

during the reign of 'Uljaytū, we are indebted to Dr. Karl Sussheim, who published an Oriental edition, with Preface and notes in Turkish, at the Ma'arif Press in Cairo in A. H. 1326 (= A. D. 1908), and an Occidental edition, published by Messrs Brill of Leyden in 1909, containing the same text, page for page and line for line, but with German Preface and Notes. This abridgement, like the last, omits the Preface, Conclusion and digressions of the *Rāḥatū 'ṣ-Ṣudūr*, but, instead of leaving the historical portion of the text untouched in its original form, the compiler has thought fit to rewrite it in a very ornate and artificial style, and to fill it with all manner of tropes, metaphors and other rhetorical figures, after the fashion of the *Ta'rikh-i-Waṣṣāf* or the *Ta'rikh-i-Mu'jam*, and to substitute for the poems in the original other poems of his own selection. In his Preface he omits all mention of the *Rāḥatū 'ṣ-Ṣudūr*, though he mentions as the basis of his work another history of the Seljuqs extending to the reign of Sulṭān Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad b. Malikshāh; yet as a matter of fact he has, apart from the excisions and verbal alterations above mentioned, exactly followed the *Rāḥatū 'ṣ-Ṣudūr*, so that we have here an example of plagiarism precisely similar to that presented by the *Bazm-ārā*, which, pretending to be an independent work, is a mere reproduction (with some verbal changes) of the *Lubābu'l-Albāb* of Muḥammad 'Awfi¹).

(4) *Ancien Fonds Persan* 69 (5).

This manuscript, which was one of the first acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale, and was used both by d'Ohsson and Quatremère, is a complete copy, written in a rather illegible *nasta'liq*, and comprising ff. 189 (pp. 378) of 25 lines,

1) See vol. 1 of the latter work, published in my Persian Historical Texts Series, pp. 5—6 of the English and 5—6 of the Persian Preface.

with it". In spite of this curse, however, two persons have ventured to defy the author's maledictions and abridge his book.

The first of these abridgements is found at the end of this MS. of the *Jahán-gusháy*, and is styled the *Mukhtaṣir* (with *kasra*). It omits the whole of the Preface (37 ff. or 74 pp. of the MS. of the *Ráḥatü's-Şudúr*), replacing it by a short Preface of only half a page. It also omits the whole Conclusion (25 ff. or 50 pp. of the original). Lastly, it omits the poems, proverbs and other extraneous matters. As regards the historical portion of the text, however, it is preserved intact, without the change, diminution or addition of a single word, so that in so far as the *Ráḥatü's-Şudúr* is a historical text, this abridgement practically supplies a second codex, save that between ff. 260—261 one leaf has been lost, corresponding with f. 143*a*, l. 3—f. 144*b*, l. 11 of the complete MS. Owing to an extraordinary piece of carelessness on the part of the copyist, however, the text of the abridgement, ending with the death of the last Seljúq ruler of 'Irâq, Tughril b. Arslán, in his war with Sultán Tukush Khwárazmsháh, is merged without any hiatus or other indication of discontinuity, in the text of the second volume of the *Jahán-gusháy* at a point indicated on pp. CII—CIII (قَبِّ—قَجِّ) of the Persian Introduction.

The second of the abridgements of the *Ráḥatü's-Şudúr* above mentioned is entitled *al-'Urâḍa fi'l-Īikâyati's-Saljúqiyya*, and is by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abdu'lláh b. an-Nizám al-Īusayni al-Yazdi, who was *Wazir* to Abú-Sa'íd, the last effective Mongol ruler of Persia (reigned A. H. 717—736 = A. D. 1317—1336), and who died in A. H. 743 ¹⁾ (= A. D. 1342—3). For an edition of this work, which was compiled in A. H. 711 ²⁾ (= A. D. 1311—12)

1) See p. 26 of Susseim's Turkish Preface, and p. xxvi of his German Preface.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 18, the Turkish and p. xix of the German Preface.

given by Professor E. G. Browne in the *J. R. A. S.* for 1902, pp. 567—610 and 849—887, and a few further particulars may be added here.

The *Kāhatu's-Şudūr* contains the history of the Seljūqs of Persia and 'Irāq from Tughril Beg to Tughril b. Arslān, was written by Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Himmat ar-Rāwandī in A. H. 599 (= A. D. 1202—3), and was dedicated by him to Sulṭān Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Kaykhusraw b. Qilij Arslān b. Sulaymān b. Ghāzī b. Qutulmish b. Isrā'il b. Seljūq, one of the Seljūqs of Asia Minor, who reigned from A. H. 588 to 607 (= A. D. 1192—1210). The apparently unique Paris MS. of the entire work is written in a beautiful old *naskh*, and is dated A. H. 635 (= A. D. 1237—8). The work is of a discursive character and contains a large amount of extraneous matter, including a Preface occupying 37 leaves and a Conclusion of about 25 leaves, the latter dealing with such matters as chess, backgammon, calligraphy, wine-drinking and other courtly and social accomplishments, besides a large quantity of poetry, anecdotes and proverbs cited in the body of the text, with which they often have but little if any connection. In spite of the many accomplishments of the author, who was not only the contemporary of the last Seljūq ruler of Asia Minor, but his special calligraphist, artist and boon-companion, this extreme discursiveness detracts from the undeniable value of the book; yet so far was the author from regretting it that he expressly calls down in his Preface ¹⁾ "a hundred thousand curses on the life, house and home, wife and children of any person who shall cut out one single word or letter from this book, or add to or subtract from it, or find fault with it, or otherwise meddle

1) F. 286 of the MS. There is a dislocation, due to the binder's having transposed ff. 161 and 154. These leaves, as at present arranged, run as follows: 153, 101, 155, 160, 154, 162.

is expressed either by the *hamza*, or by the *yā*, or is not expressed at all, but the fourth method of expression (with *madda* over the *alif*) noted on p. LXIX *supra* as occurring in the MS. first described is not employed. Similarly after final *ū* (و) either *yā* is employed, according to the practice now adopted, or the *hamza* is used, e.g. اردوی خود or اردو خود. After final *i* (ی) the method now habitually used in India is followed, i. e. a *hamza* is written. In words like *qā'im*, *dā'im*, *faḍā'il*, etc. the *hamza* is sometimes inserted and sometimes omitted, but the *yā* is always dotted, so that we find, for instance, both دایم and دایم but not دایم.

As regards the three treatises at the end of the volume they are as follows:

(1) The short account of the siege and capture of Baghdād added by Naṣīru'd-Dīn Ṭūsī to the *Jahān-gushāy*. This, commonly known as the "Appendix" or "Supplement" (ذیل), occupies ff. 218—220 of this MS., and it is not uncommonly found at the end of vol. III of the *Jahān-gushāy*¹). In this case the whole of it except the last leaf is in the same old hand as the preceding text, while all that follows (ff. 220—264) is in the later hand.

(2) Next follows the autobiographical memoir of the author of the *Jahān-gushāy* entitled *Tashiyatu'l-Ikhwān* (ff. 220b—231a) which has already been discussed in an earlier part of this Introduction (pp. XXXVII—XLI *supra*).

(3) Last comes a treatise on the history of the Seljuqs (ff. 231b—261a) containing a *résumé* of the *Rāḥatu's-Sudūr wa Āyatu's-Surūr* of Abū Bakr ar-Rāwandī, a rare work of which the only known copy is contained in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Suppl. persan 1314), and of which there exist two abridgements, that contained in this copy of the *Jahān-gushāy* and another. Some account of this work was

¹) See, for instance, Ethé's Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the India Office, N^o. 170.

the last, is undated, but, with the exception of f. 1 (which has been supplied) and ff. 220—264, is ancient, apparently dating from the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century of the *hijra* (thirteenth or fourteenth of the Christian era). Amongst its former possessors was the historian Ibn 'Arabshāh (died A. H. 854 = A. D. 1450), the author of the well-known history of Timūr known as the *'Ajā'ibu'l-Ma'qūr fi Nawā'ibi Timūr* and of the *Fākihatū'l-Khulafā wa Mufākahatu'z-Zurafā*, and some two dozen notes in his hand are written in Arabic in the margins of the volume on the pages indicated at the foot of p. XCV (ص) of the Persian Introduction, where a specimen of these notes, intended for use in his own history, is given. As that history was written in A. H. 840 (= A. D. 1436—7), this MS. must have evidently passed into Ibn 'Arabshāh's possession before that date.

The text of this MS. presents the archaic spellings usual in MSS. of this date and already mentioned in describing the first of the MSS. of the *Yahān-gushay*. Thus the Persian *dhāls* are always indicated by a dot, and *ki* is always written کى, never که. Other peculiarities are رفتنم, رفتید, رفتام, رفتاست, رفتی, etc., for the usual رفتام, رفتاید, رفتام, رفتاست. The *yā-i-khiṭāb* and *yā-i-tankir* are almost always expressed after the un-aspirated final *h* (*hā-i-makhfiyya*) not by *hamza* alone, but by *hamza* and *yā*; e. g. خانۀى for خانۀ; رفتۀى for رفتۀ, etc. This latter peculiarity, which might be revived with advantage for reasons pointed out by the editor on pp. XCVII—XCVIII (ص-ص) of the Persian Introduction, is common in MSS. of this date, and has been preserved in our edition of the *Mu'jam fi Ma'āyiri Ash'āri'l-'Ajam* in this series (vol. X), where a further distinction is established between the *yā-i-tankir* and the *yā-i-khiṭāb* after *hamza*, the former being written ى — or ى — and the latter ى —. After *alif* the *kasra* of the genitive or of qualification (*idāfat* or *taṭwīf*)

in paragraph 14 on p. XCIII (ع) of the Persian Introduction. To enumerate all of them would be unduly to enlarge this Introduction.

(2) *Suppl. persan 1375* (ز).

This is an almost complete copy, and very correct save in the case of foreign words, *viz.* Mongol and Turkish names and citations of Arabic verses and sentences. As in the MS. last described, however, there is a lamentable tendency to omit the diacritical points. The MS. comprises 233 leaves (466 pages) each containing 21 lines, written in good *naskh*. Between the leaves now numbered 215 and 216 there is a considerable lacuna, equivalent to some 30 pp. of the printed text, and to f. 153*a*, l. 12—163*a*, l. 24 of the MS. last described. This MS. is undated, but the writing and palaeographical peculiarities indicate a considerable age and point to the beginning of the eighth century of the *hijra*. A few leaves are supplied in a more modern hand, and a number of glosses, emendations and variants have also been added in comparatively recent times. The palaeographical peculiarities presented by this MS. are similar to those noticed in the last, but it presents some additional orthographical peculiarities, enumerated on p. XCIV (ص) of the Persian Introduction.

(3) *Suppl. 1556* (ح).

This MS. is nearly complete, save that a leaf has been lost between the leaves now numbered 2 and 3, and that the binder is responsible for a good many dislocations. It is fairly correct, and is written in a bad though legible *naskh*. The volume comprises ff. 264 (528 pp.) of 25 lines each. The text of the *Jahān-gushāy* itself ends on f. 218*a*, and the remainder of the volume is filled by 3 treatises, of which the first is written in the same hand as the bulk of the MS., and the two others in a more modern hand. This MS., like

insert the dots of the *ya* and write *دایم*, *فایم* and *فضایل*. In this MS. the Arabian method is never used: sometimes the dots are inserted under the *ya* and sometimes omitted (*دایم* or *دام*, etc.), but the *hamza* is never used. In this text the modern practice is followed, varying according to the accepted pronunciation of the word, the *ya* either having the *hamza* above or the two dots beneath.

(i) Words like *gū'i* (گوئی), *ibqā'i* (ایقائی), etc. are in this MS. never written with *hamza*, and the first *ya* sometimes has and sometimes has not the two dots beneath it, standing either as *گوئی* or *گوی*. In the text the modern usage is followed.

(k) The particle *mī* (می) which given continuity to the tenses of the verb to which it is prefixed is always in this MS. written separately, never joined (e. g. *می کند*, never *میکند*), while modern usage allows either alternative indifferently. Here the usage of this MS. has been followed in the printed text.

(l) In the MS. words are often divided in the middle (as is done in modern European languages) at the end of a line, a practice of obvious convenience not sanctioned by modern Persian usage.

(m) Whenever the particles *ki* (who, that) and *chi* are joined to the preceding word the final *ya* is omitted, so that we invariably find *هرک* *بلکه* for *هرکه* *بلکه*, *آنچه* *آنکه* for *آنکه* *آنکه*, *هرچه* *هرکه* for *هرکه* *هرکه* and *هرج* *هرچه*, etc. This peculiarity has been preserved in the text.

(n) When a preposition, such as *az*, *bar*, *dar*, precedes a pronoun beginning with *alif*, such as *ū*, *ān*, *ishān*, the *alif* is always elided and the two words are written together, so that we always find *ازو* not *از او*, *بران*, not *بر آن*, etc. This practice has also been followed in the text.

(o) Lastly there occur certain anomalous and unusual spellings, some of the more important of which are enumerated

sh and *g* and their Arabic prototypes *b*, *j*, *z* and *k*, and in the case of the last pair (*g* and *k*) the distinction is never made. In the case of the other three pairs it is sometimes made, especially in the case of proper names. In the text, both for the sake of clearness and uniformity, the distinction is indicated throughout, according to the later practice.

(*e*) The particle *ki* is sometimes written **کی** in the ancient way, and sometimes **ک** in the modern way. In the text the latter spelling is adopted throughout.

(*d*) The preposition *bi* is invariably joined to the following word, and we find **بهر روز**, **بداستان**, **باصفهان**, never **به روز**, etc.

(*c*) The verb *ast* is hardly ever written with an *alif* when it follows such letters as **ا**, **د**, **ذ**, **ر**, **ز**, **و**, which are not joined to the following letter, but in the case of words ending with any other letter it is written sometimes with and sometimes without the *alif*.

(*f*) The *i* indicating the genitive construction (*idāfat*) or the attribution of an adjective to a noun when it follows an *alif* is indifferently expressed in four different ways, *viz.* by the letter **ی** (e.g. **اقضای دیار مشرق**), by the *hamza* (e.g. **احصاء کنتگان**), by placing a *madda* over the *alif* of the first word (e.g. **اقضاً رای خود**), or by simply placing the words in juxtaposition without any special sign, (e.g. **انتها مراحل**), the first being the commonest and the last the rarest usage. In this text only the two first methods are employed, in accordance with modern usage.

(*g*) *Mabla* over *alif* is often omitted when required by modern usage, and that without any apparent rule. In the text it has been restored throughout according to the present practice.

(*h*) When an *alif* of prolongation is followed by *hamza* with *kasra* in Arabic words such as **دائم**, **قائم**, **فضائل**, etc. the usual modern practice in Persia is to omit the *hamza*,

it was preceded by a vowel, whether short (as in *âmādh*, *badh*, *bāshadh*, etc.) or long (as in *bādih*, *būdih*, *bidih*, etc.). The unaspirated (or 'neglected') *dāl* only occurred in words where it was immediately preceded by a consonant (such as *nārd*, *kārd*, *muzd*, *pasand*, etc.). This distinction, which disappeared after about A. H. 800 (= A. D. 1397—8), was observed both in speech and writing in all parts of Persia except those remote north-eastern regions mentioned in the text, so that at the present day the *dhāl* (pronounced as *z*) is only retained in a few words like *guzashtan*, *paziruftan*, *Āzarbayjān*, etc. The passage above cited seems, therefore, to refute the hypothesis sometimes advanced that this distinction was observed only in writing. The actual pronunciation of the *dhāl* in these ancient times (whether like the ordinary *z*, as is now the case in Persian, or like the Arabic *dh*, or in some other manner) is, however, doubtful, though many arguments (which it would out of place to enumerate here) can be adduced in favour of the view that it was pronounced like the Arabic *dh* (Welsh *dd*, English *th* in 'that', or modern Greek δ). It may be noted, however, that all such Persian words as passed into Arabic at an early date retained the *dhāl*, as, for instance, *ustādih*, *bādham*, *shādhar* (modern Persian *chādar*), etc., and, amongst proper names, *Hamadhān*, *Baghdādih*, *Qubādih*, and the like, whence it would appear that the Persian pronunciation heard by the Arabs in earlier times, even though not identical with the Arabic *dhāl*, resembled it more closely than the Arabic *dāl*, which is itself softer than the English *d*. Since this MS. forms the basis of the present text, and since, with few exceptions, it ignores the ancient distinction between *dāl* and *dhāl*, we also have ignored it and have followed the modern practice in this edition.

(b) In general, with rare exceptions, this MS. does not distinguish between the four peculiarly Persian letters *p*, *ch*,

was Sultān Ḥusayn b. Sultān Maṣūr b. Bayqara Mirzā b. ʿUmar Shaykh b. Amīr Tīmūr Gūrgān, the last of the Tīmūrid kings of Persia, who died in A. H. 911 (= A. D. 1505—6), and whose autograph the MS. bears.

In spite of all these distinctions, however, this MS. is not free from errors, especially in Mongol names and titles and Arabic verses and proverbs, wherein the mistakes are often so numerous as to obscure the sense. Moreover, like many other ancient MSS., the diacritical points are often omitted, especially in Mongol and Turkish names and other doubtful words where not only these points but also complete vocalization were especially required.

Amongst the palaeographical peculiarities of this MS. the following may be mentioned:

(a) Notwithstanding its antiquity, the distinction between Persian *dāl* (د) and *dhāl* (ذ), generally observed in MSS. transcribed before A. H. 800 (= A. D. 1397—8), is often neglected, save in certain words. Possibly this distinction, even in the seventh century of the *hijra*, was only observed in certain parts of Persia, while elsewhere the modern usage had already established itself. This supposition is confirmed by a passage in the *Muʿjam fi Maʿāyiri Ashʿari'l-ʿAjam* of Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad b. Qays ar-Rāzī, which was composed about A. H. 630 (= A. D. 1232—3)¹). The text of this passage is given on p. LXXXIX (نظ) of the Persian Introduction, and the translation is as follows: "In the speech of the people of Ghazna, Balkh and Transoxiana there is no 'dotted' *dhāl*, and they pronounce all their *dāls* 'neglected' (*i. e.* un-aspirated)" and he then gives a verse to illustrate this. From his expression "they pronounce" it is clear that the inhabitants of other parts of Persia at that epoch actually pronounced *dāl* as *dhāl* in certain definite cases, namely when

¹) See p. 192 of the text of this work published in this Series (vol. x).

4. *Manuscripts of the Jahán-gusháy.*

Seven MSS., all belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale, have been used in the preparation of this text, viz. (1) *Suppl. persan 205*, denoted as $\bar{1}$; (2) *Suppl. persan 1375*, denoted as $\bar{2}$; (3) *Suppl. pers. 1556*, denoted as $\bar{3}$; (4) *Anciens Fonds persan 69*, denoted as $\bar{4}$; (5) *Suppl. pers. 1563*, denoted as $\bar{5}$; (6) *Suppl. persan 207*, denoted as $\bar{6}$; and *Suppl. persan 206*, denoted as $\bar{7}$. Of each of these seven MSS. something will now be said as regards their correctness, age and peculiarities ¹⁾

(1) *Suppl. persan 205* ($\bar{1}$).

This MS. is complete, and is the most correct of all the MSS. of the *Jahán-gusháy* preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, and it forms the basis of the present text. It is written in a good legible *naskh*, and comprises 174 ff. (348 pp.), each containing 27 lines, and is dated Dhu'l-Hijja 4, A. H. 689 (= Dec. 8, 1290), that is exactly 8 years to a day after the Author's death, which took place on the same day of the same Muhammadan month in A. H. 681. The text of the colophon is given on p. LXXXVII ($\bar{7}$) of the Persian Introduction, and the scribe gives his name as Rashíd al-Khwáfi.

On the back of f. 1 a number of successive owners of the volume have inscribed their names with dates ranging from A. H. 724 (= A. D. 1324) to 1162 (= A. D. 1749) and later, the earlier dates being as follows: 724, 727, 771, 775, 778, 780, 1113, 1136, 1162, etc. Amongst these former owners

Jintimúr was governor of Khurásán and Mázarán, and he died (f. 116a of the same MS.) in this very year, A. H. 633, thirty years before the date (A. H. 663) assumed by Quatremère.

1) The MSS. are here arranged in order of excellence, except that the last in the list, which is very correct, is unfortunately defective, wanting the whole of vol. 1 and a third of vol. 11, on which account it is placed at the bottom of the list.

when they were written Māngú Khán, who died at the end of A. H. 656 or the beginning of A. H. 657 (end of A. D. 1258 or beginning of 1259), was still alive; while in the middle of the first volume ¹⁾ he mentions A. H. 658 (= A. D. 1260) as the current date, and in two other passages ²⁾ in the same volume he makes use of expressions which show that his father Bahá'u'd-Dín Muḥammad, who died in A. H. 651, was still alive when they were written, while at the end of the second volume he speaks of him as dead. In short, from a comparison of different passages of the book with one another, it appears that it was begun about A. H. 650 or 651 (= A. D. 1252—3), for on the one hand the former date, which corresponds with the arrival of the Author at Qaráqorúm to wait on Māngú Qá'án, is explicitly mentioned in the Preface to the first volume ³⁾, so that it cannot have been begun before that; while on the other hand his father Bahá'u'd-Dín Muḥammad, who died in A. H. 651, was alive when it was begun. Moreover, as has been already mentioned, the birth of the author took place in A. H. 623, while he explicitly states in the Preface (p. 6) that he was 27 years of age when he began to compose his history, which again points to A. H. 650 as the date of beginning. The latest date mentioned in the *Jahán-gusháy* is, on the other hand, A. H. 658 (= A. D. 1260) ⁴⁾, so that the composition of the work falls between A. H. 650 or 651 and 658 ⁵⁾.

1) See p. 75 of the text.

2) See pp. 4 and 6 of the text.

3) See p. 2 of the text.

4) P. 6 of the text.

5) Quatremère (*Mémoires d'Orient*, p. 222) supposes that the latest date mentioned in the *Jahán-gusháy* is A. H. 663, in which year, he says, there appeared a pretender who claimed to be Sultán Jalálu'd-Dín Mankobirni. This is an obvious error, and the date should be A. H. 633, as given in all the MSS. on which this text is based except the one used by Quatremère (*Anciens Fonds persan*, 69), by which he was misled, and one other (*Suppl. persan* 1563) which has 622. In the other 5 MSS. the date A. H. 633 is clearly written in words, not figures. Moreover immediately after this passage it is explicitly stated (*Suppl. persan* 205, f. 108b) that this event happened while

diately after the city fell into the hands of the Mongols, and which he continued to hold until his death, allowed him no leisure for the continuance of his great history. Quatremère, indeed (*Mines d'Orient*, p. 233), assumed the existence of other volumes, hitherto undiscovered, of the *Fahán-gusháy* mainly on the ground that it was inconceivable that so great a historian as 'Alá'u'd-Din should be content to leave his history where he left it 27 years before his death, and to omit to chronicle the most momentous event of the period, namely the sack of Baghdád and fall of the Caliphate, especially as he had announced as one of his chief objects the desire to immortalize the reign of Mangú Qá'án, only the earlier portion of whose reign (which lasted from A. H. 646—55 = A. D. 1248—57) is actually discussed, so far as he himself is concerned. Against this, however, apart from other considerations already set forth, stands the fact that of all the fourteen MSS. of the *Fahán-gusháy* described by Professor E. G. Browne in his article on the contents of that work which appeared in the *J. R. A. S.* for January, 1904, not one carries the history beyond the point mentioned, *viz.* A. H. 655.

3. *Date of the composition of the Fahán-gushá.*

Indications are not wanting to show that the Author of this history did not write it continuously in a definite year or years, but that, owing to the stress of official duties and the frequent and protracted journeys which these involved¹⁾, he composed it piecemeal, one section at one time and one at another as occasion offered. He himself, after describing the invasion of Khurásán by the Mongols and the massacre or enslavement of its inhabitants²⁾, explicitly alludes to these difficulties. In the preface to the first volume and again in the third volume passages occur which clearly show that

1) See pp. xxiv *et seqq. supra.*

2) See p. 118 of the text.

The volume concludes with an account of the Mongol governors and magistrates who administered the Persian domains of the Mongols from the time of Ogotáy Qá'án until Húlágú's arrival in Persia (A. H. 626—53 = A. D. 1229—55), such as Jintimúr, Naw-sál, Gurgúz and Amír Arghún.

The *third* volume begins with an account of the coronation of Mangú Qá'án, and the festivities which accompanied it (A. H. 649 = A. D. 1251—2), and some of the earlier events of his reign. Next comes a detailed account of Húlágú's march into Persia in A. H. 653 (= A. D. 1255) and his extermination of the Persian Isma'ílís or Assassins of Alamút. This is followed by a very detailed account of the history and doctrines of these heretics from their first appearance down to their suppression and the destruction of their strongholds and the death of their last Grand Master, Ruknu'd-Dín Khúrsháh, by Húlágú in A. H. 655 (= A. D. 1257). Some MSS. of the *Jahán-gusháy*, as already mentioned, contain in addition a short Appendix, written by Naşru'd-Dín Túsí, describing the capture and sack of Baghdád and the destruction of the last 'Abbásid Caliph, al-Musta'sim bi'lláh, by Húlágú in the following year; but this Appendix is wanting in most copies.

It is indeed much to be regretted that the author of the *Jahán-gusháy*, who lived until A. H. 681 (= A. D. 1282) and thus survived the destruction of the Assassins by some 27 years, and who was himself present at the capture and sack of Baghdád, witnessed in person many of the most important events of the reigns of Húlágú, Abáqá and Aḥmad Takúdár, and, as his history amply shows, possessed such rare qualifications for the task, should have ended his history where he did, and left no record (apart from the brief autobiographical tracts already discussed) of this eventful quarter of a century. It seems probable that the exacting duties of the governorship of Baghdád, which was conferred on him imme-

recur to this point in speaking of one of the MSS. (3, that is *Ancien Fonds persan 69* of the Bibliothèque Nationale).

The *first* volume begins with a lengthy Preface, which is followed by sections on the habits and customs of the ancient Mongols; the *Yásá-yi-Chingizi* or Code of Laws established by Chingiz Khán; and his first conquests of the 'Uyghúrs, to whose history, habits, customs and beliefs the next section, which is of great historical importance, is devoted. The author then describes in detail Chingiz Khán's conquests in Transoxiana and Persia, with the massacres, devastations and pillagings which accompanied and characterized them, the overthrow of the Khwárazmsháhs, and other events down to the death of Chingiz Khán (A. H. 615—624 = A. D. 1218—27). The reign of his son Ogotáy (A. H. 626—39 = A. D. 1229—42), the vice-regency of Kuyúk's mother Túrakíná Khátún (A. H. 639—43 = A. D. 1242—45), and the reign of Kuyúk himself (A. H. 643—44 = A. D. 1245—46) come next, and the volume concludes with two short sections, on the history of the two sons of Chingiz named Túshí or Chúchí and Chaghatáy respectively.

The *second* volume begins without preface with the history of the Khwárazmsháhs, becoming very detailed as it proceeds. Incidentally a very valuable account is given of the Qará-Khitá'í or Gúr-Khání kings of the pagan Turks, who ruled from A. H. 512—607 (= A. D. 1118—1210) in Transoxiana and Eastern Turkistán from the Oxus to Káshghar, Khutan and Balásaghún; and of certain petty Muslim Turkish rulers, variously known as Afrásiyábí, Khání, Ilak-Khání and Al-i-Kháqán, who ruled in Transoxiana and Turkistán for some two hundred years during the period succeeding the Sámání and preceding the Mongol dynasties, and who finally became the vassals of the Gúr-Khánís after certain of the Khwárazmsháhs had been tributary to them when they were at the height of their power. This portion of the second volume is also of great importance.

explicitly quotes certain passages from the *Jahān-gushāy*¹⁾.

So also Shihābu'd-Dīn Aḥmad b. Yahyā b. Faḍlu'llah, al-Kātib ad-Dimashqī (died A. H. 749 = A. D. 1348—9) in his great work the *Masāliku'l-Abṣār fi Mamāliki'l-Anṣār*, compiled in A. H. 738 (= A. D. 1337—8) in twenty large volumes dealing chiefly with history and geography, includes in the third volume certain passages translated, with acknowledgement, from the *Jahān-gushāy*. Amongst these is the section entitled "Account of the rise of Chingiz Khān, and the beginning of the passing to him of the empires and kingdoms of the kings of the world" (pp. 25—29 of the text contained in this volume = ff. 32a—33b of vol. III of the Paris MS. of the *Masālik*, Fonds arabe, 2325). Also the section entitled "Account of the laws framed by Chingiz Khān after his rise, and the judgements which he executed" (pp. 16—25 of this text = ff. 33b—36b of vol. III of the above-mentioned MS. of the *Masālik*). Also, in an abridged form, the section entitled "Account of the sons of Chingiz Khān" (pp. 29—32 of this text = ff. 36b—37a of vol. III of the *Masālik*).

The *Tārīkh-i-Guzida*, *Tārīkh-i-Banākati*, *Rawḍatu's-Ṣafā*, *Ḥabību's-Siyar* and other later histories all make extensive use of the *Jahān-gushāy* in dealing with the period of which it treats, and indeed it is becoming more and more clear that for the history of the Mongols, Khwārazmshāhs and Assassins the only original Persian sources with which we have to reckon are this work, its continuation by Waṣṣāf, and the *Jāmi'u't-Tawārīkh*.

Plan and arrangement of the Jahān-gushāy.

It has already been shown that the *Jahān-gushāy* consists of three volumes, not four, as M. Blochet has supposed, nor two, as Quatremère and others have imagined; and we shall

1) Such instances occur on pp. 75 and 148 of Derenbourg's edition of *al-Fakhrī*.

the Khwárazmsháhs and in Persia, and the anecdotes of Ogotáy Khán's doings) almost unchanged.

So also Abu'l-Faraj Gregorius b. Ahrún of Marágha, the Christian physician of Malatya, better known as Bar Hebraeus, who was a contemporary of the author of the *Fahán-gusháy* and died in A. H. 685 (= A. D. 1286—7), describes the "Book of 'Alá'u'd-Dín", *i. e.* the *Ta'rikh-i-Fahán-gusháy*, as incomparable in its own field, and adds that he has borrowed from it all that he has incorporated in his own Chronicle ¹⁾ concerning the Khwárazmsháhs, Isma'ílís and Mongols ²⁾. The same writer has also incorporated (though without acknowledgment) large portions of the *Fahán-gusháy* (sometimes abridged, sometimes *in extenso*) in the smaller Arabic history ³⁾ in which he reproduced in a condensed form the contents of his earlier and larger Syriac Chronicle, and, indeed, in all that concerns the Mongols, the Khwárazmsháhs and the Assassins down to A. H. 655 the *Fahán-gusháy* seems to have been his chief if not his only source.

So also Şafiyu'd-Dín Muḥammad b. 'Alí b. Muḥammad b. Ṭabátabá, known as Ibnu'ṭ-Ṭiqṭaqí, the author of the *Kitábu'l-Fakhrí* (composed in A. H. 701 = A. D. 1301—2) ⁴⁾

1) This is the general history of the world composed in Syriac and generally known as the *Chronicon Syriacum*. It was published with a Latin translation by Bruns and Kirsch at Leipzig in A. D. 1789, and again in Paris, without a translation, by le Père Bedjan, a Chaldaean Christian, in A. D. 1890.

2) See Quatremère's article in the *Mémoires d'Orient*, p. 235, where the passage in question, occurring on p. 574 of the Leipzig edition of the *Chronicon Syriacum*, is discussed.

3) This book, entitled *Mukhtasaru'd-Duwal*, covers a period extending from the creation of the world down to A. H. 683 (= A. D. 1284—5), *i. e.* to the reign of Arghún b. Abáqá b. Hülágú, the last important event mentioned being the death of our Author's brother, Shamsu'd-Dín Juwayní. The text has been printed at Oxford with a Latin translation in A. D. 1663, and again by the Jesuits at Beyrout in A. D. 1890. A list of the passages taken from the *Fahán-gusháy* is given in the foot-note on pp. LXXIX—LXXX (ع—ط) of the Persian Introduction.

4) See p. xx *supra*, *ad calc.*

enjoyed of obtaining the most accurate information about the subjects on which he wrote (as has been already set forth in considerable detail in an earlier part of this Introduction), attained from the very moment of its publication, if this expression may be allowed in the case of a manuscript work, a great celebrity, won the approbation of all, and was universally regarded by the best judges as authoritative and trustworthy in the highest degree. Hence most historians, whether contemporary with or subsequent to the author, have explicitly cited his work and have regarded it as one of the most authoritative of their sources for the period of which it treats.

Thus 'Abdu'lláh b. Faḍlu'lláh of Shíráz, the author of the *Ta'rikh-i-Waṣṣáḥ*, which was composed during the years A. H. 699—728 (= A. D. 1300—1328), included in the fourth volume of his work a complete abridgement of all three volumes of the *Jahán-gusháy*, of which his own work is, as stated a little further back, a continuation. Moreover in his Preface (p. 6) he praises it and its author in the highest terms, and says:

*"I am naught but a drop from a cloud,
Even though I should compose a thousand books".*

So also Rashídu'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh, who was Prime Minister to Gházán and 'Uljáytú successively, included in his great history, the *Jámi'u't-Tawárikh* completed about A. H. 710 (= A. D. 1310—11), practically the whole contents of the three volumes of the *Jahán-gusháy*, condensing some portions (such as the history of the Mongol governors of Khurásán and other provinces of Persia, and the history of the Khwárazmsháhs), expanding others, (such as the history of Chingiz Khán's youth and of his sons and grandsons, and the history of the Assassins), and leaving others (such as the history of Chingiz Khán's conquests in the domains of

A. D. 1258) to 728 (= A. D. 1327—8), it follows that the *Jahán-gusháy* ends with the year A. H. 655 (= A. D. 1257). Fifthly, the *Ta'rikh-i-Waṣṣáf* contains, at the end of the fourth volume, an abridgement of the whole of the *Jahán-gusháy*, which abridgement likewise ends with the destruction of the Assassins in A. H. 655 (Bombay ed., pp. 558—591). In short, M. Blochet's hypothesis rests on no other foundation than the colophon of an evidently illiterate copyist at the end of the tract in question to the effect that "here ends the book known as the *Ta'rikh-i-Jahán-gusháy* of Júní" (*sic*, for Juwayni), an error which probably arose from some dislocation or transposition of pages in the original from which he copied. Since, however, M. Blochet's supposition as to the existence of a fourth volume of the *Jahán-gusháy* has given rise to some confusion and doubt in the minds of other Orientalists, it seemed desirable to discuss it in a somewhat detailed manner.

II. ACCOUNT OF THE TA'RIKH-I-JAHAN-GUSHAY.

Having spoken of the Author and his family, times and circumstances, something more must now be said as to the history which is his *magnum opus*, and this will be arranged under the four following headings. (1) Fame of the *Jahán-gusháy* from the very time of its compilation onwards; (2) its plan and arrangement; (3) the date of its composition; (4) the manuscripts of the work on which the present text is based.

(1) *Fame of the Jahán-gusháy from the very time of its compilation.*

The *Jahán-gusháy*, by virtue of the importance of its contents (namely the history of the Mongols, the Khwárazmshahs and the Assassins), the absence of any other contemporary work dealing with these subjects, and the high position of the author and the unique opportunities which he

events round which the autobiographical details set forth in the tract in question chiefly centre, took place in A. H. 681 (= A. D. 1282—3), *i. e.* 26 years later. Even assuming, therefore, that the tract formed part of the *Jahân-gushây* it would have to be regarded as the whole or a part of a later volume, the fifth or sixth, of that work; for what historian writing so detailed a monograph as the *Jahân-gushây* would omit 27 years which saw events so important as the capture of Baghdád and the destruction of the Caliphate, and included the end of Húlágú's reign and the whole reign of Abaqué? Moreover the tract in question, as already pointed out, is entirely concerned with the personal adventures of the author, 'Alá'u'd-Din, during the first half of the year A. H. 681, not with the general history of even this period, and is in fact a work of an entirely different character, autobiographical rather than historical. *Secondly*, the fact that Naşiru'd-Din Túst, who was a contemporary of our Author, and was with him in attendance on Húlágú during the operations against Baghdad, himself added to the *Jahân-gushây* an appendix containing a brief account of those operations which is found in some but not all MSS. of that work seems to show conclusively that he regarded the *Jahân-gushây*, the work of his colleague and contemporary, as ending with the extirpation of the Assassins, and knew of no further continuation by the Author. *Thirdly*, the author of the *Ta'rikh-i-Waṣṣaf*, who was also a contemporary of our Author, explicitly describes ¹⁾ the *Jahân-gushây* as an account of the Mongol Empire and the states contemporary with it "from the first conquests of Chingiz Khán until the extirpation of the Assassins". *Fourthly*, the same historian explicitly describes his work as a continuation of the *Jahân-gushây*, and since the period with which he deals extends from A. H. 656 (=

1) P. 4 of the Bombay edition. The text of the passage in question is cited in the foot-note on p. LXXV (47) of the Persian Introduction.

is actually the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* is proved by the following considerations.

(1) In the second nameless tract, also by our Author, which forms the continuation of the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân*, explicit reference is made to the title and contents of the latter on ff. 3a, 12b, 25a, etc., as is fully set forth, with citations, in the note at the foot of pp. LXXIII—LXXIV (ع—د) of the Persian Introduction. In these passages the Author quotes certain phrases as having been used by him in the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân*, which phrases, or others equivalent or almost identical, actually occur in the tract at the end of *Suppl. persan 1556*.

(2) The authors of the *Ta'rikh-i-Wassaf* and the *Kazehatü's-Safâ* both explicitly cite passages as from the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* which actually occur in the tract which we are discussing.

The second tract, which, as already stated, forms the continuation of the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân*, but has no special title, carries the narrative of events down to the accession of Sultan Ahmad Takudar and the execution of Majdu'l-Mulk, and was written by our Author only some six months before his death. The only known copy of it is contained in one of the Paris MSS. of the *Jahan-gushây* (*Suppl. persan. 206, ff. 1b—41b*). M. Blochet in his Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale (pp. 278—280) supposes that the *Jahan-gushây* comprised four volumes, of which he assumes this tract to be the fourth "containing an account of the events which took place in the Persian provinces of the Mongol Empire down to the year 681 (= A. D. 1282—3) of the *hijra*". That this assumption is incorrect is obvious from the following considerations. *First*, the third volume of the *Jahan-gushây* ends with the extirpation of the Assassins in A. H. 655 (= A. D. 1257), while the death of Abâqâ Khan and accession of Sultan Ahmad, which are the public

Other works of the Author.

Besides the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* and its untitled continuation, the contents of both of which have been already summarized and concerning which something still remains to be said, the only writings of the Author of the *Tâ'rikh-i-Jahân-gushây* known to us are certain letters, *farmâns* and other state papers contained in a collection of the epistles of his great-grandfather's maternal uncle Muntajabu'd-Dîn Badî' al-Kâtib al-Juwaynî ¹⁾, represented by a manuscript in the *Institut des langues orientales* at St. Petersburg described by Baron Victor Rosen in his Catalogue of the Persian MSS. of that library, p. 158. In this MS. the letters of our Author occupy fourteen leaves, viz. ff. 178a—192a.

Quatremère (*Mines d'Orient*, p. 234) seems to have assumed that the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* (which he had not seen) was written in Arabic, whereas both it and its untitled continuation are in Persian, though, like the *Jahân-gushây*, many Arabic verses and proverbs are embodied in them. Schefer, to whom the MS. of the *Jahân-gushây* (now belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale and bearing the class-mark *Suppl. persan 1556i* which contains (on ff. 220b—231a) the text of the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* formerly belonged, seems to have misread the title as *Tathlithü'l-Ikhwân*, for he translates it (*Chrestomathie Persan*, vol. ii, p. 150 of the French portion) as "La Trinité des Frères", while he ascribes the text of what is undoubtedly the *Tasliyatü'l-Ikhwân* to Shamsu'd-Dîn Juwaynî, calls it *Tabšira-i-Khâzin* (*Ibid.*, pp. 152—4), and says that Shamsu'd-Dîn wrote it in A. H. 680 (= A. D. 1281—2) as an autobiographical memoir and sent it to 'Uljâý Khâtun, the wife of Abâqâ Khân, in order that she might lay it before her royal spouse, all of which statements are incorrect. That the tract at the end of *Suppl. persan 1556*

1) See pp. 33—331 *infra*.

The substance of the second anecdote is that on his return from the Pilgrimage Sa'dí went to Tabríz, wishing to see the two brothers, Shamsu'd-Dín and 'Alá'u'd-Dín, to whom he was indebted for so many favours. One day he met them riding in attendance on Abáqá. As soon as they saw him, they alighted from their horses, kissed his hands and feet and the ground before him, and expressed the greatest pleasure at meeting him. Abáqá was much astonished at their deferential bearing towards one who was ostensibly a stranger of no great rank, and enquired who he was. They informed him that this was the famous poet Sa'dí. Abáqá then called the poet to him and requested of him some counsel or admonition. "From this world to the next", replied Sa'dí, "one can carry nothing save reward or retribution, between which you are now empowered to choose". Abáqá requested the poet to express this idea in verse, which he did (p. LXXI of the Persian Introduction, lines 11—12). Abáqá thereupon burst into tears, exclaiming several times, "Am I a shepherd of the people or not?" and each time Sa'dí replied, "If thou art a shepherd, then the first verse applies to thee; but if not, the second."

In the opinion of the editor, Mírzá Muḥammad, both these stories are intrinsically improbable, and are at any rate exaggerated, if not totally unfounded; for the humble and deferential tone adopted by the poet (as exemplified by several quotations from his poems given on pp. LXXI—LXXII of the Persian Introduction) little accords with the extraordinary reverence shown him by the two Juwayní brothers in the anecdote; while it is most unlikely that he would venture to address to a heathen monarch like Abáqá such a verse as that referred to in the last paragraph.

of our author and his brother Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad. Of these, six are cited and extracts from them given by the editor Mirzā Muḥammad (pp. LXXvii—LXX of the Persian Introduction), the most celebrated of them, accounted one of the finest of Sa'dī's *qaṣīdas*, being that which begins:

بهیچ بار منده خاطر و بهیچ دبار ، که بر و بحر فراخ است و آدی بسیار

Moreover in the Preface prefixed to the *Kullīyyāt* or collected works of Sa'dī by 'Alī b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr in the year A. H. 734 (= A. D. 1333—4) are contained two anecdotes bearing on the relations which existed between the poet and the two brothers 'Alā'u'd-Dīn and Shamsu'd-Dīn, of which the substance is as follows.

Once upon a time Shamsu'd-Dīn Juwaynī sent to Sa'dī a present of five hundred *dinārs*. The servant who brought the gift appropriated one hundred and fifty *dinārs* of this amount. Sa'dī, suspecting what had happened, thanked the sender in two verses of which the text is given on p. LXX of the Persian Introduction, lines 15—16, and of which the translation is as follows:

"Sir, thou did'st send me a robe of honour and wealth:
May thy wealth be increased and thy foe trampled under foot!
May'st thou have a year of life for every *dīnār*,
So that thou may'st live three hundred and fifty years!"

'Alā'u'd-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik then sent to Sa'dī an order on Jalālu'd-Dīn *Khutani* (who was then at Shirāz) for ten thousand *dinārs*, but it happened that when it arrived there Jalālu'd-Dīn had already been dead for some days. Sa'dī thereupon sent some verses to 'Alā'u'd-Dīn, and Shamsu'd-Dīn at once ordered fifty thousand *dinārs* to be paid to the poet, begging him to accept it, and to make provision with it in Shirāz for travellers. Sa'dī, having read this message, accepted the money, and with it built a resthouse called *Ribāṭ-i-Qal'a-i-Qūhandiz*.

and dedicated, as its title implies, to Sharafu'd-Dīn Hārūn, son of Shamsu'd-Dīn Juwaynī, a manuscript (Fonds arabe, 2479) is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

Another eminent scholar patronized by the Juwaynī family was Kamālu'd-Dīn Mitham b. 'Alī b. Mitham al-Bahrānī, who dedicated his commentary on the *Nahju'l-Balāgha*¹⁾ to 'Alā'u'd-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik, and died in A. H. 679 (= A. D. 1280—81).

Another was the Qāḍī Nizāmu'd-Dīn Iṣfahānī, author of the *Shurafu Ayywāni'l-Bayān fi Sharafi Bayti Ṣāhibi'd-Diwān*, a collection of poems in praise of Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, his brother 'Alā'u'd-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik, and their father Bahā'u'd-Dīn Muḥammad, together with a few poems composed by themselves.

Another was Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad b. Naṣru'ilāh b. Rajab, known as Ibnu's-Ṣayqal al-Jazari, who dedicated to this family his *Maqāmāt-i-Zaynabiyya*, an imitation of the *Maqāmāt* of Ḥarīri containing fifty *Maqāmas* or "Séances", for which he received a reward of one thousand *dinars*²⁾.

Of the famous poets who sung the praises of this noble family was Humāmu'd-Dīn of Tabriz, whose *Diwān* is filled with panegyrics of them, and who dedicated to Sharafu'd-Dīn Hārūn, the son of Shamsu'd-Dīn Juwaynī, his *mathnawi* love-poem entitled *Ṣuḥbat-nāma*, written in the same metre (hexameter *hazaj*) as the *Khusraw wa Shirin* of Nizāmī.

Still more eminent than the last-mentioned was the great Shaykh Sa'dī of Shirāz, who has several fine *qaṣidas* in praise

1) See the preface to the Tīhrān edition of this work; the seventh *Majlis* of Qāḍī Nūru'lāh Shushtari's *Majālisu'l-Mū'minīn*; Ḥājjī Khalifa *s. v. Nahju'l-Balāgha*; and the *Rawḍatu'l-Jannāt* of Aqā Muḥammad Bāqī Khwānsārī (ed. Tīhrān, vol. IV, pp. 142—4).

2) Ḥājjī Khalifa (*s. v. al-Maqāmātu'z-Zaynabiyya*) gives the author's name as Ma'add instead of Muḥammad. It is not clear from what auh-Dhahabī says whether the work in question was dedicated to both brothers or to one only. For a MS. of this work, see the old Arabic Catalogue of the British Museum, p. 319, N^o. 669.

Tarjuma-i-Thamara-i-Baṭlamiyūs ¹⁾, to his son Bahá'u'd-Dín Muḥammad, governor of Iṣfahán and 'Iráq-i-'Ajam.

Another eminent *protégé* of the Juwayní family was Ṣafíyyu 'd-Dín 'Abdu'l-Mú'min b. Yúsus b. Fákhir al-Urmawí, especially celebrated for his skill in music and calligraphy. In the former art Ibn Taghrí-bardí declares him to have been excelled by none since the days of Iṣhâq b. Ibráhim al-Mawṣilí, the boon-companion of Hárúnu'r-Rashíd, while in the latter he is placed on a level with such masters of the art as Yáqút and Ibn Muqla. He was one of the librarians and copyists of the unfortunate al-Musta'ṣim bi'lláh, the last of the 'Abbásid Caliphs, and was his minstrel and boon-companion, receiving for his services 5000 *dinárs* a year. After the fall of Baghdád he entered the service of Húlágú, who, charmed by his skill on the lute, doubled his salary, granting him 10,000 *dinárs* a year from the revenues of Baghdád. Later he attached himself to our Author and his brother Shamsu'd-Dín Ṣáhib-Dívân, and was placed in charge of the *Dívân-i-Inshá*, or Correspondence Bureau, of Baghdád. His fortune, however, declined with that of his patrons, and after their destruction he fell into such poverty that he was imprisoned on account of a debt of 300 *dinárs* which he was unable to pay, and died in prison on Ṣafar 28, A. H. 693 (= Jan. 28, 1294). He was very extravagant, sometimes spending when he entertained his friends as much as four thousand *dirhams* on fruits and perfumes alone ²⁾.

Of one of his works on music, entitled *Risála-i-Sharafiyya*

1) This work was completed on the 9th of Jumáda i, A. H. 670 (= Dec. 13, 1271), and a manuscript of it transcribed within a year of that date (Rabí' i, A. H. 671) is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Fonds Arabe, 4731, ff. 1—61).

2) Ṣafíyyu'd-Dín's biography is given in Ibn Shákir al-Kutubi's *Fawátu'l-Wafayát* (Buláq ed., vol. ii, pp. 18—19); Ibn Taghrí-bardí's *al-Manhalu'l-Sáfi*, vol. iv, under the letter 'ayn (ع); the *Ta'rikh-i-Wassáf* (ed. Bombay, pp. 43, 55, 61, 65); the *Kitábu'l-Fakhrí*, (ed. Derenbourg, pp. 74, 449—51) etc.

of the Muḥammadan faith. The Shaykh enjoyed high honour during his life-time and died in A. H. 722 (= A. D. 1322)¹. The poet Humámu'd-Dīn of Tabríz composed several poems in his honour.

Mention of certain poets and men of learning specially attached to this family.

The Juwaynī family were under the Mongols comparable in wealth, power and patronage of talent to the House of Barmak (or "Barmecides") under the 'Abbásid Caliphs, and many eminent doctors and poets frequented their assemblies; while, like the Barmecides, they too suddenly fell from their sovereign's favour and were almost extirpated. Adh-Dhahabī says in his *Ta'rikhu'l-Islám* that every author who dedicated a book to them received a thousand *dinárs* in gold, while on one occasion when Abáqá came to Baghdád they made great entertainments in his honour and gave away more than a thousand separate presents. Hence the number of poets, scholars and writers who sought their patronage and favour was very great, and only a few of the most notable can be here mentioned.

Amongst these the celebrated astronomer and philosopher Naṣīru'd-Dīn Ṭúsi (d. A. H. 672 = A. D. 1273-4) deserves the first mention. He composed a Persian treatise on the biographies of the Saints and the conduct of pilgrims on the Mystic Path entitled *Arwa'áfu'l-Ashráf* ("Traits of the Noble"), and dedicated it to Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī; and dedicated another Persian treatise on astronomy, entitled

¹ His biography (of which an abridgement is given above) is contained in Ibn Taghrī-bardī's *al-Manhal as-Ṣáfi*, and particulars concerning his ancestors, gleaned from Ibnu'l-Athír, the *Táju'l-'Arús*, the *Nafaḥātu'l-Uns*, etc., are given at the foot of p. LXIII (٤٣) of the Persian Introduction. The form *Ḥammúya* is correct, while *Ḥamawí* (the *nisba* from the Syrian town of Ḥamát) is a vulgar error.

‘Abbás Aḥmad, son of the last ‘Abbásid Caliph al-Musta‘šim-bi’lláh, and on his marriage with this lady, who was known as “*Sayyida-i-Nabawiyya*”, he gave her a dowry of 100,000 *dinárs* of gold. She bore him several children, whom he named after some of the most celebrated of the Caliphs, such as ‘Abdu’lláh al-Ma’mún, Aḥmad al-Amin, Zubayda, etc. He also was put to death by Arghún, in consequence of malicious accusations brought against him by Khwája Fakhru’d-Dín Mustawfí of Qazwín, the cousin of Ḥamdu’lláh Mustawfí, author of the *Ta’rikh-i-Guzida*, in the month of Jumáda ii, A. H. 685 (= July—August, 1286), while, by a strange coincidence, his wife, “*Sayyida-i-Nabawiyya*”, died on the same day, neither being aware of the other’s death¹).

Khwája Bahá’u’d-Dín Muḥammad, another son of Shamsu’d-Dín, who during Abáqá’s reign was governor of Iṣfahán and the greater part of ‘Iráq-i-‘Ajam, died a natural death during his father’s life-time. He was masterful, unforgiving, and merciless in the shedding of blood. A pretty full biography of him is contained in the *Ta’rikh-i-Waṣṣáf* (Bombay ed., pp. 60—66).

One of the daughters of our Author was married in A. H. 671 (= A. D. 1272—3) to the eminent Šúfi Shaykh Šadru’d-Dín Abu’l-Majámi‘ Ibráhím b. Shaykh Sa‘du’d-Dín Muḥammad b. al-Mu‘ayyad b. Abí Bakr b. Muḥammad b. Ḥammúya al-Juwayni ash-Sháfi‘í, and was given by him a dowry of 5000 *dinárs* of gold. This Shaykh Šadru’d-Dín-i-Ḥammúya was he who was instrumental, aided by the Amír Nawrúz, in converting to Islám Gházán Khán, and some hundred thousand of his captains, nobles and followers, in A. H. 694 (= A. D. 1294—5), from which time onwards the Mongol sovereigns of Persia abandoned their original paganism in favour

1) These particulars are supplied by Ibn Taghrí-bardí (Paris MS., Fonds Arabe 2070, ff. 77b—78a). The text of the passage in question is given at the foot of p. LXII (سپ) of the Persian Introduction.

for a period of nearly 22 years (A. H. 661—683 = A. D. 1263—1284), the Prime Minister and most influential person after the actual ruler in Persia. His control, indeed, which was almost absolute, exceeded even these limits, and included, besides Persia, Asia Minor and part of India and Syria. His wealth was such that his daily income was estimated at one *tumán* of gold, *i. e.* 10,000 *dinárs*; while his patronage of poets and men of learning, and his generosity towards them, are a favourite theme of contemporary writers. Finally, after a life of honour and happiness, he was put to death at Ahar (in Qarájá-Dágh of Adharbáyján) in the reign and by the command of Arghún on the 4th of Sha'bán, A. H. 683 (= October 16, 1284). His four sons, Yaḥyá, Faraju'lláh, Mas'úd and Atábek, shortly afterwards suffered the same fate, while his grandson 'Alí, the son of Khwája Bahá'u'd-Dín b. Shamsu'd-Dín, was put to death at Káshán in A. H. 688 (= A. D. 1289), and his tomb afterwards became a place of pilgrimage. Maḥmúd, the brother of the 'Alí just mentioned, became afflicted with palpitation of the heart in consequence of the fear which weighed upon him, and died at the end of Gay-Khátú's reign; while Manşúr, our Author's son, was in the same year brought from Iḥilla to Baghdád, and executed on the bridge there. All the sons of Shamsu'd-Dín perished except Zakariyyá, who was at Abkháiz. When the author of the *Ta'rikk-i-Waṣṣá'f* was in Tabríz in A. H. 692 (= A. D. 1293) he visited the tombs of Shamsu'd-Dín, his brother 'Alá'u'd-Dín 'Aṭá Malik (our Author), and their seven sons in the cemetery of Charandáb; and he quotes in his history some affecting verses in Arabic composed in commemoration of their sad fate by a contemporary man of letters.

Sharafu'd-Dín Hárún, another son of Shamsu'd-Dín, was reckoned one of the most accomplished men of his age, and was a great patron of men of learning of all classes. He was married to Rábī'a, the daughter of the *Walli-ahd* Abu'l-

‘Alá’u’d-Dín were the special favourites and trusted advisers of Sultán Aḥmad, they naturally incurred the hatred of Arghún. Moreover it was still widely believed, in spite of the disgrace and death of Majdu’l-Mulk, that Shamsu’d-Dín had poisoned Abáqá. In the year A. H. 681 (= A. D. 1282—3) when Arghún went from Khurásán to Baghdád to winter there, he revived the charge of embezzlement which had been made against ‘Alá’u’d-Dín in the reign of his father Abáqá, and proceeded to arrest and torment his agents. One of these, Najmu’d-Dín Aşfar (or Aşghar) who had recently died he exhumed, and ordered his body to be cast out on the road. ‘Alá’u’d-Dín was greatly distressed and vexed at this, and was attacked by a violent headache, which shortly caused his death. Adh-Dhahabí states, however, that his death was caused by a fall from his horse. Be this as it may, he died at Mughán on the 4th of Dhu’l-Hijja, A. H. 681¹⁾ (= March 5, 1283), and was buried at Tabríz in the Charandáb cemetery. His nephew Hárún b. Shamsu’d-Dín was appointed by Sultán Aḥmad to succeed him as governor of Baghdád.

The fate of the remaining members of this illustrious family, all of whom were put to death by Arghún on his accession to the throne, is somewhat beyond the scope of this Introduction, but, for the information of the reader, will be summarily indicated.

*A brief Account of the remaining members of the
Author's family.*

Our Author's brother, Shamsu'd-Dín Muḥammad Juwayní, was during the latter period of the reign of Húlágú and the entire reigns of his sons Abáqá and Takúdar, that is to say

1) This date, given in the *Jámí'u't-Tawárikh*, the *Ta'rikh-i-Gusida* and the *Ta'rikh-i-Waqqáf*, and also by adh-Dhahabí and Ibn Taghrí-bardí, is probably the correct one, but a number of other historians and biographers (enumerated in Note 5 at the foot of p. LIX of the Persian Introduction) give A. H. 680, and others A. H. 683.

saying that they had orders to keep guard over him that night so that the case might be further enquired into on the morrow. Then many of those who were present regretted that they had not made more haste to take their vengeance on their foe, and as he was led forth a number of persons, both Mongols and Musulmáns, fell upon him, even wounding one another in their struggle to reach him, tore and hacked him to pieces, and even roasted and ate portions of his flesh. Then they dismembered his body and sent each of his limb to a different town, his head to Baghdád, his hand to 'Iráq, and his foot to Fárs, while one bought his tongue for a hundred *dinárs* and brought it to Tabríz. On this tragic event the following well-known quatrain was composed:

*"For some brief days thy guile did mischief wreak;
Position, wealth and increase thou didst seek:
Now every limb of thine a land hath ta'en;
Thou 'st overrun the kingdom in a week!"*

Majdu'l-Mulk's partisans and dependents, amongst whom were many Christians, were sent from Alá-Dágh, where he met his fate, to Baghdád, where, as soon as they entered the gates, they were set upon by the populace and stoned or stabbed to death, after which their bodies were burned in the market-place.

Here ends the second of the two tracts of which the contents have been given above, the last event recorded being the destruction of Majdu'l-Mulk, which according to the *Jámi'u't-Tawárikh*, took place on Wednesday the eighth of Jumáda i, A. H. 681 (= August 14, 1282), only some six or seven months before the death of the Author, which came about in the following manner. After the accession of Takúdar b. Húlágú, known as Sulţán Aĥmad, a great enmity grew up between him and his nephew Arĥún b. Abáqá b. Húlágú, who aspired and subsequently succeeded to the throne. Since Shamsu'd-Dín the *Şáhib-Dhwán* and his brother

www.KetabFarsi.com

Dín's assailants to be imprisoned, and the State seal to be set on their goods and chattels, which were in the course of a day or two collected together in a tent. When Majdu'l-Mulk was brought before the King and asked to give an account of his proceedings, he was unable to speak for fear, and the King thereupon ordered these things to be restored to 'Alá'u'd-Dín and that in addition he should receive a reward, but he prayed that the goods might be distributed amongst those assembled at the Qúríltáy, which was accordingly done.

Amongst the effects of Majdu'l-Mulk were found some caskets containing talismans and amulets, some written in yellow and red on paper, others on pieces of lion's skin. The Mongols are very fearful of witchcraft, and many persons have suffered death on suspicion of this crime. The Mongol soothsayers and scribes (*qámán wa bakhshiyán*), after inspecting these talismans, ordered them to be soaked in water, wrung out, and the water extracted from them to be given to drink to Majdu'l-Mulk, so that any evil effect they might possess might accrue to him. He refused to drink the draught, and this refusal in itself confirmed their suspicions and was the cause of his undoing, for the Mongols, convinced that he was guilty of witchcraft, ordered him to be handed over to his enemies to be put to death by them.

As soon as Majdu'l-Mulk's condemnation became known, the Mongol soldiers began to pour in from all directions "like the thirsty in search of water or the sick in search of health", clamouring for his blood. Our author describes the struggle which went on within him as to whether he should take part in this act of vengeance, for he remembered how more than twenty years before he and his brother had saved this same man from impending calamity, and how since then he had returned nothing but evil for all the good they had done him. It was past midnight when three Mongols entered the tent where Majdu'l-Mulk was confined,

(brother of Abáqá and seventh son of Húlágú) and the release from captivity of 'Alá'u'd-Dín 'Aṭá Malik, which had been ordered by the new king as soon as he had ascended the throne. Accordingly on Saturday, Šafar 5, A. H. 681 (= May 15, 1282) he set out with the messengers, and on the fifth day reached the Royal Camp in Armenia, and accompanied the new sovereign thence to Ala-dāgh, the summer quarters of the Mongols, situated in the North of Adharbáyján, where a great *quriltáy* was held, attended by all the princes and nobles, and lasting nine days. On the conclusion of the feasting and rejoicing, the new governors were appointed to the various provinces and districts, and to our author's brother, who enjoyed the special favour of the new King, were assigned Khurásán, Mázandarán, 'Iráq, Arrán and Adharbáyján absolutely, and Asia Minor in conjunction with the Seljúq rulers. His son Hárún received Diyár Bakr, Mošul and Irbil; while our Author, 'Alá'u'd-Dín 'Aṭá Malik, was given his old government of Baghdád (the affairs of which had, since his dismissal, fallen into great disorder) and, after receiving numerous marks of the new King's favour, was ordered to proceed thither without further delay.

The new king, Aḥmad Takúdar, was also informed of the attacks of Majdu'l-Mulk and his partisans on 'Alá'u'd-Dín's property and possessions, and learned that no portion of the sums so obtained had found its way into the Imperial Treasury, but that all had been retained by the aggressors. He therefore ordered that the great nobles Súnjáq and 'Urúq should investigate the matter ¹⁾, and meanwhile caused 'Alá'u'd-

1) A fuller account of this transaction, and of the manifold intrigues of the rival parties of the Juwaynis and Majdu'l-Mulk is given in the *Jámi'u'l-Tawárikh* (Suppl. pers. 209, f. 316b). The original Persian of this passage is cited by the editor of this volume on pp. LIV—LV of the Persian Introduction, *ad calc.* Armanf Khátún, the wife of Sulṭán Aḥmad Takúdar, strove to protect Shamsu'd-Dín Šáhib-Diwin, while Arghún supported Majdu'l-Mulk, who accused his adversary of having poisoned Abáqá, and of desiring now to rid himself of all those who were in a position to give evidence against him.