānid dynasty 67, 83, 88, 198, 209–10, 211, 212, 215, 220, 222–68, 286, 307
  Administration of 227–33, 238–40
  Historical and other works relating to 7–17, 31
  Loss of Khurāsān to Ghaznevids 264, 266
  Origins of 209–10, 222–5
  Prosperity of Transoxania under 234 ff.
  Relations with 'Abbāsids 226, 271
  Relations with population 212–13, 225–6, 257–8, 267–8, 270
  Relations with priesthood ('ulamā) 17, 232, 240, 243–4, 258, 264 n., 267
  Relations with Turks 255–7
  Restoration of, attempted 269–70
  Revenues and Taxation of 238–40, 254n, 259
  Vassals of 233–4, 246, 248, 253–4
Samarqand :—
  Commerce of 235, 236–7
  Conquest of, by Arabs 185, 187
    by Chingiz-Khān 411–4, 419
    by Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh 365–6
  Description of 83–92
  Historical works on 15, 16
  Province of 92–5, 111, 140
  (General references) 9 n., 81, 82, 83, 95, 96, 97 n., 112, 165, 181, 185, 186, 190, 191, 195, 199, 200, 202, 203, 209, 215, 223, 239, 240, 241, 241 n., 247, 258, 264, 268, 269, 280, 282, 283, 285, 296, 304, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 333, 334, 353–4, 355–6, 358, 359, 363, 365–6, 369, 370, 375, 379, 405, 406, 407, 417, 419, 427, 430, 450–3, 455
Samarqandī ('Abd ar-Razzāq, historian) 56
Samarqandī (Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥ., historian) 15
Samarqandī (Abu'l-Qāsim, theologians) 267 n. 313
Samarqandī (Ashraf b. Muḥ., faqīh) 320
Samarqandī *see also* -Kātib and Niẓāmī
Samdūn 119
Šamghār 162
Samījan 130
Sāmjan (Hither and Further) 114, 116
Šāmjan arīq 99; *see also* Ḥarāmkām
Šāmjan lake 114, 118
Samnān 425
Sāmsīrak 174
Samtīn 109, 119
Sanbukjan 167
Sanda rabāṭ 149
Sangābād 155
Sangān-Akhsak 153
Sangbast 448
Sangbāth 130
Sangdīza 90
Sang-gardak (Inner and Outer, districts) 135
Sang-gardak (village) 74
Sang-gardak-darya 72, 74, 135, 139
Sangrasān arīq 89
Sang-tuda 69
Sānjan 141
Sanjarfaghān 92, 93
Sanjufīn 130
Sankjan 167
sapīd-jāmagān 197, 198–200
Sapīd-Māsha 106
Sarakhs 262, 266, 302, 335, 339, 340, 351, 375, 447, 448
Saraqusta 153
Sar-Chāhān 422, 425
Sardar 130
Sar-i pul 126, 127, 127 n., 411
Sārīn 167
Sarkath 141
Sārkūn 130
Šarmanjān 73, 74
Šarmanjī 73 n.
Šarsanda 167
Sary-Kamish, Lake 146, 152
Sārykūl 369, 403
Sary-su 392
Sāsānid dynasty, &c. 1, 77, 78, 183, 186, 197–8, 206, 207, 209, 221, 225 n., 232, 234
Satūq *see* Bughrā-Khān
Sāwkān 149
Sawrān 176–8, 314
Sayf ad-Dīn Aghrāq-malik 440–3, 453
Saylık mts. 172
Sayr b. 'Abdallāh (afshīn) 211
Sayrām 175, 450–1, 456
Sayyād-tagīn Khānī 279
Schefer, Ch. 14, 25–6, 29, 36, 37, 40, 50, 238 n., 317 n.
Scythians 38
Selenga river 392
Seljuk 178, 257, 269
Semiryechye 64, 157, 201, 234, 281, 317, 323, 353, 358, 363, 365, 368, 393, 395, 401–2, 450
Sengūn (Kerait) 362 n.
Sergius (Armenian) 389
-Shabāngarāī, Muh. b. 'Alī 46
Shābjan 130
Shāfi'ites 98, 143
Shaghljan 177
Shāh-'Abbās-Walī 146, 150; *see also* Kāth
Shāh-baklısh 117
Shāh-Khātūn 295
Shāh-Malik (ruler of Jand) 178, 298, 302, 303, 304
Shāh-rāh 96
Shahrikhān 160

Shahrisabz 134; *see also* Kish
shahristān 78
Shahristān (Kāth) 145
Shahristān (Khurāsān) 153 n., 330
Shahristān (Ushrūsana) 166
-Shahristānī (Muḥ.) 32, 428–9
Shahrkant 178; *see also* Yanikant
Shāh-rūd 115
Shāhrukh (Tīmūrid) 47, 48, 55, 56, 57 n.
Shāhrukhīya 169
Shāh-Zinda *see* Qutham b. 'Abbās
Shajarat al-Atrāk 56 n., 57
Shakdālīk river 138
Shākhākh 175
Shākirs 180, 183
Shakrāna Gate (Isfījāb) 175
Shalja 236
Shamākhā 152 n.
-Shāmī, Niẓām ad-Dīn 54, 62
Shamīdīza 130
Shamsābād (Bukhārā) 109, 111, 316, 318, 319
Shams ad-Dīn (shaykh) 379
Shams ad-Dīn Muḥammad (of Bāmiyān) 538
Shams al-Mulk Nasr b Ibrāhīm (Qarā-Khānid) 99, 109, 111, 248 n., 304, 314–16
Shams al-Mulk Shihāb ad-Dīn Alp -Sarakhsī 439, 440
Shamsī A'raj Bukhārī (poet) 355 n.
Shāpūr (Sāsānid prince) 113
Shāpūrkām 113
Shapurqān 79, 80, 297
Shaqīq b. Ibrāhīm -Balkhī (shaykh) 202, 389 n.
Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī -Yazdī 53–4, 55, 56, 58
Sharaf ad-Dīn (wakīl) 432
Sharafdan 130
Shargh 99, 141; *see also* Jargh
Sharghiyān 141
Sharīk b. Shaykh -Mahrī 195
Sharkhiyān bridge (Balkh) 273
Shāsh (province) 98, 162, 169–75, 178, 179 n., 195, 200–2, 209, 210, 212, 215 n., 241 n., 369
Arab invasions of 185, 187, 192
Commerce of 235–6
Shāwdān 164
Shāwdār 94, 210
Shāwghar 177, 256
Shāwkam 362
Shāwkān 130
Shāwkath (Īlāq) 175
Shāwkath (Ushrūsana) 165
Shāwkharān 141
Shaybānī 86
Shaykh-'Abbās-Walī *see* Shāh-'Abbās-Walī
Shaykh-Khān 412
Shibir 392
Shihāb ad-Dīn (Ghūrid) 338, 344, 349–52, 353
Shihāb ad-Dīn -Khīwakī 350, 376, 404, 429
Shihāb ad-Dīn -Suhrawardī 373
Shihāb ad-Dīn *see* Shams al-Mulk
Shihābī Ghazal Khujandī (poet) 360 1
Ibn Shihna 39 n.
Shi'ite activities in Central Asia 190, 193, 194–5, 197, 198, 212, 217 n., 241, 242–4, 267, 304–5
in Ṭabaristān and Daylam 213, 214
Democratic character of 212, 267
Shikān 131
Shiki-Qutuqu-noyon 391, 442–3, 449, 454
Shikistān 131
Shikit 156, 163
Shirabad 74
Shīrāz (Soghd) 94 n.
Shīrghāwshūn 131
Shīrkath 141
Shīrwān 131
Shiyā (Shiyān) 131
Shu'ayth b. Ibrāhīm (Qarā-Khānid) 314
Shughnān 65, 66, 338
Abū Shujā' (preacher) 311
Abū Shujā' Muḥ. b. Ḥusayn (historian) 32 n.
Abū Shujā' Farrukh-shāh (ruler of Khuttal) 334
Shūkhnāk (Shūkhanān) 131
Shukrallāh Zakī 18
Shūlīs 422
Shulluk 136 n.
Shūmān 74, 185
-Shūmānī (Zayn aṣ-Ṣāliḥīn Muḥ. b. 'Abdallāh) 316 n.
Shūniyān pass 302
Shurākhān 149, 150, 298
Shūrūkh 154
Shutūrkath 170–1
Shūzyān 141
Sīb 153
Sibā' b. an-Nu'mān 196
Sibāra 130
Siberia 392 n.
Sichār 119
Sifāya (Sipāya) 142
Sighnāq 179, 328, 342, 369, 414, 415
Sihūn 155; *see* Syr-Darya
Sijistān 194, 198, 208, 209, 213, 216, 219, 233, 248 n., 330–1, 333 n., 427, 438, 439
Sikijkath 99
Silver mines 65, 164, 168, 169, 171–2
Siminjān 67, 248
-Sīmjūrī, Abū 'Alī 10 n., 253–4, 257–64, 267
-Sīmjūrī, Abu'l-Ḥasan 250, 251–3
-Sīmjūrī, Abu'l-Qāsim 262 n., 265, 266

-Sīmjūrī *see also* Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr
Sīmjūrid dynasty 16, 228, 239
Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) 9, 267, 311
Sinām 135
Sinām mts. 72, 134
Sināwab ariq 83, 94
Sind 185, 217, 219; *see also* Indus river
Sīnīz (Fārs) 236 n.
Sinjar (Saljūqid) 33, 92 n., 308, 319, 320–32, 335, 363
Sinjar-malik (of Bukhārā) 355, 360
Sinjar-shāh b. Ṭughān-shāh 346
Sipah-sālār, office of 229, 243 n.
Siqnāq *see* Sighnāq.
Sīstān, Ta'rīkh-i 248 n.
Sīwanch 119
Siyāb (Siyāh Āb) 89
Siyāhgird 76
Siyāh-kūh 152
Siyām 135
Siyām mts. 134; *see also* Sinām
Siyāra (Siyāza) 131
Siyāsat-nāmah 25; *see also* Niẓām al-Mulk (Abū 'Alī)
Siyāwush 107
Slave armies (Turkish) 227, 291, 320 n.
Slaves (Slavonic) 235
Slaves (Turkish) 220, 222, 227, 228, 236, 240, 253, 261, 284
Sogdiana, Soghd 1, 93, 95, 100 n., 112, 181–2, 185, 187, 190, 199, 202, 206, 210 n., 212; *see also* Samarqand
Soghdian coinage 206–7
Sorkanshira 43 n.
Stein, Sir A. 237, 255 n
Stone bridge (over Wakhsh river) 69, 71
le Strange, G. 63 n.
Subā' b. an-Naḍr 95
Subā'ites 95
Sūbakh 135, 137, 199
Subānīkath 176
Sūbarlī (?) 337
Subāshītagīn (of Bukhārā) 101
Sūbāshītagīn (general) 269, 272–3
Subīdhghuk 131
Sūbuday-bahādur (Mongol) 370, 371, 385, 408, 420–6, 431, 458
Suburnā (Sūbarna) 153, 337 n.
Sufna 119
Sufradān (Sufrādan) 131
Sughd *see* Sogdiana
Sughd river 89
Sughdabīl 183 n.
Sughdān 131
Suketu-cherbi 416
Sūkh 157, 158, 160, 161, 164
Sūkhashīn gate 87
-Sulamī, Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥ. (wazīr) 246
Sulaymān (caliph) 186
Sulaymān (ḥājib) 270
Sulaymān (Qarā-Khānid) 316 n.; *and see* Aḥmad-Khān
Sulaymān b. 'Abdallāh (Ṭāhirid) 214
Sulaymān b. Muhammad (Saljūqid) 325
Sulaymān-shāh b. Atsiz 332
Sulaymān-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid) 318, 319
-Ṣūlī, Abū Bakr Muh. b. Yaḥyā 15 n.
-Ṣūlī, Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm 15
Sultān, title of 271
Sultān-shāh b. Īl-Arslān 337–8, 339–40, 342, 346
Su-lu (Khān of Turgesh) 187, 191, 201
Sūmnāt (India) 285
Sūnaj 141
Sunak-ata (Sunak-kurgan) 179
Sunit tribe 433
Sū-qarā 349 n.; *see* Qarā-sū
Suqnāq-tagīn 401, 403, 404
Suqrī 155
Sūrān rabāt 155
-Sūrī, Abu'l-Faḍl 293
Surkhāb river *see* Wakhsh
Ibn Surkhak (Sāmānid) 270
Surkhān river 70, 72, 73 n., 74, 75, 452
Surkhkat 131
Surmāiā 131
Surūd *see* Asrūd
Surūda 135
Sussheim, K 28 n.
Sutīfaghn 131
Sutīkan 131
Sutkand 177
Sūtkhan 131
Sutrūshana 165 n.; *and see* Ushrūsana
Sūyāb 195, 201
Sūyanj 131
Sūydak 169
Suyunch-Khān 409
Syr-Darya—
  Basin of, Survey of 155–65, 169–79
    Qarākhānid conquest of 264
  Estuary of 152, 178
    Muslim conquest of 178, 257
  Jūchī's campaign on 39, 407, 414–16
  Names of 155
  (General references) 64, 82, 83, 94, 186, 192, 201, 315, 324, 328, 329, 356, 357, 369, 375 n, 404, 407, 408, 417–18, 420, 450, 451, 455

-Tabānī, Abū Ṣādiq (imām) 300
-Tabānī, Abū Ṭāhir (Ṭālib) 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad 294
Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī 38 n., 60–61, *see also* -Jūzjānī
-Ṭabarī, Muḥ. b. Jarīr (historian) 2–3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 62
Ṭabaristān 213, 214, 218
Ṭabghāch *see* Ṭamghāch
Tabrīz 47
Tādhan 131
Tādīza 131
Tadyāna 141
Ṭafghāch *see* Ṭamghāch

Ṭafghāch-Khāṭūn 367
Ṭaghāma 132
Ṭaghīn-Khān 269
Ta-hia 66 n
Ṭāhir b. 'Abdallāh (Ṭāhirid) 212, 214, 216
Ṭāhir b. 'Alī (rabāṭ of) 81
Ṭāhir b. Faḍl (of Ṣaghānīyān) 254
Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn b. Mus'ab 10, 203, 208, 210
Ṭāhir b Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhir 217
Ṭāhir b. Layth (Ṣaffārid) 216
Abū Ṭāhir b. Ilk (faqīh) 316
Abū Ṭāhir *see* -Khāṭūnī, -Tabānī
Ṭāhirid dynasty 31, 78, 198, 207–11, 212–22, 224, 226
Ṭāhirīya, 142, 155
Ṭāir-bahādur 408
Tā'ir-ṣu river 69; *and see* Andījārāgh
taishi 391, 451
Tāj ad-Dīn Bilgā-Khān (of Utrār) 364
Tāj ad-Dīn 'Omar -Bistāmī 422
Tāj ad-Dīn 'Omar b. Mas'ūd 449
Tāj ad-Dīn Tughān 422
Tāj ad-Dīn Zangī 351
Ṭājī-beg 433
Tajiks 411
Takash (Khwārazm-shāh) 28, 32, 33, 179, 337–49, 373, 378; tomb of 361, 436
Takhsānjkath 132
Takhsīj 132
Ṭākhūna ariq 105, 118 n.
Talas 224, 295; *see also* Tarāz
Talas river 176, 363, 367, 450
Ṭalha b 'Abdallāh -Khuzā'ī 208
Ṭalha b. Ṭāhir 208, 210, 211
Abū Tālib *see* -Tabānī
Ṭālqān (Khurāsān) 79, 198, 437, 439, 443, 444, 446, 449, 454
Ṭālqān (Ṭukharistān) 67, 417, 419
Tamākhush 160
Ṭamghāch (city) 397
Ṭamghāch-Bughrā-Khan Ibrāhīm 322
Ṭamghāch-Khān (Ṭabghāch, Ṭafghāch), title 304, 319 n.
Ṭamghāch-Khān Ḥasan 323 n.
Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn 17, 90, 315
Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad 333, 336
Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr (Būritagīn) 36, 109, 300–304, 311–14, 315, 318; *see also* Qilich-Ṭamghāch-Khān
Tamliyāt 69
Tamuchin 382–4; *see also* Chingiz-Khān
T'ang Dynasty, History of the 3
Tang-i ḥarām 138
Tangut 404, 436 n., 453, 458
Taoists 388, 450; *see also* Ch'ang-Ch'un
Tāq Kisrā 315
Ṭārāb 115 n., 117, 132
-Tārābī 360
Tarākha (Tazākha) 132
Ṭarāz (Talas) 159, 224, 236, 241, 256, 281, 323 n., 341, 358; *see also* Talas
Ṭārband 171 n.
Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-gushāy 39–40; *see also* -Juwayni
Ta'rīkh-i Khayrāt 54 n., 56; *see also* -Musawī
Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī 19–20, 32 n.; *see also* -'Utbī, Abū Naṣr
Tarkhūn (Ikhshīdh of Soghd) 184
Tarmashīrīn (Jaghatāid) 54, 460
Ṭarwākh 132
Ṭāsh (ḥājib) 228, 252–3, 270
Tāsh (rabāt) 154
Tashatun (Uighūr) 387
-Tashkandī, Muhammad 52
Tashkent 171; *see also* Shāsh
Tash-kurgan 97
Tavvaz 306 n.
Ṭawāwīs 97, 98, 99, 112, 115, 116, 317
Taxation under Umayyads 187–8, 189 90, 192
under 'Abbāsids 204, 210n., 220
under Sāmānids 220, 238–40
under Ghaznevids 287–9, 291–3
Ṭāyankū-Ṭarāz (Qarā-Khitāy) 344, 350, 356, 358–9, 363–4
Ibn Ṭayfūr 196 n.
Tayjiut tribe 44
Tāynāl-noyon 416
Ṭāyqān 67; *see* Ṭālqān (Ṭukhāristān)
Abū Ṭayyib *see* Ṣa'lūkī
Abu'ṭ-Ṭayyib *see* -Muṣ'abī
Temuga 385
-Tha'ālibī, 'Abd al-malik b. Muḥ. 9, 10, 19 n., 196 n.
-Tha'ālibī, Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad, 18, 24
Thābit b. Quṭba 183, 184
Thābit b. Ṣinān -Ṣābi' 7, 8, 255 n.
Thaqaftān (Yimek) 369 n.
Tibet 65, 66, 200, 202, 453
Tiesenhausen, Baron V. G 63 n.
Tiflis 446
Tīm 132
Timūr 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 86, 88, 169, 215, 407, 408, 412, 417, 445–6, 454
Timūrids 51, 55
Historical literature under the 52–8
Timūr-malik 417–18, 432, 437
Tirmidh 71–6, 80, 138, 184, 191, 235, 241, 249, 254, 259, 266, 272, 278, 285, 297, 298, 301 n., 302, 303–4, 314, 315, 319, 326, 330, 334, 336, 352, 419, 427, 440
-Tirmidhī, Abū 'Abdallah Muḥ. b. 'Alī 75
-Tirmidhī, Abū 'Īsā Muḥ. b. 'Īsā 75 n.
-Tirmidhī *see* 'Alā al-Mulk
Tirmidh-shāh 73 n.
Tiskhān (?) 164

Tokhari 66
Tomaschek 69 n., 70, 71 n., 96 n., 98, 102 n., 108
Toquchar-bahādūr (Toquchar-noyon) 371, 419–24, 429, 437, 447
Toquz-Oghuz Turks 200–2, 211, 254
toyins 389 n.
Trans-Caspian provinces 117
Transoxania—
  Aristocracy of 180–1, 223, 226, 227, 307–8, 316
  Coinage of 203–7
  Commerce and industries of 234–40, 256
  Conditions in, before Arab conquest 180–3
    under early 'Abbāsids 197–8, 203
    under al-Ma'mūn 202–3, 210
    under Mongols 417, 427, 450–3, 456–7
    under Muhammad Khwārazm-shāh, 363–6, 368–9, 395
    under Qarā-Khānids, 17, 268–75, 279–86, 295–6, 298–9, 300–5, 307–8, 310–22
    under Qarā-Khiṭāys 339, 353–6, 362–3
    under Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids 212–15, 226–7, 234–40
    under Umayyads 187–8
  Conquest of, by Arabs 182–92
    by Qarā-Khānids 257–68
    by Saljūqids 313–14, 316–17, 318
    by Mongols 403–20
  Final subjugation of, to Muslim rule 210–12
  Invasions of Khwārazm-shāhs into 333–4, 341–2, 355–60, 363–6
  National and religious movements in, 194–5, 199, 199–200, 248, 270
  Native rulers in 180, 182, 183, 186, 188, 190, 195–6, 201, 202, 210–11, 223, 224, 233
  Political fluctuations of 64–5
  See also China, Maḥmūd, Shi'ites, Ṭurks
Trebizond 395
Tūban 141
Tubkār 163
Tūdh 132
Ṭughān (ḥājib) 248
Ṭughān *see* Tāj ad-Dīn
Ṭughān rabāt 154
Ṭughānchik 272
Ṭughān-Khān I (of Kāshghar) 274–5, 279–82
Ṭughān-Khān II (of Semiryechye) 282, 285, 294
Tughān-Khān (Sulaymān-tagīn) 318 n.
Ṭughān-shāh Abū Bakr 338, 339, 340, 346
Ṭughān-tagīn (of Kāshghar) 241, 256
Ṭughān-tagīn b. Ṭamghāch-Khān Ibrāhīm 314 n.
Tughāy 416
Tughāy-Khān 411, 413, 414
Tughrul b. Arslān (Saljūqid) 346–7
Ṭughrul b. Mikā'īl (Saljūqid) 297, 300, 303, 305, 306 n., 307, 308, 310
Tughrul *see* 'Izz ad-Dīn
Ṭughrul-Khān *see* Būzār
Ṭughrul-Qarā-Khān Yūsuf (Qarā-Khānid) 315
Tughrul-tagīn (Qarā-Khānid) 315
Tughrul-tagīn b. Ikinchī 324
Tughrul-Yanāl-beg (governor) 318
Tūjī-Pahlawān 432
Ṭukhāristān 66–8, 191, 217, 303, 338, 439 n., 444 n.
Tūkhtā-bīkī *see* Tūqtā-bīkī
Tukkath 174
Tulun-cherbi 433, 442
Tūluy 52, 385, 407, 424 n., 438–9, 442 n., 446–7, 462
Tumansky, A. G. 13
Tumtar 132
Tumurtāsh 153
Tumushkath 132
Tūnkath, 172, 173, 233, 315
Tupalang 72
Tūqtā-bīkī 361–2, 370 n.
Tūq-tughān (Tūqtā-Khān) 370
Tūrān 64
Turār 177
Turbān 132
Tūrbāy (Dūrbāy, Tūrtāy ?) 449
Turgesh Turks 187, 201
Turk b Japhet 27
Turk river *see* Parak
turkān (title) 337 n.
Turkān (wife of Il-Arslān) 337–8
Turkān-Khātūn (wife of Takash, mother of Muhammad Khwārazm-Shāh) 349, 350, 356, 357–8, 361, 364, 366, 375–7, 378–80, 398, 407, 411, 419, 428, 430, 431, 433
Turkestan (modern town) 177 n.
Turkestan mts. 82
Turkish calendar 286 n.
  language 64
  prose literature 2, 52
  rulers, character of 305–6
  slaves *see* Slaves, Slave armies
  songs 273 ; *see also* Uighūr
Turkistān (medieval) 64, 83, 236, 316, 366
Turkmens 178, 234, 254 n , 257, 284–5, 293, 295, 297–300, 301–2, 306 n., 333, 408, 416, 440, 449 ; *see also* Saljūqids
Turks, Central-Asian—
  Historical and Geographical works relating to 13, 17, 20, 26, 31, 36
  Invasions into Transoxania, 186–7, 190–1, 192, 200–1, 256–60, 263–4

Relations with China 381–2, 394
with Sāmānids 256
Spread of Islām amongst 178, 254–6, 257, 267
Trade with Transoxania 236, 237–8, 255 n., 256
(General references) 64, 66, 70, 71, 77, 96 n., 99, 112, 113, 117, 156, 162, 177–8, 195, 199, 201, 209, 211–12, 234, 236, 246, 254, 258, 273, 279, 283, 286, 291 n., 296, 297, 305–7, 309–10, 320, 369–72; *see also* Ghuzz, Qarluqs, Qipchāqs, Saljūqids, Slaves, Turgesh, Turkmens, Uighūrs, Uzbegs
Turks, Osmanli 52, 461
Turmuqān 162
Turnāwadh 132
Ṭūs 251, 262, 272, 335, 339, 344, 425
Ṭūsan 132
Ṭūshā-Basqāq *see* Nūshā-Basqāq
Tushkīdaza 132
-Ṭūsī, Nāṣir ad-Dīn 39, 40 n., 362 n.
Tūskās 132
Ṭūṭī-beg 330

Abū 'Ubayda 6, 192 n
'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir 218, 219
'Ubaydallāh gate 135
Ubburdan 168
Ūbūqār 114
Ūdana 115, 132
Ughnāq (?) 356, 363
Uguday 43, 44, 52, 393, 412, 417, 433–5, 437, 438, 439, 441 n., 445, 448, 455, 458, 460, 462
Uighūr alphabet adopted by Mongols, 41, 51, 387, 391, 424
Uighūr writings 51–3, 54
Uighuria 40, 362, 387–90, 393 n., 401, 450
Uighūrs 36, 45, 51, 52, 53, 102 n., 311–12, 362, 394, 400 n., 403, 404, 407, 416 n., 455
Culture and religion of 387–91
'Ujayf b. 'Anbasa 95
Ūjna (Ūjana) 161
Ukhun 399 n.
'Ulamā *see* Priesthood
Uljākant (Unjākant) 170
Ūljāytū 45–6, 47, 48, 49
Ulughbeg, *History* of 41 n., 52, 53, 56–7
Ulugh-Khān 443 n.
Ulūq-Khātūn 401
Ulūs-Idī 416, 418; *and see* Jida-noyon
'Umar, 'Umayr *see* 'Omar
Umayyad dynasty 197, 228, 255
Historical literature under 4
Transoxania under 182–94
'Umdat al-Mulk 440
'Umrānī, 'Alī b. Muḥammad 32 n.
Ūrast 159, 211
Ura-tube 166
Urgench 457; *see* Gurgānj
Ūrkhān 445
Urukhs 132
Usbānīkath 176
-Usbānīkatī, Sa'īd b. Ḥātim 256
Ūsh 156, 157, 159, 163
Ushmūnayn 235 n.
Ushpurqān *see* Shapurqān
Ushrūsana 82, 94, 124, 128, 165–9, 191, 192, 196, 200, 202, 210–11, 212, 224, 274 n.
Ushtābdīza 90
Ushtīqān 158, 162, 163, 164
Ushturj 81
Ushtūrkath 170
Usmand 132
Usrūshana *see* Ushrūsana
ustādh (title) 232
Ustughdādīza 141
Ustun- (? Usun-) noyon 433
-'Utbī (family) 229, 248, 253
-'Utbī, Abu'l-Ḥusayn (wazīr) 17, 252, 253 n.
-'Utbī, Abū Ja'far (wazīr) 110, 250, 251
-'Utbī, Abū Nasr (historian) 17, 19–20, 50, 252; see also *Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī*
Utrār (Ūṭrār), 39, 177, 179, 202, 356, 364, 369, 397–8, 406, 407, 408, 410, 412, 414, 417
Uṭrār-banda 177
-Uṭrūsh *see* Ḥasan b. 'Alī
Ūtshund 141
Ūtūqā 455 n.
Uzārmand 148
Uzbegs 68, 75, 130 n., 150
Uzboi 150 n., 154
Ūzgand (Farghāna) 156, 157, 161 n., 163, 164, 179 n., 268, 269, 270, 272, 274, 275, 285, 300, 317, 353, 363, 366
Ūzgand (Jand) 179, 414
Ūzlāgh-Shāh (Quṭb ad-Dīn) 378–9, 432, 437–8

V— *see* W—
Vakhshu (Wakshu) 65
Varahrān *see* Bahrām
Vardanzi 113
Vladimir, Saint 305
Vyatkin, V. 63 n.

Wābkand (Wābkana) 114, 128, 132
Wadhāk canal 144, 146
Wadhār 92, 94, 128, 235
Wāfkand *see* Wābkand
Wāghiz (district) 163
Waghkath 167 n.
Waḥīd ad-Dīn -Būshanjī (qāḍī) 460
Wajāz 152
Wakhāb river 65

Wakhān river 65, 66
Wakhsh (province) 69, 301, 338, 417, 419
Wakhsh river 65, 68–71, 72, 74 n., 81 n.
Wakhsūn 120
wakīl, office of 229, 231, 307, 377–8, 379–80
Wakshu 65
Walī, Sayyid Ahmad b. Amīr 15 n.
Wāliyān (Walishtān) 441, 443, 444
Walkh 442
Walls for protection from Turks, 71, 112, 172–3, 201, 211
Wana, Wanaj 141
Wanandūn 133
Wang-Khān (Kerait) 382
Wānkath 156, 158, 163
Wanūfāgh 115, 133
Wanūfakh xx
Waragh *see* Fāshūn *and* Ra's al-Waragh
Waraghchan 141
Waraghdih 153
Waraghsar 83, 92, 93, 191
Warakhshah 115, 116
Wardāna (Vardanzi) 113
Wardān-Khudāts 113
Wardrāgh 151
Wardūk 174
Warka (hill) 111
Warka (village) 111, 114
Warqūd 98 n.
Warsnīn 87, 88, 90
Warthīn 141
-Warthīnī (historian) 16
Warwālīz 67
Wāshgird 71, 74
Wasīj 176 n., 177
Wassāf (street) 141
-Wassāf (historian) 40, 47, 48–9, 54, 58
-Wāthiqī, 'Abdallāh b 'Uthmān 258
Watwāt, Rashīd ad-Dīn 33
Wāykhān 149, 150
Wazāghar 133
Wazārmand 148
Wāzd 94
Wazghajn 141
wazīr, office of 197, 229, 308–9, 377, 379–80
Wazīr (town) 152
Wazīr b. Ayyūb b. Hassān 106
Wāzkard 94
Wazwīn 133
Wībawd 133
Wīnkard 170
wiqr (measure) 161
Wīza 142
Wīzd 94
Wolff, O. 59

Yabghū *see* Payghū
Yadhakhkath (Yadhukhkath) 164
-Yāfi'ī, Abū Sa'ādat 51 n.
Yaghān-Dughdū 378
Yaghān-tagīn *see* Bughrā-Khān Muḥammad
Yaghmā (Turkish tribe) 254
Yaghmūr-Khān 335
Yaghna 141
Yahūdīya 79, 80
Yaḥyā b. Ahmad (Sāmānid) 242
Yaḥyā b. Asad (Sāmānid) 209, 210
Yaḥyā b. Zayd ('Alid) 193
Yalavāch *see* Mābā, Mahmūd
Yamīn al-Mulk (Yamīn-malik) *see* Amin al-Mulk
Yanāl-tagīn (general) 268
Yanāl-tagīn (of Khorezmia) 330
Yanikant (Shahrkant) 178, 415, 416, 432, 437
Ya'qūb b. Ahmad (Sāmānid) 210
Ya'qūb b. Layth (Ṣaffārid) 77, 216–19, 223, 238
Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf *see* -Hamadānī
-Ya'qūbī 6, 7
Ya'qūb-tagīn 317
Yāqūt 8 n, 32, 34, 35–6, 120 n.
Yārkand 281
Yārkath (quarter of Samarqand) 90
Yārkath (district in Samarqand province) 92, 94
Yāsā (*Yasāq*) 41–2, 54, 391, 461
Yasawur 419
Yasīr 113, 117
Yasīrkath 133
-Yazdī, Ghiyāth ad-Dīn 54 n.
-Yazdī *see* Sharaf ad-Dīn 'Alī
Yāzghir *see* Yāzir
Yazīd b. Ghūrak 112
Yazīd b Muhallab 184
Yazīd I [Caliph) 184
Yazīd II (Caliph) 188
Yāzīr (Yāzghir) 430, 449
Yazn (?) 123
Yemenite kings, legendary conquest of Samarqand 85, 87
Yenisei river 392, 394
Yimek (tribe) 369 n.
Yuan-ch'ao -pi-shi 43, 382, 423
Yuan Chwang *see* Hiuen Tsiang
Yuan-shi 44, 45
Yueh-Chih *see* Kushans
Yūghank 133, 356 n.
Yūghūr (town) 370
Yūghūrs 340, 370
Yūkhasūn 133
Yu-ku 370
Ibn Yūnus 271
Yūsuf (Inanch-Payghū, Saljūqid) 297
Yūsuf (? Tatar) 369
Yūsuf b. 'Abdallāh -Andkhudī 329 n., 335
Yūsuf b. 'Ali (Qarā-Khānid) 282
Yūsuf al-Barm 198, 201, 208
Yūsuf b. Hārūn *see* Qadir-Khān

Yūsuf b. Isḥāq (wazīr) 250, 251
Yūsuf Kankā 396
Yūsuf b. Sabūktagīn 286
Abū Yūsuf *see* Ya'qūb b. Aḥmad

Zabaghduwān 133
Zāčhak 141
Zafar-nāmah see -Shāmī, Niẓam ad-Dīn *and* Sharaf-ad-Dīn 'Alī
Zāgharsars (Zāgharsawsan) 133
Zaghrīmāsh 90
Zakān 133
Zakī *see* Aḥmad Zakī *and* Shukrallāh
Zalthīkath 171
Zamakhshar 148, 149
Zāmīn 94, 165, 166, 167, 336
Zāmīthan 133
Zamm 80, 81
Zand 133
Zandān 113, 114, 227, 396
Zandarāmsh 157, 158, 163, 164
Zandarmīthan 133
Zandīya (Zandīna) 141
Zangī *see* Tāj ad-Dīn
Zangī b. 'Alī 325
Zanǧī b. Abū Ḥafṣ 427
Zanjān 426
Zar 115, 116; *and see* Rūd -i Zar
Zār 133
Zarafshān mts. 82, 452
Zarafshān river 65 n., 80, 82
  Irrigation system on 83, 93, 94
  Names of 82
  Provinces in basin of 82–133, 165–9
Zarākh 177
Zarakhsh 133
Zaranj 216
Zaranjara 133
Zarānkath 175
Zardūkh 147, 148
Zārkān 163, 164
Zarkarān 133
Zarmān 96, 97, 200
Zarmāz (?) 200
Zarmītan 120
Zarnūq 407–8
Zarūdīza 133
Zāwa 423, 424
Zāwir 133
Abū Zayd *see* -Balkhī
Zayn ad-Dīn *see* -Qazwīnī
Zayn aṣ-Ṣāliḥīn *see* -Shūmānī
Zaynab (daughter of Maḥmūd of Ghazna) 284, 299
Zāz (Zār) 133
Zhukovsky, V. A. 63
Zīkūn 141
Zimliq 133
Zīnwar 74
Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ 194, 195, 196
Ziyārid dynasty 225, 251
Zoroaster 199
Zoroastrians *see* Fire-worshippers
Zubayda (wife of Hārūn ar-Rashīd) 66 n.
Zughārkanda ariq 106
Zūsh 114
Zūzan 438

REFERENCE TABLE OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN PLACE-NAMES

Medieval name used in the text of this book	*Corresponding name or approximate position shown on modern maps*
Akhsīkath	At junction of Syr-Darya and Kasan river
Āmul	Charjui
Balāsāghūn	NE. of Aulie-ata, probably on Chu river
Binkath	Tashkent
Gurgānj	Urganj, Urgench
Īlāq	Valley of Angren river
Isfījāb	Sairam (near Chimkent)
Jand	Neighbourhood of Perowsk
Kāth	Shah Abbas Wali
Kish	Shahrisabz
Nasaf, Nakhshab	Karshi, Qarshi
Quwādhiyān	Kabadian
Rabınjan	Katta-Kurgan
Rāsht	Karategin
Ṣaghāniyān	Denau (north of Termes)
Shāsh	District of Tashkent
Ṭarāz	Aulie-ata
Tirmidh	Termes
Ushrūsana	District of Ura-tube
Yanikant	Neighbourhood of Kazalinsk
Zamm	Kerki

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY