

# HISTORY OF INDIA,

AS TOLD

BY ITS OWN HISTORIANS.

---

THE MUHAMMADAN PERIOD.

---

EDITED FROM THE POSTHUMOUS PAPERS  
OF THE LATE

SIR H. M. ELLIOT, K.C.B.,

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE.

BY

PROFESSOR JOHN DOWSON, M.R.A.S.,

STAFF COLLEGE, SANDHURST.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER AND CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1867.

[All rights reserved.]

NEW YORK: 1871.



PRINTED BY R. B. FORD.

## PRELIMINARY NOTE.

---

[*THESE* are not the days when the public care to listen to the minor details of an author's life; but Sir H. M. Elliot's relations and the thinned number of his personal friends—while confidently leaving his posthumous works to speak for themselves—recognise the double duty of placing on record the more prominent events of his career, and of defining under what guarantee his writings are now submitted, so to say, to a new generation of readers. The former will be found in a separate note, but to explain the origin and progressive advance of the present publication, it may be stated that after Sir Henry Elliot's death, at the Cape of Good Hope, his fragmentary papers were brought to this country by his widow. And as the introductory volume of the original work had been issued under the auspices and at the cost of the Government of the North-Western Provinces of India, the MSS.—constituting the materials already prepared for the more comprehensive undertaking in thirteen volumes—were placed at the disposal of those ever liberal promoters of Oriental literature, the Directors of the East India Company, by whom they were submitted to a Committee consisting of the late Prof. H. H. Wilson, Mr. Edward Clive Bayley, of the Bengal Civil Service, and Mr. W. H. Morley, of the Inner Temple, a gentleman who had distinguished himself as an Arabic scholar, and who was reputed to be well versed in other branches of Oriental lore. On the recommendation of this Committee, the Court of Directors readily sanctioned a grant of £500 towards the purposes of the publication, and Mr. Morley was himself entrusted with

*the editorship. Mr. Morley's circumstances, at this critical time, are understood to have been subject to important changes, so that, although he entered upon his task with full alacrity and zeal, his devotion soon slackened, and when the MSS. were returned four years afterwards, they were found to be in such an imperfectly advanced state as effectually to discourage any hasty selection of a new editor. For which reserve, indeed, there were other and more obvious reasons in the paucity of scholars available in this country, who could alike appreciate the versatile knowledge of the author, and do justice to the critical examination of his leading Oriental authorities, or other abstruse texts, where references still remained imperfect.*

*As Lady Elliot's adviser in this matter, a once official colleague of her husband's, and alike a free participator in his literary tastes, I trust that I have secured the best interests of the projected undertaking in the nomination of Professor J. Dowson, of the Staff College of Sandhurst, who has so satisfactorily completed the first volume, under the revised distribution of the work, now submitted to the public.—EDWARD THOMAS.]*



## EDITOR'S PREFACE.

---

The foregoing note has described how, sixteen years after Sir Henry Elliot's first volume was given to the world, his papers were placed in my charge for revision and publication.

My first intention was to carry out the work on the original plan, but as progress was made in the examination of the voluminous materials, the necessity of some modification became more and more apparent. The work had long been advertised under the revised title which it now bears, as contemplated by the author himself; its bibliographical character having been made subordinate to the historical. It also seemed desirable, after the lapse of so many years, to begin with new matter rather than with a reprint of the old volume. Mature consideration ended with the conviction that the book might open with fresh matter, and that it might at the same time be rendered more available as an historical record.

In the old volume, Sir H. Elliot introduced a long note upon "India as known to the Arabs during the first four centuries of the Hijri Era," and under this heading he collected nearly all the materials then within the reach of Europeans. Since that compilation was made, it has been to a great degree superseded by new and more satisfactory translations, and the work of Al Istakhrí has also become available. The translation of Al Idrísí by Jaubert was not quoted by Sir H. Elliot, but an English version of the part relating to India seemed desirable. The subject had thus outgrown the limits of an already lengthy note, and a remodelling of this portion of the book became necessary. The notices of India by the early Arab geographers form a suitable introduction to the History of the Muhammadan Empire in that country. They have accordingly been placed in chronological order at the opening of the work.

Next in date after the Geographers, and next also as regards the antiquity of the subjects dealt with, come the *Mujmalu-t Tawárikh* and the *Futúhu-l Buldán*. In the latter work, Biládurí describes in one chapter the course of the Arab conquests in Sind. The *Chach-náma* deals more fully with the same subject, and the Arabic original of this work must have been written soon after the events its records, though the Persian version, which

is alone known to us, is of later date. The Arab occupation of Sind was but temporary, it was the precursor, not the commencement, of Musulmán rule in India. On the retreat of the Arabs the government of the country reverted to native princes, and notwithstanding the successes of Mahmúd of Ghazní, the land remained practically independent until its absorption into the Empire during the reign of Akbar in 1592 A.D. Priority of date and of subject thus give the right of precedence to the Historians of Sind, while the isolation of the country and the individuality of its history require that all relating to it should be kept together. The "Early Arab Geographers," and "The Historians of Sind," have therefore been taken first in order, and they are comprised in the present volume.

So far as this volume is concerned, Sir H. Elliot's plan has been followed, and the special histories of Sind form a distinct book, but for the main portion of the work his plan will be changed. In classifying his materials as "General Histories" and "Particular Histories," Sir H. Elliot adopted the example set by previous compilers of catalogues and other bibliographical works, but he sometimes found it convenient to depart from this division. Thus the *Kámilu-t Tawárikh* of Ibn Asír and the *Nizámu-t Tawárikh* of Baizáwí, are general histories, but they are classed among the particular histories, be-

cause they were written shortly after the fall of the Ghaznivides, and their notices of India are confined almost exclusively to that dynasty.

The great objection to this arrangement in an historical work is that it separates, more than necessary, materials relating to the same person and the same subject. Thus the *Tárikh-i Badáúní* of 'Abdu-l Kádir is particularly valuable for the details it gives of the reign and character of Akbar under whom the writer lived. But this is a general history, and so would be far removed from the *Akbar-náma* of Abú-l Fazl, which is a special history comprising only the reign of Akbar. A simple chronological succession, irrespective of the general or special character of the different works, seems with the single exception of the Sindian writers to be the most convenient historical arrangement, and it will therefore be adopted in the subsequent volumes. This plan will not entirely obviate the objection above noticed, but it will tend g to its diminution.

Upon examining the mass of materials left by Sir H. Elliot the bibliographical notices were found for the most part written or sketched out, but with many additional notes and references to be used in a final revision. The Extracts intended to be printed were, with some important exceptions, translated; and where translations had not been prepared, the passages required were generally,

though not always, indicated. The translations are in many different hands. Some few are in Sir H. Elliot's own handwriting, others were made by different English officers, but the majority of them seem to have been the work of *munshis*. With the exception of those made by Sir H. Elliot himself, which will be noted whenever they occur, I have compared the whole of them with the original texts and the errors which I have had to correct have been innumerable and extensive. But with all my care it is to be feared that some misreadings may have escaped detection, for it is very difficult for a reviser to divest himself entirely of the colour given to a text by the original translator. In some cases it would have been easier to make entirely new translations, and many might have been made more readable; but, according to Sir H. Elliot's desire, "the versions are inelegant, as, in order to show the nature of the original, they keep as close to it as possible; and no freedom has been indulged in with the object of improving the style, sentiments, connection, or metaphors of the several passages which have been quoted:" the wide difference in the tastes of Europeans and Orientals has, however, induced me to frequently substitute plain language for the turgid metaphors and allusions of the texts.

The notes and remarks of the Editor are enclosed in brackets [ ], but the Introductory chapter on the Arab

Geographers must be looked upon as being in the main his work. Where any of Sir H. Elliot's old materials have been used and throughout in the notes, the distinctive mark of the brackets has been maintained.

The reference made by Sir H. Elliot to the works of other authors are very numerous, especially in the articles which appeared in his printed volume. Some of these references have been checked, and the passages referred to have been found to be of very little importance. They would seem to have been made for the author's rather than for general use, but still it is difficult to determine beforehand what particular part of an article may attract attention or excite opposition. I have worked under the great disadvantage of living in the country, far away from public libraries, and have been confined in great measure to the limited resources of my own library. It has thus been impracticable for me to verify many of these references or to judge of their value. I have therefore deemed it more expedient to insert the whole than to omit any which might eventually prove serviceable.

With the advertisements published before the work came into my hands, there was put forth a scheme of spelling to be observed in the reprint of Sir H. Elliot's Glossary and in this work, by which Sanskritic and Semitic words were to be made distinguishable by dia-

#### EDITOR'S PREFACE.

critical marks attached to the Roman equivalent leta. Admitting the ingenuity of the scheme, I nevertheless declined to adopt it, and so a determination was come that the long vowels only should be marked. It seems to me that this system of spelling, while it would have required a great deal of minute attention on the part of the Editor and Printer, would practically have been unheeded by the general reader, and useless to the scholar. In doubtful cases, the affiliation of a word without proofs or reasons, would have been valueless; but more than all this, the many Turanian words must have appeared with a Sanskritic or Semitic label upon them. Either too much or too little was attempted, and even if the design could be completely accomplished, a philological work like the Glossary would be a more fitting vehicle for its introduction than a book like the present.

To shorten the work as much as possible it has been determined to omit the Extracts of the original texts, but even then, it will be impossible to include the whole of the materials in the three volumes advertised.

I have throughout been anxious never to exceed my powers as Editor, but to place myself as far as possible in Sir H. Elliot's place. I have not attempted to controvert his opinions, or to advance theories of my own, but palpable errors have been corrected, and many alterations and additional notes have been introduced, which

#### EDITOR'S PREFACE.

... been rendered necessary by the advance of know-  
ledge. With the unrevised matter, I have used greater  
freedom, but it has been my constant aim to complete  
the work in a manner that its designer might have  
approved.

It only remains for me to express my obligations to  
Mr. E. Thomas for many valuable hints and suggestions.  
I am also indebted to General Cunningham for several  
important notes, which I have been careful to acknow-  
ledge *in loco*, and for placing at my disposal his valuable  
Archæological Reports, which are too little known in  
Europe, and some extracts of which appear in the  
Appendix.



## APPENDIX.

### NOTE (A).—GEOGRAPHICAL.

[Sir H. ELLIOT in his introductory remarks on Al Bírúní's geographical chapter, observed that before the time of that writer "the whole of Upper India was a perfect *terra incognita*, and the Arabians knew much less of it than Pliny and Ptolemy." The geographical extracts at the beginning of this volume, fully prove the justice of this observation. Multán, Mansúra, Alor, and other places of note in the valley of the Indus, were visited by their early travellers, and the ports upon the coast, especially those about the Gulf of Cambay, were also known from the reports of their mariners. All beyond this was vague, and evidently drawn from hearsay information. Their scanty knowledge is farther shown by the identity of much that was written on the subject. Sulaimán and Ma'súdi drew their information from the same or very similar sources; and a great part of Istakhrí's and Ibn Haukal's description is verbatim the same, so that there can be no doubt that one copied from the other. In Bírúní we have ample evidence of a much wider knowledge, not always accurate, not always intelligible at the present time, but still showing that he had acquired, either by personal travel or by diligent investigation, a fair general knowledge of the topography of Hindustan, and even of parts beyond.<sup>1</sup> Idrísí gives a full compilation from the works of his predecessors, with some additional matter from sources now lost to us, but he does not appear to have used the writings of Bírúní, and his work is blemished by many false spellings.]

<sup>1</sup> [He cannot be absolved from the blunder of having placed Thanesar in the Doab, but the further error of locating Muttra on the east of the Jumna is due to his translators. All the versions of Rashidu-d din say that the river lies on the east of the city. (وہ شرقي شہر جون افتادہ). See first edition pp. 73, 97. *Erinand's Fragments*, 62, 100.]

[Sir H. Elliot endeavoured to identify and fix the position of several of the most important and interesting of the places mentioned by the early geographers and historians, and some additions have since been made, chiefly from sources unpublished at the time when his original volume appeared. The following is an index of the notes :—

KINGDOMS.			
	PAGE.		PAGE.
The Balhará . . . . .	354	Rahrúa, Ruhmi . . . . .	361
Juzr or Jurz . . . . .	358	Kashbín . . . . .	361
Táfan . . . . .	360		
CITIES AND TOWNS.			
	PAGE.		PAGE.
Agham—The Lohána . . . . .	362	Kajuráha . . . . .	383
Alor . . . . .	363	Kállari, Annari, and Ballari . . . . .	384
Amhal, Fámhal, etc. . . . .	363	Kandábel, Tárán, Budha, Baizá . . . . .	385
Armabel . . . . .	364	Kannazbúr . . . . .	389
Askalanda . . . . .	365	Mandal, Kiraj . . . . .	390
Bániya, Bātiya . . . . .	367	Manjábari . . . . .	391
Bhambúr . . . . .	368	Minnagara . . . . .	392
Bráhmañábád, Mansúra, Mahfúza . . . . .	369	Narána . . . . .	393
Debal, Karáchi, Thatta, and Láhorí-bandar . . . . .	374	Nirán, Sakúra, Jarak . . . . .	396
Hala-kandi, the Hellenee, Pindus . . . . .	379	Sadusán . . . . .	401
Jandrúd . . . . .	380	Sámái, Tughlikábád, Kalá-kot . . . . .	401
Kaikánán, Kaikán, Kákars . . . . .	381	Sindán, Subára, Saimúr . . . . .	402
		Túr, Muhatampur, Dirak, etc. . . . .	403

### *Balhará.*

[The early Arab Geographers are unanimous in their spelling of the title "Balhará." The merchant Sulaimán says it is a title similar to the Chosroes of the Persians, and not a proper name. Ibn Khurdádba says that it signifies "King of Kings." According to Mas'údí it is a title borne by all the kings of the country, while Ibn Haukal states that it is a name derived from that of the country. Idrisi follows Ibn Khurdádba in giving to it the signification of "King of Kings," but, he adds, that the title was hereditary. Thus it seems clear that it was the general title of a dynasty, and that it must have borne some such signification as that assigned to it by Ibn Khurdádba.]

[Taking the accounts of the Arab writers, and comparing them with the Indian annals, there can be no great hesitation in identifying the "Balhará" with the dynasty settled at Ballabhi-pura, the princes of which were the founders of the Ballabhi era, and were

probably known as the Ballabhi or Ballabh Ráís. This identification, originally proposed by Colonel Tod, has met with tacit acquiescence, except from M. Reinaud, who considered the term "Balhará" to represent Málwá Rái or "King of Málwá."¹

[Ballabhi-pura was, according to Tod, "destroyed in the fifth century, by an irruption of the Parthians, Getes, Huns or Catti, or a mixture of these tribes,"² In another place he gives the date of this event from Jain records as A.D. 524.³ And in a further passage he says, that after the destruction of Ballabhi-pura, its princes "fled eastward, eventually obtaining Chitor, when the Islands of Deo and Somnath-pattan, in the division termed Larika, became the seat of government. On its destruction, in the middle of the eighth century, Anhalwára became the metropolis, and this, as recorded, endured until the fourteenth century."⁴ Hwen Tsang visited Balabhi in the seventh century, and Thomas gives the date of its destruction as 802 Samvat (745 A.D.)⁵ The ruins of the city are well known, being situate about twenty miles west of Bhowuggur, in Kattivar; and the name survives in that of the modern town of Wallay, which stands near them.⁶]

[Hindu authorities thus record the removal of the seat of government to the country of Láríke or Láta, which country Mas'údí names as being subject to the Balhará, and which the other writers describe as forming part of his dominions.]

[The capital of the Balhará is stated by Mas'údí to be "Mánkír (or Manákír) the great centre of India," and to be situated "eighty Sindi parasangs (640 miles) from the sea," a palpable exaggeration. Istakhri and Ibn Haukal say that "Mánkír is the city in which the Balhará dwells, but they do not name it in their lists of the cities of Hind. Bírúní and Idrísí make no mention of it. The unavoidable inference is that the place had fallen to decay, and was known only by tradition in the days of these Arab writers.]

[The name Mánkír or Manákír bears a suggestive resemblance to "Minagara," a city which Ptolemy places on the Nerbadda,

¹ [Rel. des Voyages, xciv. *Mem. sur l'Inde*, 138, 144.]

² [Travels I. 23.]

³ [Annals I. 217.]

⁴ [Tod, Travels I. 213.]

⁵ [Thomas' Prinsep *Useful Tables*, p. 158.]

⁶ [Journal Royal Asiatic Society, xiii. p. 146.]

among the cities of Larike. Both are probably representatives of the Sanskrit *mahá-nagara*, "great city." Mánkir is said to mean "great centre," so that the word *mahá* (great) must be represented by the first syllable *má*; and the other syllables *nakir* or *nákir* are by no means a bad Arabic transcription of "Nagara," for the alphabet would not allow of a closer version than *nakar*. In Minagara, the word *nagara*, "city" is unquestionable. Ptolemy mentions another Minagara on the East coast, somewhere near the Mahánadí river, and Arrian, in the Periplus, has another Minagara in the valley of the Indus. The syllable *mi* would therefore seem to be a common appellative, having no local or ethnological import, but corresponding with *mahá* or some similar word.]

[The bearings of Minagara and of some of the neighbouring places are thus stated by Ptolemy :—

Minagara .....	115° 15'	×	19° 30'
Barygaza Emporium (Broach) .....	113 15	×	17 20
Siripalla .....	116 30	×	21 30
Xeragere .....	116 20	×	19 50
Ozene (Ujjain).....	117 00	×	20 00
Tiatura .....	115 50	×	18 50
Nasica (Násik).....	114 00	×	17 00
Namadi fluvii fontes à monte Vindio	127 00	×	26 30
Fluvii flexio juxta Siripalla .....	116 30	×	22 00

There is a palpable error in these statements of Ptolemy, for he places Ujjain to the south of Nerbadda, and two degrees south of the bend of the river near Siripalla. But Ujjain lies to the north of the Nerbadda, and the river has no noticeable bend in this quarter. The river Mahi, however, has a very great bend; Ujjain lies to the south of it, and the respective bearings are more in agreement, so that the two rivers would here seem to have been confounded.]

[Tiatura may be Talner, and Xeragere may be Dhar, as Lassen supposes, for these are situated on well-known roads, and as General Cunningham forcibly observes, Ptolemy's geography must have been compiled from routes of merchants. Comparing the bearings of the various places, Minagara would seem to have been situated somewhere between Dhar and Broach. Lassens identifies Minagara with Balabhi-pura, but this city was situated too far west.]

[The neighbourhood of Dhar is exactly the locality in which

Idrisí would at first sight seem to place Nahrwára or Nahlwára, which he leads us to infer was the capital of the Balhará in his time. This city, he tells us, was situated eight days' journey inland from Broach through a flat country. The towns of Hanáwal (or Janáwal) and Dulka lie between them, and Dulka is situated on the river (Nerbadda) which forms the estuary on which Broach stands, and at the foot of a chain of mountains called Undaran, lying to the north. Near Hanáwal there is another town called Asáwal. This description is inconsistent, for Asáwal is an old name of Ahmadábád, and that city lies to the north far away from the Nerbadda. Abú-l Fidá seems to rectify this, for he declares Cambay to be the port of Nahrwára, which city he says is three days' journey from a port. He refers to Abú Rihán as spelling the name Nahlwára, and on turning back to page 61, it will be seen that this is his orthography. The city described by Abú Rihán and Abú-l Fidá is undoubtedly Anhalwára Pattan, and if Cambay be substituted for Broach in Idrísí's description, the account, so far as we understand it, will be consistent with itself and with the other writers. Cambay stands at the head of the bay which bears its name, between the mouths of the Sábarmatí on the west, and the Mahí on the east. Asáwal or Ahmadábád is on the left bank of the former, and the Arávallí chain of mountains lies to the north of Anhalwára. Idrísí specially mentions the bullock carriages of Nahrwára, and those of Guzerát are still famous. Lastly, no Nahrwára is known near the river Nerbadda. Thus Ptolemy and Idrísí would both seem to have confounded the river of Broach (the Nerbadda) with those of Cambay (Sábarmatí and Mahí).]

[Hwen Tsang, who travelled in India between 629 and 645 A.D., visited the kingdom of "*Fu-la-pi*" (Vallabhi), but his account does not help to settle the locality of the capital, for he only says that it was a journey of 1000 *li* (166½ miles) north from Málwá. The kings were of Kshatriya race, and were connected with the sovereigns of Kanya-kubja, the reigning monarch, Dhruva Bhatta, being son-in-law either of King Siláditya or of that king's son.]

[The "Balhará" would thus seem to represent, as Tod affirmed, the Ballabh Rájis of Ballabhi-pura who were succeeded by the Bala Rájis of Anhalwára Pattan. Their territories included the ports in the country of Látá (Lárike) on the gulf of Cambay. These ports

were frequented by Arab trading vessels, and so the accounts given of the Balhará by their geographers, vague and meagre as they are, exceed all that is recorded by them of the other cotemporary kingdoms. The extent of the Balhará's territory can only be surmised, and no doubt it underwent continual change. Mas'údí, by implication, places Tanna within his dominions, but this is farther south than would seem to be warranted. The Táptí on the south, and the Arávalli mountains on the north may perhaps represent an approximation to the real extent of the kingdom. This may appear a limited dominion for a monarch of such renown as the Arabs represent the Balhará to have been; but it must be remembered that these writers were accustomed to a simple patriarchal form of government, free from the pomp and splendour of the further east.]

[There are copper records extant showing that in the first half of the fourth century grants of land in the neighbourhood of Jambúsir were made by the Gurjjara-rájas and by the Chálukyas. The latter were of a Rajput tribe, and would then appear to have been making their way southwards to the scene of their subsequent power. In 812 A.D., just before the time of the merchant Sulaimán, a grant was made by the "Láteswara," that is, "King of Láta," but the names therein recorded have not been identified with those in any of the dynastic lists. Allowing for the omissions not unusual in such grants, there is a Dhruva who may correspond with the Dhruva Bhatta of Hwen Tsang.]

#### *Juzr or Jurz.*

[Sulaimán and Ibn Khurdádba write the name "Jurz" but the Paris edition of Mas'údí has Juzr, which the editors understand as signifying Guzerat. Abú Zaid says incidentally that Kanauj is "a large country forming the empire of Jurz;"<sup>1</sup> and relying upon this statement M. Reinaud identifies Jurz with Kanauj.<sup>2</sup> But Mas'údí locates the Bauúra at Kanauj, and speaks of Juzr as quite a distinct kingdom. Sulaimán and Mas'údí concur in making the country border on the kingdoms of the Rahma and the Balhará, and the former says that the country is situated on a tongue of land, and is rich in camels and horses. "Juzr" closely resembles the name "Guzerát," especially in its Arabic form "Juzarát" and the other

<sup>1</sup> [Ante p. 10. The Arabic text gives the name as "Juz."]

<sup>2</sup> [Rel. des Voyages, xcv. *Mém. sur l'Inde*, 206.]

known conditions are satisfied by this identification. Guzerát is a peninsula, it bordered on the dominions of the Balhará, and the horses of Kattiwár are still famous.]

[Hwen Tsang visited the "kingdoms of *Su-la-cha* or *Suráshttra*, and *Kiu-che-lo* or *Gurjjara*, after that of *Vallabhi*, but, according to his expositor, M. Vivien de St. Martin, *Su-la-cha* (*Suráshttra*) represents the modern Guzerát, and *Kiu-che-lo* (*Gurjjara*) "the country of the Gujars" between *Anhalwára* and the *Indus*. This location of the two territorial names differs from the generally received acceptation of their meaning, and rests entirely upon the expositor's interpretation of Hwen Tsang's confused statements—the only arguments adduced in its favour, being a proposed identification of *Pi-lo-mo-lo*, which Hwen Tsang gives as the name of the capital of *Kiu-che-lo*, with the modern *Bálmer*; and an ethnological theory that the Gujars might have given their name to this country in the course of their migrations. But no example of such an application of the name is adduced, and Hwen Tsang himself in another passage (p. 169) accurately describes this very country as being north of *Kiu-che-lo*, and stretching "1900 li (316½ miles), a travers des plaines sauvages et des déserts dangereux" to the river *Indus*. The Sanskrit *Suráshttra* and *Gurjjara* survive in the modern names *Surat* and *Guzerát*, and, however the territories embraced by the old terms may have varied, it is hard to conceive that *Surat* was not in *Suráshttra* nor *Guzerát* in *Gurjjara*. All evidence goes to prove that the old and modern names applied to the same places. Thus, Ptolemy's *Surastrene* comprises *Surat*, and the grants of the "Rajas of *Gurjjara*" dated in the early part of the fourth century, conveyed land in the vicinity of *Jambusara* or "Jumbooseer."—*Bírúni* (*supra* p. 67), shows what the Muhammadans understood by Guzerát in his day, and while *Guzerát* answers to the "*Juzr*," of his predecessors, the supposed "country of the Gujars" does not, for that cannot be said to be "a tongue of land."]

[The fact is that there is great confusion in this part of Hwen Tsang's itinerary, and his bearings are altogether untrustworthy. In the first volume he says, "Du cote de l'ouest ce royaume (*Suráshttra*) touche à la rivière *Mahi*;" but in vol. ii. p. 165, he says "La capitale touche du côté de l'ouest à la rivière *Mo-hi* (*Mahi*)." A very material difference. The first statement is quite in agreement with the true

position of *Suráshtra*. Hwen Tsang represents his route to have proceeded north from *Kach* to *Vallabhi*. This error, M. Vivien de Saint-Martin observes, renders it necessary to reverse the direction, and he adds, "Ceci est une correction capitale qui affecte et rectifie toute la suite de l'itinéraire." If it is thus necessary to reverse the north and south, may it not be also necessary to do the same with the east and west? No such general correction, however, will set matters right; for Hwen Tsang says correctly that he proceeded south-east from *Gurjjara* to *Ujjain*. It is curious, moreover, that M. V. de Saint-Martin does not adhere to his "correction capitale," for Hwen Tsang states that he went north from *Vallabhi* to *Gurjjara* and his expositor, places *Gurjjara* to the north, while according to his own canon it ought to be south.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Táfan.*

[Sulaimán writes the name "Táfak;" Ibn Khurdádba and Mas'údí have "Táfan." Reinaud cites also the variations "Tákan" and "Tában." Founding his opinion on the statement as to the beauty of the women, whom he supposes to be Mahrattas, Reinaud places this country in the neighbourhood of Aurangábád.\* His argument is amusing, but is untenable, for it is inconsistent with the account given of the country by the Arab writers. Mas'údí says, "Some kings have their territory in the mountains away from the sea, like the king of Kashmír, the king of Táfan, and others;" and again, "the Míhrán (Indus) comes from well-known sources in the highlands of Sind, from the country belonging to Kanauj in the kingdom of Bauūra, and from Kashmír, Kandahár and Táfan." Sulaiman says that "Táfak" lies by the side of the kingdom of Juzr, and this is inconsistent with Reinaud's view of Juzr being Kanauj and Táfak being Aurangábád; for if Juzr be Guzerát, Táfak must be placed to the north of it, as the dominions of the Balhará were on the south-east. The mountains in this direction are, first, the Arávali mountains; next, the Salt-range, and lastly, the Himalayas. In Kazwíní there is a notice of the fort of "Taifand," subdued by Mahmúd of Ghazní, in the year 1023 A.D.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Stanislas Julien's "Hiouen Thsang," Map and Mémoires Analytique. Thomas' Prinsep I. 260; Vishnu Purána, p. 177; Journal R. A. S., Vol. I. p. 247, N.S.]

<sup>2</sup> [Ecl. des Voy. ci.]

<sup>3</sup> [Ante, p. 99.]



This fort he represents as being on the summit of a mountain, to which there was only one way of access, and when taken, there were 500 elephants in the place. The names are sufficiently similar, and the descriptions point to the same locality. In the absence of more definite information, the Salt-range seems to comply most closely with what we are told about the position of Táfand.]

*Rahma or Ruhmi.*

[According to Sulaimán, this State is bordered by those of Balhará, Jurz and Táfand, and is constantly at war with the two former. Mas'údí says it stretches along the sea and continent, and is bounded inland by a kingdom called Káman. He adds that Rahma is the title of their kings, and generally their name also. They had great strength in troops, elephants, and horses. Reinaud says it "appears to correspond with the ancient kingdom of Visapour,"<sup>1</sup> but it is difficult to fix the locality of this kingdom. The name is probably the Sanskrit Ráma. The use of kauris for money, the extremely fine cotton fabrics, and the existence of the rhinoceros in the country, would point to a locality on the Bay of Bengal about Dacca and Arracan. If the neighbouring kingdom, which Mas'údí calls Káman, is the same as that which Ibn Khurdádba calls Kámrun and places on the borders of China, there can be no doubt that Kámrup or Assam is intended, and this identification, which is exceedingly probable, will confirm the locality of Dacca as the probable site of the kingdom of Rahma. The accounts of this kingdom and of Kámrup were probably gathered by the Arab writers from mariners who had visited the ports in the Bay of Bengal, and their ignorance of the interior of the country, led them to infer that the territories of the Balhará on the western coast were conterminous with those of Rahma on the eastern side.]

*Káshbín.*

[Tod identifies Káshbín with Kach Bhúj, while Reinaud supposes it to be Mysore.<sup>1</sup> All the description given of it is that it is an inland country, so that in the absence of any closely resembling Indian name, its locality is a mere matter of guess.]

<sup>1</sup> [Rel. des Voy. cii.]

*Agham.—The Lohánas.*

Agham, or Agham-kot, lies about thirty miles south-east from Haidarábád, and though now almost forgotten, it was formerly a place of some consequence. Its position is not very easily identified, and the name is rarely introduced into the maps. In Lt. Burton's it seems to be entered under the name of "Angoomanoo," and in the Quartermaster-General's map of 1850, under that of "Aghamama."

The *Deq-Lar Náma* says it is on the Rain. The *Tuhfatu-l Kírám* mentions it among the towns on the Sánkra. Capt. McMurdo says it is on the Lohána Daryá; but he strangely fixes its site at Kalákot, seven miles to the west of Thatta, observing erroneously that it is not mentioned till long after the Arab conquest. Its position may be indicated at present as lying between the Gúni and the Rain; but it does not follow that it will answer to that description next year, as the course of these streams is constantly shifting.

It is also called Agham Lohána. In the *Chach-náma*, we find frequent mention of a chief under that name, who was governor of Brahmanábád in the time of Chach. Lohána is the designation of a powerful tribe, which at that period, under an apparent confusion of terms, is said to have included both the Samma and Lákha clans. It can merely mean that they were then in a position of comparative subordination. Under all the vicissitudes the Lohánas have undergone, they still retain their credit, as well as their religion, and constitute the most influential tribe in Sind, whether regarded as merchants or officials. But, not confined within that narrow province, they have spread their ramifications beyond the western borders of India, and are found dispersed throughout Afghánistán, Buluchistán, and Arabia, exposed to inconveniences, insults, and dangers of no ordinary kind, in pursuit of their darling object of wealth, and final return to their native soil to enjoy the fruits of their industry.

The Lohánas derive their name and origin from Lohanpúr in Multán. The date of their emigration must have been very early, and even their own traditions do not attempt to fix it. Their subdivisions are said to amount at least to fifty, the chief of them being the Khudábádí and Sihwání. They all of them wear the Janco, or

Brahmanical thread. Though, for the most part, they worship the Hindu deities, a few have adopted the faith of Bábá Nának. They are described, by an accurate observer, as eating meat, addicted to spirituous liquors, not objecting to fish and onions, drinking water from the hand of their inferiors as well as superiors in caste, and being neither frequent nor regular in their devotions.

As the town of Agham is mentioned as early as the time of Muhammad Kásim, we may presume that it derived its name from the Lohána chieftain above-mentioned, who was the contemporary and opponent of Chach.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Alor.*

[This name is found in various forms—Mas'údí (p. 23) calls it Al Rúr; Ibn Khurdádba writes Al Daur (p. 14); Istakhrí has Al Rúz (p. 27), and Al Rúr (p. 28). The *Ashkalu-l Bilád* has Aldúr (p. 34), and Alrúr (p. 37); Gildemeister makes Ibn Haukal's version to be Rúz and Alrúz; Birúni's spelling is ambiguous (see p. 48); Idrísí has Dúr (p. 79). The *Marásidu-l Ittilá'* has Al Rúr.] The ruins of the town lie between Bhakkar and Khairpur, and are known by the name of Alor. Lieut. Maclagan says that it is also called Aror and that the *band* spoken of by Burnes is really an arched bridge. [There can be little doubt of the first syllable being the Arabic *al*, and the real name Rúr, as it survives in the modern town of Borí, which stands close by the ruins of Alor.]

#### *Amhal, Fámhal, Kámhal, or Mámhal.*

[The name of the border town between Sind and Hind appears in many forms. Istakhrí has Amhal, Fámhal, and Kámhal; the *Askálu-l Bilád* has Fámhal in the text, but Kámhal in the map. Gildemeister's Ibn Haukal has Kámuhul. Idrísí has Mámhal; Abú-l Fida has Kámhal, but a note states that a MS. of Ibn Haukal gives the name as Fámhal. The *Marásidu-l Ittilá'* has both Kámhal and Mámhal, giving Biládurí as authority for the latter. Careless writing and the omission of sometimes of one, sometimes of two points, will account for the various readings of Fámhal, Kámhal, and Mámhal, and taking this view of the question, Kámhal would

<sup>1</sup> Compare, *Chach-náma*, MS. pp. 39, 41, 49, 66, 144, 195, 200. *Beg-Lar-náma* MS. p. 73. *Tuhfatu-l Firám*, MS. p. 143. Captain McMurdo, *Journal of the Royal As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 24, 30, 247. Lieut. Burton, *Sindh*, pp. 314-317, 338-342.

appear to be the best reading. Looking, however, at its reported position, at two-thirds of the distance between Mansúra and Kam-báya, it would appear to answer to Anhalwára, and, if so, Istakhri's solitary reading "Amhal" is right. Wára is a common noun, signifying "field."<sup>1</sup>

*Armá-bel.*

The name of this place frequently occurs during the early period of Arab connection with Sind; but neither its orthography nor position can be established with certainty. The *Chach-náma*, in different passages, calls it Armáel, Armaná-bíl, Armapilla, and Armábel (p. 157). The *Futúhu-l buldán* has Armáil; which M. Reinaud reads Armáyl, but considers the true reading to be Armábyl, for the reason given in the note.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Khurdádba and Istakhri write Armábíl (pp. 14, 29); Ibn Haukal according to the *Ashkálu-l Bilád* has Armáil (p. 34), and Armábíl (p. 38), Gildemeister, his translator, reads it as Armáil, and suggests Armábíl as preferable.<sup>3</sup> The *Nubian Geographer* has Armíyáel and Armáyl, which his translator gives as Ermaíl (p. 77 note). The translator of *Idrisi* has the same (pp. 77 and 80). Abú-l Fidá, with his usual pretensions to accuracy, pronounces it Armábíl. The *Marásidu-l Ittilá'* has Armá-fl. Ouseley prefers Armaiel. An old and rare Persian lexicon writes it as Armábal.<sup>4</sup> The *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* has Armanbila, Armanpela, or some similar name. It is not entered in any modern map which I have seen, except that in Rees' *Cyclopædia*, where it receives the name of Ermájl, evidently derived from the map in the French or Dutch edition of Abbé Prévost's *Histoire Générale des Voyages*, Vol. xv., where it bears the same name, and is apparently set down from the statement of the Nubian Geographer. It is not in Ouseley's small map, prefixed to his *Epitome of the Ancient History of Persia*, which, however, includes some other names given only by the Arab geographers.

<sup>1</sup> [Ritter, v. 560.]

<sup>2</sup> *Candúbýl* et *Armábýl* sont peut-être l'équivalent de *Caná de Abyl*, *Arm de Abyl*. Dans cette hypothèse *Abyl* serait le nom primitif de la province. En effet, Ales-takhry et Ibn-Haukal s'accordent à dire que *Abyl*, ou un mot approchant, sert à désigner un personnage qui jadis régna sur le pays et lui donna son nom.—*Fragments*, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicia*, pp. 177 and 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Fa-hang-i Ibrahímsháhi*.

With respect to its locality, we read of Chach's going to it on his way from the Indus to Makrán, and his finding there a governor on the part of the late ruler of Sind; and we also read of Muhammad Kásim capturing it on his way from Makrán to Debal (pp. 119, 151 and 157). Istakhrí and Ibn Haukal speak of it as being in the province of Makrán, and six days' journey from Kíz, our modern Kedge. The other Arab geographers, as usual, follow these authorities.

Combining all these several names and statements together, I am disposed to consider that Armá-bel is the ancient and correct reading; and that its name is partly preserved in, while its position corresponds with, the modern Bela, the capital of the province of Las. It is placed on a considerable eminence—a strong and rocky site on the northern bank of the Purálí (the Arabis of the ancients); and, though it is now partly surrounded by a sorry mud wall, and contains only about 300 houses, there are old Muhammadan sepulchres and other vestiges of antiquity in its neighbourhood, especially about five miles to the westward, which seem to indicate its greater importance at some former period. Coins, trinkets, and funereal jars are occasionally found there; and in the nearest point of the contiguous hills, separating the province of Las from the old town of Jhow, numerous caves and rock-temples exist, ascribed by tradition to Farhád and the fairies, but which have been considered by an observant traveller to be the earthly resting abodes of the former chiefs, or governors, of the province.<sup>1</sup>

What adds much to the probability of this identification is, that Bela is mentioned in the native histories, not simply as Bela, but as Kára-Bela; showing that it has been usual to prefix another name, which is now dropped in ordinary converse.

*Askalanda.—Uhh.—Alexandria.*

The Askalanda, Asal-kanda, and Askalandra of the *Chach-náma* is the same as the Askaland and 'Askaland-Usa of the *Mujmalu-t-Tawárikh*, and the Askandra and Askanda of the *Tuhfatu-l-Kiráam*. The close correspondence of name, especially in the last instance, induces us at once to recognise it as identical with the Alexandria built at the confluence of the Acesinae with the Indus; but a little

<sup>1</sup> Masson's *Journey to Kalát*, p. 305; see also his *Travels in Balochistan*, etc., Vol. II, p. 28.

examination will show this resemblance to be more specious than real.<sup>1</sup>

The ancient kingdom of Sind was divided in four Satrapies, of which the third (v. *supra*, p. 138) comprised the fort of Askalanda and Málbar,<sup>2</sup> "which are also called Talwára and Chachpúr." It is evident, from the description of the other Satrapies, that this one contained the whole tract north-east of Alor, and south-east of the Panjnád and Ghara; almost precisely the same, in short, as the present Dáúdpútra country. Now Málbar and Chachpúr still exist, under the modernised names of Mírbar and Cháchar, close together at the very junction of the Acesines and Indus, on the eastern side of the river, opposite to Mittankot; and in them, therefore, we should have to look for Alexandria, if, which is not probable, it was on the left bank of the Indus. Consequently, Askalanda must have been higher up the river, as subsequent passages will show.

In the time of Chach (p. 141), the governor of Pábiya "south of the river Biás," fled to Askalanda, which, therefore, was not likely to have been far from, or across, that river. Again, some years after, (pp. 202, 203), we find Muhammad Kásim breaking up his camp at Pábiya,<sup>3</sup> "on the southern bank of the Biás," to go to Askalanda. It is not expressly mentioned that he crossed that river, and we may presume, therefore, that he did not. Nowhere else do we find any indication of its position; but, as will be seen in the note upon the Meds, it was the capital when Jayadratha and Dassál ruled in Sind.

Its proximity to the Biás and its name of Askaland-*Usa*<sup>4</sup> lead us to regard it as the Uchh of more modern times. That place bears marks of the most undoubted antiquity, and the absence of all mention of it in the *Chach-náma* where we are, both in the time of Chach and Muhammad Kásim, introduced to many transactions in its

<sup>1</sup> That Askaland also is a corruption of Alexandria, seems probable, from the peculiar position in Balkh and Tukháristán assigned to the Askalkand, Sikilkand, and Saklakand of the Arabian geographers.—Abu-l Fida, *Geog.*, p. 473.—Juyboll, *Marásidu-l Ittilá*, Vol. II. p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> ["Maibar" is the reading of Sir H. Elliot's MS. in this passage, but "Pábiya" is the more general spelling. See *supra*, p. 138, 140.]

<sup>3</sup> [The text has "Yábiba," but Pábiya must be meant.]

<sup>4</sup> [It is very doubtful if *Usa* is really part of the name. See note in p. 109.]

neighbourhood, can only be accounted for on the supposition that it is disguised under some other appellation.

It has been supposed, indeed, that the name of the Oxydracæ is derived from this old town of Uchh, but their position, according to Strabo and Arrian, appears rather to have been on the western side of the Acesines; and it is a curious coincidence that, in that direction also, there is another ancient Uchh, now in ruins, near the junction of the Hydaspes with that river, which offers a far more probable identification, and allows us, moreover, to assign to the Ossadii, instead of the Oxydracæ, the Uchh, or Askaland-Usa, near the junction of the Hyphasis with the Acesines. The name of the Oxydracæ assumes various forms in different authors.—*Hydracæ* in Strabo, *Syracouæ* in Diodorus, *Scydroi*, *Scothroi*, and *Scythroi* in Dionysius, *Sydraci* in Pliny, *Sygambri* in Justin, and *Oxydracæ* in Strabo, Arrian, Curtius, Stephanus, and others; but in no author are they confounded with the *Ossadii*, which constituted a separate tribe, acting entirely independent of the *Oxydracæ*.

It is certain that neither the upper nor lower Alexandria was built near the present Uchh. So cursorily, indeed, does Arrian notice the confluence near that spot, that Major Rennell and Dr. Vincent carry the Hyphasis direct into the Indus, without bringing it first into the Acesines. Nevertheless, although Alexander may himself have raised no city there, we might still be disposed to admit that the celebrity of his power and conquests may have given rise to the name of Askaland, or Askandra, did we not reflect that, if we are to put any trust in the chronology of the *Mujmalu-t-Tawdirikh*, the name must have preceded the invasion of the Grecian conqueror, and cannot therefore, independent of the other reasons above mentioned, be connected with it.<sup>1</sup>

#### Baniya.

[This name occurs in the list of the cities of Sind as given by

<sup>1</sup> Diod. Sic. *Biblioth. Hist.* xvii. 102.; Arrian, *Anab.* vi. 14, 15; Strabo, *Geog.*, xv. *Tauchnitz*, III. 252, 273; Q. Curtius, *De gest. Al.*, ix. 16, 31. *Fragments Arabes et Persans*, pp. 27, 47; *Tuhfatul Kiram*, MS. pp. 16, 17; *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 31; Vincent, *Voyage of Nearchus*, pp. 133-135; Droysen, *Geschichte Alex.*, p. 446; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. 1, p. 471; Mannert, *Geog. der Griechen und Romer*, Vol. V. Lassen, *Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, Vol. III. p. 199, and *Ind. Alterth.*, Vol. I. Müller, *Fragments Hist. Græc.*, Vol. II. p. 415; Schwanbeck, *Megasthenis Fragments*, p. 33.

Istakhri (p. 27), and the *Ashkalu-l Bilād* of Ibn Haukal (p. 34), but no description is given of the place. Idrisi says that it is a small but pleasant place, about three days' journey from Mansūra on the road to Mámhal, and so it is laid down in the maps of Istakhri and the *Ashkalu-l Bilād*. It is not mentioned by Abu-l Fidá, nor in the *Marasidu-l Ittilá'*. The *Bhāti* mentioned by Birúni at page 61, and the *Bátiya* in the *Chach-náma* (p. 174), are probably variant spellings of the same name.]

*Bhambúr.—Barbarike.*

Bhambúra, or Bhambúr, is not named in our oldest works on Sind; but it is mentioned in a modern native historian as having been captured during the Khalifat of Hárúnu-r Rashíd. It is the scene of many legendary stories of Sind; and, according to one of them, owes its destruction in a single night to the divine wrath which its ruler's sins drew down upon it. Its ruins skirt the water's edge for about a quarter of a mile, and cover a low hill almost surrounded by a plain of sand, a little to the right of the road from Karáchi to Ghára, and about two miles from the latter place. There are evident marks of its having been at one time flourishing and populous; and even now, after heavy rains, coins, ornaments, and broken vessels are found among the debris of the fort.

Coupling these manifest signs of antiquity, with the fact that the natives commonly considered Bhambúr as the oldest port in Sind, and that the legend at page 332, proves its connection with the main stream of the Indus, it may possibly represent the Barbarik Emporium of the Periplus, and the Barbari of Ptolemy; the easy conversion from the native Bhambúr into the more familiar Barbari being a highly probable result of the wanton mispronunciation to which the Greeks were so much addicted. But opposed to this is the statement of Arrian, that Barbarike was on the centre stream of the Delta, which would make Láhori-bandar its more likely representative. Perhaps in Arrian's time there may have been direct communication between the main channel and Bhambúr.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Arrian, *Periplus maris Eryth.*, pp. 22, 24; Ptolemy, *Geogr. lib. vii. c.*; Capt. McMurdo, *Journ. R. A. S.*, Vol. I. p. 25; Lt. Burton, *Sindh*, p. 389; *Tuhfatu-l Kírám*, MS. pp. 19, 166, 234.



*Bráhmaṇábád.—Mansúra.—Mahfúza.*

In the time of the native dynasties which preceded the Arabs, the capital of Lower Sind was Bráhmaṇábád.

[The old name of the place, according to Birúni, was Bahmanu or Bahmanwá. The *Ashkálul-Bilád* calls it Bámiwán (p. 34), but Ibn Haukal gives the name as "Támfrámán" according to Gilde-meister, and "Mámiwán" according to Major Anderson. Idrisi has Mirmán (p. 78), but this is obviously a blunder. In the *Chach-náma*, the name is written Báin-wáh, and in the *Túrikh-i Túhíri*, Páin-wáh. It is probably the Blámbaráwáh of the *Tuhfatul-Kiráṁ* (p. 332). Captain McMurdo writes it *Báhmaṇa*, and Briggs "Bamunwasy."]

Under its immediate government were included Nírún, Debal, the country of the Lohánas, the Lákhas, and the Sammas, and the whole southern coast. Its position, therefore, was one of great importance, and as its ruin is comparatively modern, it is surprising that so much doubt should exist with respect to its locality.

Various positions have been assigned to Bráhmaṇábád. The *Ayin-i Akbari* says the fort had 1400 bastions, and that "to this day there are considerable vestiges of this fortification;"\* but it is not said in what direction, or on which side of the river, it lay; but the mention of the bastions would seem to point out that Kalákot was probably indicated. In a passage in the *Beg-Lár-náma*, mention is made of "a place called Matáhila, near the fortress of Bráhmaṇábád, twenty *kos* distant from Nasrúpúr" (MS. p. 80). Dr. Vincent says it was within four miles of Thatta, and corresponded with Pattala,† concurring in this with D'Anville and Rennell.

Capt. McMurdo fixes it on the Púrán, afterwards called Lohána Daryá, but it is not quite plain what he means by the Lohána Daryá.† He, at any rate, altogether repudiates Thatta and Kalákot, and we must look for his Bráhmaṇábád near Nasrúpúr. "It was situated on the Lohána Daryá, at a short distance from where it separates from the Púrán." Again, "On or near the Púrán river, in what was sub-

<sup>1</sup> [Ante p. 34, 61, 189; Birúni's *Kanún*, quoted by Thomas in Prinsep, Vol. II. p. 120; Renaud, *Fragments*, pp. 41, 113; *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 61; Jour. R. A. S. I. 27; Firsiha, iv. 405; Gilde-meister, *de rebus Ind.* 164; J. A. S. Beng. xxi. p. 60.]

<sup>2</sup> Gladwin's *Ayacn Akberes*, Vol. II. p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*, Vol. I. p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> [The Falakhi river in all probability.]

sequently called the Shahdādpūr Pergana. Bāhmana was afterwards called Dībal Kāngara."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burnes fixes it at Kalākot,<sup>2</sup> and so does Sir A. Burnes.<sup>3</sup> Capt. Postans says Bhambūra, mentioning at the same timenative tradition in favour of Khudābād, a little above Haidarābād.<sup>4</sup>

There seems no reason to conclude that the Brāhmanābād, or Bahmanābād, of which we are treating, was founded by the Persian king, Bahman, upon his invasion of Sind. His city is expressly said to have been built in the province of Budha,<sup>5</sup> which never extended so far as the Indus. Nor is it probable that, had he built a city on the Indus, he would have done so on the eastern, rather than on the western, bank of that river. The fact is, that Bahmanābād is a mere abbreviated form of Brāhmanābād; and is still a very common mode of elision throughout Western India and the Dekhin, where Brāhman, in common parlance, is usually converted into Bahman.

Though the *Chach-nāma* does not anywhere expressly point out where Brāhmanābād was situated, we are at any rate assured, from several passages, that it was on the eastern side of the Indus, and this alone is sufficient to show that the speculations which have been raised, respecting the identity of Kalākot and Thatta with that old capital, rest upon no solid foundation.

We may fairly consider, in general terms, that Brāhmanābād, after being intermediately succeeded by the Arab capital Mansūra, is now represented by the modern Haidarābād; and although it may not have been upon the identical spot occupied by the modern capital, it was at least within the island, or peninsula, formed by the Falailī and the main stream of the Indus, from which the former seems to have diverged in old days at a point higher than at present. Matārī, indeed, would seem to be the most probable site of the city, with reference to the quotation given above from the *Beg-Lar-nāma*. To fix it higher up, as at Khudābād or Hāla, would take it too far from Mansūra, which we have next to consider.

Bilādurī tells us that old Brāhmanābād was about two parasangs distant from Mansūra, which, in the time of Muhammad Kāsīm, was

<sup>1</sup> *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I, pp. 23-8, 30, 38, 232.

<sup>2</sup> *Visit to the Court of Sindh*, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> *Travels into Bokhara*, Vol. III, p. 81.—*Journal R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I, p. 210.

<sup>4</sup> *Personal Observations on Sindh*, p. 161 and 163.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, p. 106.

occupied by a forest: (p. 122). When we consider the space which is always covered by the sites of old Indian towns, from the straggling mode of their erection, we are authorized to conclude that a large portion of Bráhmañabád was included in Mansúra, and that, in point of fact, the two sites are identical. The position of Haidarábád, upon a ridge of limestone hills about eighty feet high, must, from the first, have pointed out that site as a commanding one for a capital, and it has probably ever been thus occupied, by successive towns, from the first dawn of Sindian civilization. It is, indeed, on the site of Bráhmañabád that D'Anville would place the earlier Minagara, in which he is followed by Reinaud.<sup>3</sup>

The '*Ajáibu-l Makhlúkát* says that Nasrúp was built on the site of Mansúra, and the same opinion is expressed by D'Anville,<sup>3</sup> and accredited by the local information of Capt. McMurdo. Tieffenthaler,<sup>4</sup> Vincent,<sup>5</sup> Rennell,<sup>6</sup> Tod,<sup>7</sup> and Gildemeister,<sup>8</sup> misled by the mistake of Abú-l Fazl,<sup>9</sup> fix Mansúra at Bhakkar. M. Reinaud considers the testimony of Biládurí, Mas'údí, Istakhrí, Ibn Haukal, and Al Birúní to bear out D'Anville entirely in his position of Nasrúp; but the mere fact that all the geographers agree in representing a branch of the Indus as flowing by Mansúra, is quite sufficient to dislodge Nasrúp, which is twelve miles from the nearest point of the river.

Biládurí tells us that, after Hakim had built Mahfúza on the Indian side of the lake,—or body of water, whatever it may have been,<sup>10</sup>—his successor 'Amrú built Mansúra on this (the western) side, and established it as the capital. M. Reinaud says, "Mahfúza was built in the neighbourhood of the capital (Bráhmañabád), on the other side of a lake fed by the waters of the Indus." I do not find on what authority this is stated. Mansúra was, indeed, two

<sup>1</sup> De Guignes, *Notices et Extr.*, Tom. I. p. 10—Golius ad *Alfragan.*, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Eclaircissemens Géographiques*, p. 37; *Antiquité Géogr.*, p. 35.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Antiq. de l'Inde.*

<sup>4</sup> *Geogr. Besch. von Hindostan*, Vol. I. p. 81.

<sup>5</sup> *Comm. and Nav. of the Ancients*, Vol. I. p. 145.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoir*, p. 185.

<sup>7</sup> *Annals of Rajaasthan*, Vol. II. pp. 310, 338.

<sup>8</sup> *De reb. Ind.*, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Gladwin's *Ayem Akberre*, Vol. II. p. 112.

<sup>10</sup> [*Supra*, p. 126.] Allusion seems to be made to the Phitto, now dry, the Faláilí, and other streams, which, during the inundation, leave the main stream between Hála and Haidarábád.

parasangs from Bráhmańábád, and M. Reinaud is right in stating that these two latter names were often used the one for the other,<sup>1</sup>—for they are so combined and converted both by Ibn Haukal and Birúní;<sup>2</sup> but beyond the announcement that Mahfúza was on the eastern side of the *bahsira* (lake, marsh, or inundation of the Indus), and Mansúra on the western, we have nothing which indicates the true position of Mahfúza.

It appears to me that Mahfúza, and not Mansúra, is represented by Nasrpúr. Indeed, independent of the position with reference to the eastern and western side of the stream above mentioned, it is worthy of remark, that the meaning of the two names is the same—both signifying “the protected, the abode of refuge.” The identity, or resemblance of name, therefore, would be as much in favour of Mahfúza as Mansúra.

Nasrpúr, which modern authorities universally spell as Násirpúr, was built, or rather re-constructed, on the river Sánkra, by Amir Nasr, who was detached by Sultán Fíroz Sháh for that purpose, with a thousand cavalry, in 751 A.H., 1350 A.D. Nasrpúr was subsequently the favourite residence of the Tarkháns, and was greatly embellished by them during their brief rule.<sup>3</sup>

It being shown above that Mansúra is nearly identical with Bráhmańábád, it remains to prove that both are not far distant from the modern capital of Haidarábád.

Among the reasons for considering Mansúra to be identical with Haidarábád, is the position assigned to it by Istakhri and Ibn Haukal, who describe it as being “a mile long and a mile broad, and surrounded by a branch of the Indus.” This is the mode in which it is also described by Kazwíní. Notwithstanding this, it is laid down in the map of the *Ashkálu-l-Bilád*.<sup>4</sup> as being situated on the main stream. Istakhri’s map rightly locates it on the branch, but Ibn Haukals’ map, as printed by Major Anderson,<sup>5</sup> places it about midway between the two. The island, to be sure, is out of all pro-

<sup>1</sup> Mas’údí ascribes Mansúra to Mansúr, son of Jamhúr; Al Birúní, to Muhammad Kásim; but Biláduri is the best authority, and he ascribes it to ‘Amrú, the son of Mú. Kásim.—*Mémoire sur l’Inde*, pp. 193, 298.

<sup>2</sup> [*Supra*, p. 34–61.—*De rob. Ind.*, pp. 18, 19, 164.] See also Gollius ad *Alfragan.*, ex Hamza, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuhfatu-l-Kiráń*, M.S. pp. 27, 139.

<sup>4</sup> [*Supra*, p. 33.]—*De rebus Ind.* pp. 166, 215.

<sup>5</sup> J. A. S. Beng. xxi. p. 49.

portion large, but its position necessarily identifies it with that which is formed by the Falailí and the Indus,—and the space which the town is represented to have occupied is exactly that which constitutes the limestone ridge on which Haidarábád is built.

The distances laid down also by Ibn Haukal are, with one exception sufficiently correct. Thus, from Mansúra to Debal is six days' journey, which is exact,—on the supposition that Debal, as elsewhere shown, is Karáchi. From Mansúra to Túrán is fifteen days' journey, which also agrees well enough with Haidarábád. From Mansúra to Kandábel (Gandáva) is eight days' journey, which also agrees very well.—“He who travels from Mansúra to Budha must go along the banks of the Indus as far as Sihwán,”—which shows Mansúra to be close on the Indus, as, indeed, it is elsewhere expressly declared to be, and not so far removed as Nasrpúr. From Mansúra to Cambay is twelve days' journey. Here the distances are long, but the desert must have made continuous travelling indispensable, as the halting places were necessarily reduced to the smallest possible number.

The widest departure from the ordinary distance is that between Mansúra and Multán, which is set down by Ibn Haukal at only twelve days' journey. This is very rapid, considering that about four hundred miles separate them, requiring an average of thirty-three miles a day. But though the average be high, it is certainly not beyond the means of conveyance where camels are abundant, as in Sind.

Birúni lays down the distance at fifteen parasangs from Multán to Bháti, another fifteen from Bháti to Alor, and twenty from Alor to Mansúra—making the entire distance only fifty parasangs from Multán to Mansúra; while, at the same time, he gives it as thirty parasangs from Mansúra to Loharáni Bandar (p. 61). There is here also a surprising abridgment of the former distance, which, may perhaps be accounted for by considering the frontier to be reckoned from in one instance, and the capital in the other. Still, such an error or inconsistency in a space so frequently traversed, is not easily accounted for, occurring as it does in two such trustworthy authorities as Ibn Haukal and Birúni; and it would have been satisfactory to find some more plausible solution. Mas'údí, with a much nearer approach to correctness, gives the distance as seventy-

five parasangs between Multán and Mansúra, and his statement may be considered a sufficient corrective of the other geographers (p. 24).

It may be proper to add, that none of these ancient places, mentioned in this and other Notes, have sites assigned to them in any modern maps. Burnes, Wieland, Vivien de St. Martin, Berghaus, Zimmermann, all reject them. D'Avezac enters some, but all erroneously, except Debal,—at least, according to the principles above enunciated. Even Kiepert, in his valuable *Karte von Alt-Indien*, Berlin, 1853, drawn up for the illustration of Professor Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*, enters only Bráhmánábád; and that he places on the right bank of the presumed ancient course of the Sindhu, which he has laid down as flowing far to the eastward of the present Indus. As he has admitted other names more modern than these, he should not have ignored them all.

[Since the death of Sir H. Elliot the remains of a buried city, supposed to be the ancient Bráhmánábád, have been discovered and explored by Mr. A. F. Bellasis, of the Bombay Civil Service. The exact position of the ruins is stated to be forty-seven miles north-east of Haidarábád, and if their investigator is right in believing them to be the ruins of Bráhmánábád, the question of the position of that city is put at rest. The identification has presumption in its favour, though it has not yet been satisfactorily proved; and one circumstance is strongly against it:—Large numbers of coins were discovered among the ruins; but the great bulk of these were Muhammadan, and the few Hindu coins that were brought to light “seem to be casual contributions from other provinces, of no very marked uniformity or striking age.” Were the ruins those of an old Hindu city, Hindu coins of a distinct character would probably have been found. The coins discovered were those of Mansúr bin Jamhúr, Abdu-r Rahmán, Muhammad 'Abdu-lláh and Umar (see *supra*, p. 127).<sup>1</sup>]

*Debal.—Karáchi.—Thatta.—Láhori Bandar.*

It is strange that the site of a port once so noted as Debal should now be left to vague conjecture; but amongst the fluctuating channels of the Sindian Delta we must rest content with mere surmises.

<sup>1</sup> [*Illustrated London News*, Feb. 21, 28, 1857.—Thomas' Prinsep, II. 119.]

Some of the various opinions entertained upon the question of its locality may be here noticed. Native authorities seem decidedly in favour of considering Thatta to represent Debal, following generally the text of Firishta.<sup>1</sup> Mir Ma'súm ignorantly observes that Debal is 'Thatta and Láhorí Bandar.'<sup>2</sup> Abú-l Fazl is equally inexact, or rather more so.<sup>3</sup> Idrísí (*supra*, p. 77) and the Arabian geographers having determined that Debal was six stations from the mouth of the Indus, Thatta was necessarily the only site which could be selected.

Modern authors have also for the most part inclined to Thatta, including De la Rochette and Rennell. Capt. McMurdo, while he says that Thatta is still known to the Arabs by the name of Debal alone, shows that the latter must have been a seaport.<sup>4</sup> Sir A. Burnes says, also, that Thatta is called by the Arabs Dewal Sindy,<sup>5</sup> and himself assigns Kalánkot as its position.<sup>6</sup> Lieut. Burton says, we are certain that the modern Thatta occupies the ground of the ancient Dewal, as the Arabs and Persians know it by no other name,—Shál-i Debalí still being used to mean a shawl of Thatta manufacture.<sup>7</sup>

D'Anville more correctly establishes it on one of the mouths of the Indus;<sup>8</sup> and some others, resigning Thatta, have assigned other localities to Debal. M. Reinaud inclines to the neighbourhood of Karáchi;<sup>9</sup> and so does Elphinstone.<sup>10</sup> Dr. Burnes says it occupied a site between Karáchi and Thatta, in which he follows Mr. Nathaniel Crow,<sup>11</sup> one of the first of our modern enquirers in Sind, who combined much discrimination with ample opportunities of local knowledge.

But there can be no question that Debal was on, or close to, the sea-coast; with which the distant inland position of Thatta is by no means correspondent. For my own part, I entertain little doubt that Karáchi itself represents the site of Debal. . . The very name of

<sup>1</sup> Briggs, *History*, etc., Vol. IV. p. 404.    <sup>2</sup> *Tárikh-i Sind*, MS. pp. 2, 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ayem Akberce*, Vol. II. p. 115.

<sup>4</sup> *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 29, 234.

<sup>5</sup> *Travels into Bokhara*, Vol. III. p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> *Cabool*, p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> *Sindh*, p. 380.—*Unhappy Valley*, Vol. I. p. 128.

<sup>8</sup> *Antiq. de l'Inde*, p. 34.

<sup>9</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 170.

<sup>10</sup> "Dewal was probably somewhere near Karáchi."—*History of India*, Vol. I. p. 607.

<sup>11</sup> *Visit to the Court of Sind*, p. 133 and 162.

Debal, or rather Dewal, "the temple," was doubtless acquired from the conspicuous position which that object must have occupied from the sea; where it was calculated to attract the gaze and reverence of the passing mariner, like its fellow shrines of Dwáraka and Soumát; and as there is no other so eligible and commanding a spot along the whole coast of Sind, from Cape Monze to Kotesar, it is highly probable that the promontory on which fort Manora now stands is the identical site occupied by the celebrated temple which gave name to the port of Debal,<sup>1</sup> and which, as being the Palladium of its security, was the chief object of attack to the catapults which had been brought round by the sea to effect its destruction.<sup>2</sup>

The following may be mentioned amongst the reasons why Debal cannot possibly have been Thatta, and which incline us to view Karácht with favour:—

The Sarandíp vessels were, in their distress, driven to "the shore of Debal" (p. 118).<sup>3</sup> It could not, therefore, have been an inland town like Thatta, fifty miles from the nearest point of the sea, and one hundred miles by any of the tortuous channels of the Delta:

The pirates who attacked them were "dwellers at Debal, of the tribe which they call Tangámara." Now, these Tangámaras we know to have occupied the sea-coast from Karácht to Láhorí Bandar, and to be the popular heroes of several local tales—especially their Ráná 'Ubaid, who lived even as late as the year 1000 A.H. (1591 A.D.).<sup>4</sup>

Biláduri also speaks of "the Bay of Debal" (p. 116), and of the ships which had been despatched from the Persian Gulf, arriving at Debal with soldiers and mangonels (p. 120). Elphinstone considers this latter fact as decisive against Thatta;<sup>5</sup> but too much may be built on this argument, for, subsequently, we find these same mangonels carried by water even to Nairán.

Ibn Haukal says, Debal is a "large port on the shore of the sea,

<sup>1</sup> The *budd*, or temple, was contiguous to the town of Debal, not within it, (see p. 120).

<sup>2</sup> It is worthy of remark that Manora is the name of one of the celebrated Buddhist patriarchs. Abel-Rémusat writes it "Manura." M. Stanislas Julien "Manorata;" [or Sanskrit *Manoratha*.]—*Mélanges Asiatiques*, Tom. I. p. 115.—*Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. II. Beil. ii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Chuch-nima*, MS. p. 83.

<sup>4</sup> *Tuhfat-ul Kirám*, MS. p. 134.

<sup>5</sup> *History of India*, Vol. I. p. 507.



the emporium of this and the neighbouring regions. It lies to the west of the Míhrán,<sup>1</sup> and has no large trees or date-palms" (p. 37). It is indeed a place of great sterility, and only occupied on account of its trade. Nothing can be more decisive against the fertile Thatta, and in favour of the barren Karáchi.

Again, from Debal to Mansúra is six stages, which, on the supposition that the latter, as elsewhere shown, is Haidarábád, would not suit Thatta in any respect, but exactly suits Karáchi.

The *Marásidu-l Ittilá* says Debal [or *Daibul*, as it writes the name in Arabic fashion] is a celebrated city "on the shore of the sea of Hind, an emporium where the rivers of Lahore and Multán discharge themselves into the salt sea."<sup>2</sup>

Further quotations need not be added to show that Debal was on the sea-coast, and could not have been so far inland as Thatta, or even Láhorí Bandar, which, however, is the next most probable site after Karáchi.

Láhorí Bandar, or Lári Bandar, succeeded Debal as the sea-port of the Indus, and is first named by Birúni; but Debal had evidently maintained its position down to the time of Jalálu-d dín's incursion into Sind, in 1221 A.D. It will appear, afterwards, from the extracts taken from the *Jahán-kusháí*, that the Sultán conducted himself with the greatest severity towards the people of that port, for he plundered the country, and as he erected a mosque opposite to a Hindú temple, during his short stay there, it is evident that the place was considered then to be of sufficient consequence to be insulted in the wantonness of his fanaticism.

In Ibn Batúta's time, about a century latter (1333 A.D.), we have no mention of Debal, which seems then to have been superseded entirely by Láhorí Bandar.

Láhorí has itself been taken to be Debal. The *Tuhfatu-l kirám*, indeed, distinctly asserts that "what is now Bandar Láhorí was in former times called Bandar Debal:"—but its authority is not to be rated high in such matters,<sup>3</sup> and while, confessedly, there are some

<sup>1</sup> Gildemeister reads "east," but the *Ashkahn-i Bilad* and Istakhrí must be correct in giving "west."—*De rebus Indiciis*, pp. 170, 178, 179.—See *Mémoires sur l'Inde*, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> Junybol, *Lexicon Geographicum*, Vol. I. p. 421.

<sup>3</sup> *T. Kirám*, MS. p. 234. This may mean merely "the port connected with Debal," because at p. 1 we read, "Debal is now called Thatta."

points slightly in favour of its being Debal, there are others which are decisive against it. It is itself fifteen miles from the shore of the sea: it has no bay: and a passage in Bírúni is very conclusive:—where, after saying that the gulf of Túrán (the present bay of Súnmiáni) lies between Tíz and Debal, he adds, that beyond the gulf of Túrán are the small and great mouths (of the Indus), the one near the town of Loharáni, the other to the east, on the borders of Kachh. The country (between them) bears the name of Sind Ságara, or the sea of Sind (pp. 49. 65).<sup>1</sup> Loharáni (Láhorí) is here mentioned as quite distinct from Debal, and was then evidently only just rising into importance,

Ibn Batúta calls the place “Láhiriya” or “Láhari”<sup>2</sup>—but it generally goes now by the name of Láhorí, probably from its presumed connection with Lahore. Its ruin and abandonment have now given a greater prominence to the port of Dhárája, which lies a little to the east of Láhorí.

The original name was most likely Lári, being so called after Lár, the local name of the southern portion of the province of Sind.

The name of Lár had once a very great extension on these southern coasts,—for Ptolemy and the Periplus both mention Guzerát under the name of Larice;<sup>3</sup> and Bírúni and Abú-l Fidá place Somnát, and even Tána, in or on the borders of the province of Lár (*supra*, p. 61).<sup>4</sup> The merchant Sulaimán, also, calls the gulf of Cambay and the waters which wash the Malabar coast “the seas of Lár:”<sup>5</sup> and Mas’údí says, that “at Salmúr, Subára, Tána and other towns a language called Láriya is spoken,” so that, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that Lári Bandar was the original form under which this port was first known.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fragments Arabes*, pp. 113, 119.

<sup>2</sup> Kosegarten, *de Mohammede ebn Batuta*, p. 17. Defrémery, Paris, 1855.

<sup>3</sup> Lassen, *Zeitschrift f. d. k. d. Morgenl.* Vol. I. p. 227.—D’Anville, *Eclaircissements sur la Carte de l’Inde*, pp. 69, 75.—Tod, *Western India*, pp. 187-9, 255.

<sup>4</sup> *Fragments Arabes*, p. 112.—Gildemeister, *De rebus Indicis*, pp. 185, 188.

<sup>5</sup> *Mém. sur l’Inde*, pp. 200, 298.

<sup>6</sup> [The *Ldia-deva* of Sanskrit geography, and the Larice of Ptolemy and the Periplus, is the country about the gulf of Cambay and the mouth of the Nerbudda. The Arab geographers agree, also, upon this locality. It is very questionable if that term is susceptible of the extension which Sir H. Elliot here seeks to give it. The *Lar* of Sind would rather seem to be a distinct name. See McMurdo, *Jour. R. A. S. I.* 224.; Hwen Tsang III. 409.]

*Hála-kandi.—The Hellenes.—Pindus.*

The ruins of old Hála, or Hála-kandi, on the Indus, thirty miles above Haidarábád, lie to the south-east of the present site. Had its name appeared in the *Chach-náma*, we might have ascribed its foundation to the Rájá Hál, mentioned in p. 106. Tod names a later prince of the Samma family as the founder.<sup>1</sup>

It is probable that the designation of the Hála range of mountains has a similar origin, for we nowhere find them mentioned in any early work; but such a very modern attribution would scarcely satisfy a late writer, who sees in them the cradle of the great Hellenic race:—

“The land of Hellas, a name so dear to civilization and the arts, was so called from the magnificent range of heights situated in Beloochistan, styled the ‘Hela’ mountains. \* \* \* The chiefs of this country were called ‘Helaines,’ or the ‘chiefs of the Hela.’”<sup>2</sup>

He gives as a motto to this fanciful chapter on the Hellenes, the following lines from the fragments of Hesiod:—

Ἕλληνας δ' ἐγένοντο θεμιστόπολοι βασιλῆες  
 Δῶρος τε, Εὐόβης τε, καὶ Αἰόλου ἰπποχάρμη.  
 Chiefs of the war-car, guards of holy Right,  
 Dorus and Æolus, and Zuthus' might  
 From HALLEN sprang.

As he conceives *Æolus* to represent the *Haiya* tribe of Rájputá, it is surprising that he disregards the more obvious resemblance of *Dorus* and *Zuthus* to the mighty *Dors* and the energetic *Zats*;—the former now nearly extinct, the latter now better known as the wide-spread Jats.

Another mountain range in the same neighbourhood is even still more unduly exalted, in a mode which sets all true relations of time, space, position, and language, at complete defiance.

“I would now direct the reader's attention to the most salient feature in the land of Hellas. The mountain chain of PINDUS, traversing a considerable portion of Greece, and forming the boundary between Thessaly and Epirus, takes its name from the PIND. Its present name is Pind Dadun Khan \* \* \* whence the Pind or “Salt Range” of Afghanistan was naturally transferred to a corresponding

<sup>1</sup> *Travels in Western India*, p. 474. Halár in Guzerát is called after a Jhareja prince of the same name.

<sup>2</sup> E. Poccoke, *India in Greece*, p. 48.—This is an unfair contortion, in order to suit the etymology: the real spelling being *Hála*, or, more correctly, *Hára*; so that we have, unfortunately, nothing but the simple initial aspirate to support the grand Hellenic hypothesis.—See the *Tuhfat-ul Kirám*, MS., pp. 130, 164.

remarkable feature in Greece. It is not a little remarkable, that in the latter country the true Pindus \* \* \* should give nearly the corresponding length of the Pind in Afghanistan, viz., a distance of about sixty miles."<sup>1</sup>

This elaborate super-structure is based on an utterly false assumption. The salt range is not, and never was, called the Pind. Pind is a common word in the Upper Panjáb, signifying simply "a village," and recurs a hundred times over in that locality—as Pind Bhattiyán, Pind Malik Aulyá, Pindí Ghaib, Ráwal Pindi, etc., etc.—and so, Pind Dádan Khán merely means the "village of Dádan Khán," and one, moreover, of modern erection. The word "Pind," indeed, has only lately been introduced into the Panjáb—long even after the name of the celebrated Grecian mountain was itself converted into the modern Agrapha.

The whole of this arrogant and dogmatical work is replete with similar absurdities; and yet the only notices it has received from our Reviewers are of a laudatory character. It is to be feared that no English publication of late years will go so far as this to damage our literary reputation in the eyes of continental scholars; and it is therefore to be regretted that it has not yet received the castigation due to its ignorance and presumption.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Jandrúd.*

[About a mile, or half a parasang, from Multan was the castle or fortified residence of the governor, which Istakhrí calls Jandrúd. The *Ashkálu-l-Bilad*, according to Sir H. Elliot, reads Chandráwar, but the initial *ch* is at best suspicious in an Arabic work; the map has Jandrúd. Gildemeister's Ibn Haukal has Jandrár, Jandar, and Jandaruz; and Idrísí says Jandúr. Ibn Haukal helps us to the right reading when he says, the Jandarúz is a river, and the city of Jandarúz stands on its banks. Immediately before this he had been speaking of the river Sandarúz, which is evidently the Sind-rúd, so that we may at once conclude that the final syllable is the Persian *rúd* (river). Sir H. Elliot, in a subsequent passage, supposes it to

<sup>1</sup> *India in Greece*, p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> The author's credit stands on a false eminence, as being one of the Editors of the reprint of the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*; and we find one of his really able collaborators lamenting, in his preface to the *Hist. of Rom. Literature*, that "*the Early History of Rome*, promised by the author of that remarkable work, *India in Greece*, should not have been available for these pages." [It must be remembered that these animadversions were written in 1863.]

derive its first syllable from the Arabic word *Jand*, a cantonment or military colony,—in which case the name would signify the “cantonment on the river.” But Háfiz Ábrú, in an extract which will appear in Vol. II., informs us that the river Chináb was called “Jamd;” the name of the place, therefore, may have been Jamdrúd. Multán itself is situated about three miles from the Chináb, so that Jandrúd, or Jamdrúd, must have been its port on that river.]

*Kaikánán.—Kaikán.—Kákars.*

This name appears under the various aspects of Kaikánán, Kikán, Kaikán, Kizkánan, Kabarkánán and Kirkáyán,—the first being of most frequent occurrence. Though so often mentioned, we can form but a very general idea of its position.

The *Chach-náma* tells us that, under the Ráf dynasty, the Sindian territory extended “as far to the north as the mountains of Kirdán<sup>1</sup> and Kaikánán” (p. 138). Again, the Arabs “marched in A.H. 38 to Kaikánán, by way of Bahraj and Koh-páya,” where, after some partial successes, their progress was intercepted by the mountaineers in their difficult defiles, and in the end the Arabs sustained a complete defeat. One of the objects of these expeditions to Kaikánán, which lasted for about twenty years, was to obtain horses from that province, as they are represented to have been celebrated for their strength and proportions. The tract of Budh was reached during one of these incursions, and we find one of the Arab armies returning from another incursion by way of Síwistán.<sup>2</sup>

Biláduri also mentions these expeditions, with some slight variations in the details; and is the only author who adopts the spelling of the Arabic *káf*, and omits the last syllable,—representing the name as “Kikán,” or “Kaikán” (p. 116),—whereas the *Chach-náma* prefers Kaikánán (p. 138). He says “it forms a portion of Sind in the direction of Khurásán,” and he speaks of “Turks” as its inhabitants. In an important expedition directed against a tract of country lying between Multán and Kábul, in A.H. 44, “Turks are encountered in the country of Kaikán.” In another, ‘Abd-ulla sends to Muá’wiya the “horses of Kaikán” (p. 117), which he had

<sup>1</sup> [This name may be read “Karwán,” and the initial may be optionally *G*.]

<sup>2</sup> MS. pp. 72-78.

taken amongst other spoil. In another, Asad attacks the Meds, after warring against Kaikán (p. 117). In the year 221 ھ. Biládur<sup>1</sup> speaks of a portion of Kaikán as occupied by Jats, whom 'Amrán defeated, and then established within their country the military colony of Baizá (p. 128). On this occasion, the country was attacked from the side of Sind, not from Makrán, which will account for the mention of the "Jats," instead of "Turks."

It may also be doubted if the Kabákánán (p. 39) or Kízkánán of Ibn Haukal refers to this tract,—and yet it would be more difficult to account for its total omission, if it do not. According to them, Kaikánán was in the district of Túrán, and a city in which the governor of Kusdár resided. This apparent discrepancy can only be reconciled by supposing that there was both a province and town of that name. They give us no further indication of its position, except that the district of Atal is said to lie between Kaikánán and Kandábel,—which, of itself, attributes to it a much greater extension to the north, than if it were a mere portion of Túrán.<sup>2</sup>

The later Arab geographers follow these authorities, and add nothing further to our information.

Abú-l Fazi Baihakí mentions Kaikáhán amongst the other provinces under the authority of Mas'úd, the Ghaznivide; and as Hind, Sind, Nímroz, Zábulistán, Kasdár, Makrán, and Dánistán are noticed separately, it shows that Kaikáhán was then considered a distinct jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup>

In Hwen Tsang's travels we have mention of the country of Kikan, situated to the south of Kábul, which is evidently no other than the province of which we are treating.<sup>3</sup>

From this time forward, we lose sight of the name, and are left to conjecture where Kaikánán was. Under all the circumstances of the case, we may be justified in considering it so far to the east as to include the Sulaimáni range, which had not, up to a comparatively late period, been dignified with that name. As with respect to Asia, and many other names of countries, so with respect to Kaikánán, the boundaries seem to have receded with the progress of discovery; and though, on its first mention, it does not appear to have extended

<sup>1</sup> Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicis*, pp. 164, 174, 177.

<sup>2</sup> *Tárikh-i Mas'údi*, MS.

<sup>3</sup> *Foe-koue-ki*, p. 395; Hwen Tsang III. 185, 414.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 176.

beyond Shál and Mustúg, yet, by the time of the Ghaznivides, we are authorised to conclude that it reached, on the east, to the frontier of Multán, and, on the south, to the hilly tract of Siwistán, above the plains of Sind.

Under the present condition of Afghánistán it may be considered, in general terms, as including the whole of the country occupied by the Kákars. The expedition of A.H. 44 to the country between Multán and Kábul certainly shows that Kaikánán must have comprised the Sulaimání range to the south of the Gúmal; and the celebrity of its horses would appear to point to a tract further to the west, including Saháráwán and Múshkí, where horses, especially those used on the plain of Mangachar, are still in great demand, and whence they are often sent for shipment to the coast.

There is no place extant which recalls the name of the old province, except it be Káhán, which was perhaps included within its south-eastern frontier. It is barely possible, also, that there may be some connection between the name of the Kákars and that of the ancient province which they occupy. It will be observed above, that Baihakí mentions a district of Dánistán, and the order in which it occurs is "Kusdár, and Makrán, and Dánistán, and Kaikáhán." This implies contiguity between the several places thus named, and it is, therefore, worthy of remark, that Dáni is entered in all the genealogical lists of the Afgháns as the eldest son of Gharghasht, the son of their great progenitor, Kais 'Abdu-r Rashíd Pathán; and that Kákar, from whom the powerful tribe of that name is descended, was himself the eldest son of Dáni. Names change in the course of ages, especially among people in a low stage of civilization; and it may perhaps be conceded that "Kákarán" and "Kaikáhán" would, under such circumstances, be no very violent and improbable metathesis.

*Kajuráha, Capital of Jajáhoti.*

[*Extract of General Cunningham's Archaeological Report for 1864-5,—Page 68.*]

["The ancient city of Khajuráho, the capital of the Chandel Rajputs, is situated thirty-four miles to the south of Mahoba, twenty-seven miles to the east of Chhatrapur, and twenty-five miles to the

north-west of Panna . . . . The earliest mention of this capital is by Abú Rihán, who accompanied Mahmúd in his campaign against Kalinjar in A.D. 1022. He calls it Kajuráha, the capital of Jajáhoti, and places it at thirty parasangs, or about ninety miles, to the south-east of Kanauj. The true direction, however, is almost due south, and the distance about twice thirty parasangs, or one hundred and eighty miles. The next mention of Khajuráho is by Ibn Batúta, who visited it about A.D. 1335.—He calls it Kajúra . . . . The earliest mention of the province is by Hwen Tsang, in A.D. 641.—He calls it *Chi-chi-to*, or Jajhoti . . . From the accounts of Hwen Tsang, and Abú Rihán, it is evident that the Province of Jajáhoti corresponded with the modern district of Bundelkhand in its widest extent.”]

*Kállari.—Annari.—and Ballari.*

[Such seems to be the correct spelling of three names, which appear in a great variety of forms.—Istakhri has Kálwi, Annari, and Balwi, but the first takes the form of Kaladi or Kalari in his map. In the printed extract of the *Ashkátu-l Bilád* the names appear as Falid, Abri, and Balzi; also, as Abri, Labi, and Maildi, some of which divergences may be credited to bad copy and misprints. Gildemeister's Ibn Haukal gives them as Ayará, Válará, and Balrá; Idrisi has Atri and Kálarí; Abú-l Fidá has Kállari, Annari, and Ballari, and these agree with the names as they appear in the map of the *Ashkátu-l Bilád*. They were three neighbouring towns on the road from Alor to Mansúra, Annari standing first, Kállari next, and Ballari last in Istakhri's map, and in that of the *Ashkátu-l Bilád*. The termination *ri* or *ari* would seem to be a common noun, and the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* writes it with the Hindi *re*. Idrisi says Annari is four days journey from Alor, and Kállari two days from Annari, and Mansúra only one day from Kállari. Ibn Haukal places Annari and Kállari on the east of the Mihran, but Idrisi says, that it stands on the western bank (p. 79); and enters into details which show pretty clearly its relative position to Mansúra. There is a “Bulrey,” marked in Allen's map of Sind, about thirty miles south of Haidarábád, but this position does not correspond with the above description.]



*Kandábel.—Túrán.—Budha.—Baizá.*

It is essential to a right understanding of ancient Siudian geography to ascertain where Kandábel, of which there is such frequent mention, was situated. We can only do this by implication, and by comparison of the various passages in which the name occurs.

The *Chach-náma*<sup>1</sup> mentions it in three different passages, at least, if Kandhála in the last reference be meant, as seems probable, for that place. If we are to put faith in the first passage (p. 152), there would be no need for further enquiry, as it is distinctly mentioned thus:—"Kandábel, that is, Kandahár." But it may be shown that this identification cannot possibly be admitted, for Chach reaches the place through the desert of Túrán (a province of which Kusdár was the capital),<sup>2</sup> on his return from Armá-bel to Alor. He straitened the garrison by encamping on the river Síni, or Sibí, and compelled them to agree to the payment of one hundred horses from the hill country, and a tribute of 100,000 dirhams. Here the name of the river, and the position, put Kandahár out of the question, and we can only regard the passage as the conjecture of some transcriber, interpolated by mistake from the margin into the text.

The real fact is, that Kandábel<sup>3</sup> can scarcely be any other place than the modern Gandáva, and we shall find, with this single exception, that all the other passages where its name occurs sufficiently indicate that as the position. Indeed, it is probable that this very instance lends confirmation to this view, for the Síni river seems to be no other than the Sibí, now called the Nári, but flowing under the town of Síni, and, during the floods, joining the Bolán river, into which the hill-streams, which surround and insulate Gandáva, disembogue themselves. The river which runs nearest to Gandáva is now called the Bádra.

The *Mujmalat Tawárikh* tells us that Kandábel was founded by the Persian king, Bahman, "between the confines of the Hindus

<sup>1</sup> MS. pp. 48, 71, 115. [*Supra*, 152, 162.]

<sup>2</sup> Mordtmann, *das Buch der Länder.—Marsádu-l Ittíf*, Ed. Juynboll, Vol. II. p. 214.—*Mémoires sur l'Inde*, pp. 176, 278.

<sup>3</sup> It is almost uniformly spelt in this mode, with the Arabic *Káf*, the variations being very few. The final syllable is occasionally *nih*, *bál*, and *gal*; but *bel* is most probably the correct form. We find the same termination in Armá-bel, or the modern Bala. It may possibly be connected with the Mongol *belu*, "a city," as in *Khán-batu*, the city of the Khán.—See *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. XV. p. 200.

and the Turks" (p. 106). Biládurí frequently mentions it, and speaks of Kandahár as entirely separate and distinct (pp. 117, 118, 125, 127). He tells us it was situated on a hill or elevated site, and that 'Amrán, after taking the town, transferred the principal inhabitants to Kusdár (p. 128), from which place it was situated at the distance of five parasangs.<sup>1</sup>

According to Ibn Haukal, and the corresponding passages in Istakhrí (p. 29), Onseley's *Oriental Geography*, and the *Ashkálu-l-Bilád*, Kandábel was the capital of Budha, and a large place of commercial traffic, deficient in the produce of the date-palm, and situated in a desert, eight stages from Mansúra, and ten through the desert from Multán.<sup>2</sup>

All these descriptions make Kandábel correspond sufficiently with the modern Gandáva, to leave no doubt of their identity. Later historians speak of it as being on the borders of Kirmán,<sup>3</sup> but their notions of that province were very indefinite, and any place on the eastern confines of Sind would equally answer their loose mode of delineation.

Gandáva, which is the capital of the province of Kachh Gandáva, is surrounded by a wall, and is still one of the most important places between Kelát and Shikárpúr, though greatly declined from its former state. Indeed, Bágh is a much larger, as well as more commercial town, but the credit of antiquity cleaves to Gandáva.

Kandábel, it will be observed, is represented as the capital of Budha, which, therefore, next demands our attention. This is evidently the same province as the Bódhpúr, Búdhiya, and Budápur (p. 145) of the *Chach-náma*.

Under the Rái dynasty, the second satrapy of Sind comprised, besides the town of Siwistán, which was the capital,<sup>4</sup> "Búdhpur,

<sup>1</sup> *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 176. The distance is too short to suit Gandáva, which is eighty miles north-east of Kusdár. Has not "parasangs" been entered instead of "stages?"

<sup>3</sup> Gildemeister, 172, 177, 178. <sup>4</sup> Elmácin, *Historia Saracenicæ*, ann. 101.

<sup>5</sup> Sihwán on the Indus is here alluded to; but the town of Sebi, or Sibi, and the province of Siwistán, are the constant source of confusion and mistake, whenever the name occurs; inasmuch, that it is sometimes difficult, as in the passages here quoted, to determine positively which place is indicated. This perplexity is not diminished by the fact of the large province of Sistán, or Sijistán, being not very remote.

and Jankán (Jangár), and the skirts of the hills of Rújhán, as far as the borders of Makrán (p. 138).” Again, “Chach marched towards the fortress of Budápúr and Siwistán.” After crossing the Indus “he went to Búdhiya, the capital of which tract was Nánaráj Kákáráj), and the inhabitants of the place called it Sawís.” . . . . “After taking the fort of the Sawís, he moved towards Siwistán” (p. 145).

When Siwistán was attacked by Muhammad Kásim, the governor fled to Búdhiya, where was “a fortress called Sísam,<sup>1</sup> on the banks of the Kumbh,” whither he was pursued by the Arab general, who encamped with a portion of his army at “Nílhán on the Kumbh.” Here, the chiefs of Búdhiya determined to make a night attack upon his camp. These chiefs of Búdhiya, who were of the same family as the ruler of Sísam, are subsequently shown to be Jats;<sup>2</sup> whose origin was derived from a place on the banks of the Gang, which they call Kúndhár.”<sup>3</sup> After failing in this expedition, they voluntarily surrendered themselves, as they had “found from the books of the Buddhists that Hindústán was destined to be conquered by the army of Islám,” and then turned their arms vigorously against their former comrades. On Muhammad’s advancing to Sísam, “some of the idolaters fled to Búdhiya, higher up: some to the fort of Bahítlúr,<sup>4</sup> between Sálúj and Kandhábel” (p. 162); and there sued for peace, and after agreeing to pay tribute, sent their hostages to Siwistán.

In the *Mujmalu-t Tawárikh* we read that Bahman, the Persian king, “built in the country of Budh a town called Bahmanábád, which according to some is Mansúra” (p. 106).

[Biláduri mentions this tract as the scene of the slaughter of Budail (p. 119), and it is, perhaps, disguised under the name of Basea in p. 123.]

In Istakhri (p. 29), and in Ibn Haukal, it assumes the form of Budh, or Budha. “The infidel inhabitants within the borders of Sind are called Budha and Mand. They reside in the tract between

<sup>1</sup> In the province of Sebti (Siwistán), according to the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*. [It is probably “Seisan,” on the Manchar lake.—See p. 161.]

<sup>2</sup> Or Channas, according to the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> [See Note, p. 160.]

<sup>4</sup> Bahaktúr and Bahla, in the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*.

Túrán, Multán, and Mansúra, on the western bank of the Mihrán. They live in huts made of reeds and grass" (p. 38). Again, "Atal is inhabited by Musulmán's and infidel Budhas."<sup>1</sup> . . . "From Mansúra to the first borders of Budha is fifteen stages" (p. 39), and any one who travels that road must go along the banks of the Mihrán until he reaches Sadústán (Sihwán)."

"Nadha," or "Nudha," seems to be the reading preferred by Idrisí (p. 83), and the Nubian geographer. Kazwíní describes the country as having a population resembling the Zat, and yielding plenty of rice and cocoa-nuts. It also produces camels with double humps, which being rarely found elsewhere, were in great demand in Khurásán and Persia.<sup>2</sup> Ibn Haukal also remarks upon the excellence of its breed of camels. The *Marásidu-l-Ittilá'*<sup>3</sup> likewise approves of the initial N, instead of B; but these later authorities are of no value, when arrayed against the repeated instances to the contrary from the *Chach-náma*, and the great majority of the readings in Ibn Haukal and Istakhrí.<sup>4</sup>

From a comparison of all these statements, it would appear that the old tract of Budh, or Búdhiya, very closely corresponds with the modern province of Kachh Gandáva, on all four sides except the northern, where it seems to have acquired a greater extension, of which it is impossible to define the precise limits. It is worthy of remark that, in the very centre of Kachh Gandáva, there is still a place called Budha on the Nári river, and it is possible that the name is also preserved in the Kákar tract of Borí, or Búra, forming

<sup>1</sup> See also Gildemeister, *de reb. Ind.*, pp. 164, 171, 172, 177.

<sup>2</sup> This, if the right reading, must be understood in the sense of remotest, because the capital Kandábel is declared to be only eight stages, and Túrán, which is contemporaneous with Budh on the west, is only set down at fifteen stages. The *Ashán'u-l-Bilád* gives the distance from Mansúra to the nearest point of Budh as only five marches. This is probably the correct reading.—See *Journal A. S. B.*, 1852, No. 1, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup> *De reb. Indíciis*, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Jurnboll, Vol. II. p.

<sup>5</sup> If Nudha could be supposed the correct reading, it would lend an interest to a passage in Dionysius, who says in his *Periegesis*—

Ἰνδοὶ καὶ ποταμοὶ νότιοι Σκοθαὶ ἐνδιούσιον—v. 1088.

Nóτιοι might be meant for "the Nodhites," instead of "southern," as usually translated; or the Arabs might have converted the "southern" into a separate class with a distinctive name.

part of the Afghán province of Síwistán.<sup>1</sup> In the *Ayin-i Akbari* the town of Budhyán is mentioned as being on the northern frontier of Sirkár Thatta, one hundred kos from Bandar Láhori.

It is impossible to assent to an hypothesis lately started in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, quoted above, that this tract was designated after the present Burohees, or Bráhúís. Their name itself is too modern,—besides being belied by the usual meaning ascribed to it, of “mountaineer;”—and even their partial occupation of this low eastern tract is not yet a century old. From time immemorial it has been held by the Jats, who still constitute the majority of the population, and the Bráhúís are a mere intrusive stock from the provinces of Múshki and Jhow, and the rugged highlands of Sahárawán, which abut Kachh Gandáva on the westward. It has been surmised, also, that these Budhiyas were the Bhodya and Bhoja of the Puránic legends, and even the Bhotyas of Tibet. This is treading upon still more dangerous ground.<sup>2</sup> It is far more probable that, if the name had any significant origin at all, it was derived from the possession of the Buddhist religion in its purity by the inhabitants of that remote tract, at the time when Bráhmanism was making its quiet but steady inroads by the more open and accessible course of the river Indus. [See *post*, Note on the Meds.]

#### Kannazbúr.

[Omission and misplacing of the dots have caused this name to assume a very varying form in Roman characters. Ibn Khurdádba (p. 14) calls it “Kinnazbún,” and Istakhrí’s version (p. 29) may be so read. The *Ashkálú-l Bilád* (p. 34) has “Kabryún;” Gilde-meister’s version of Ibn Haukal makes it “Kannazbúr;” Idrísi writes “Firábúz,” but “Kírbúz” sometimes occurs. The *Marásidú-l Ittilá* has “Kírbún,” but Juynboll, the editor, says this is a false reading for Kannazbúr. Biláduri (p. 119) agrees in this last spelling, and the *Chach-náma* has “Kannazpúr,” and “Kínarbúr.” The position of the place appears to correspond with that of the modern Punjgoor in Makrán.]

<sup>1</sup> In the passage quoted above from the *Mujmalu-t Tawárikh*, Bahman is said to have founded a city called Bahmanábád in the country of Budh. There is a place entered as Brahman in Burnes’ map, between Shál and Borí.

<sup>2</sup> V. de Ssiut-Martin, *Études de Géog. ancienne*, Tom. I. pp. 328-334.—Lassen *Ind. Alterth.*, Vol. I. pp. 559, 611, 727.

*Mandal.—Kīraj.*

It is difficult to fix the position of Mandal, one of the places to which Junaid despatched an expedition.

The name of Mandal, or Mandalam, being applied generally to signify "a region," in Sanskrit, adds to our doubts upon this occasion. Thus we have Tonda-Mandalam, Pándú-Mandalam, Chola-Mandalam, and many others. [Almost, or entirely, all of them being situated in the South.] The most noted Mandal of the Arab geographers was that whence Mandali aloe-wood was derived; hence *agallochum* was frequently called "Mandal;" but no one seems to have known where it was situated. Kazwini says no one can penetrate to it, because it lies beyond the equinoctial line: but he calls it a city of India, taking that word in its enlarged sense of East Indies. [The *Marásidu-l Ittilá'* calls it a city of Hind, but gives no indication of its locality. Abú-l Fidá has no notice of it.] Avicenna, in his *Kánún*, says that, according to some, it is in the middle of the land of Hind. The place here alluded to, is probably the coast of Coromandel, whence the *agallochum*, brought from the eastern islands, was distributed to the marts and countries of the west.

Avicenna's description might be made to apply to Mandala upon the Nerbadda, which in the second century of our era was the seat of the Haihaya dynasty of Gondwána;<sup>1</sup> but this is, of course, too far for any Arab expedition, notwithstanding that M. Reinaud considers Ujjain and Málwa<sup>2</sup> to have been attacked at the same period, under the orders of Junaid (p. 126). But Málabár would have been a more probable object of attack than Málwa, in the heart of India. As we proceed, we shall find other expeditions almost all directed to different points in the Guzerát peninsula,—as, indeed, was the case, even from the time of the conquest of Sind, when the inhabitants of Basra were engaged in a warfare with the Meds of Suráshtra.

<sup>1</sup> Langlois, *Harivansa*, Vol. I. p. 6.—*As. Res.*, Vol. IX. pp. 100, 105, 112.—*J. A. S. Bengal*, August, 1837.—*J. A. S. Bombay*, Vol. IV. p. 179.—*Mod. Traveller*, "India," Vol. I. p. 141.—Schlegel's *Ramayana*, Vol. I. pt. ii. p. 208.—*As. Ann. Reg.*, Vol. VIII. Misc. Tracts, p. 19.—Bandry, *Encycl. Moderne*, Tom. XVIII. col. 151.—Lassen, *Ind. Athorith.*, Vol. I. Bell. IV. 4.

<sup>2</sup> [These two names were left blank in his "Fragments," but were restored in the *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 192. In Goejes' most careful edition of the text of Biládiri the names are distinctly written "Uzain" and "Málabat."]

It is evident that we must seek, also, no very distant site for Mandal. Even Mandal-eswara (Mandlaisar), on the Nerbadda, would be too remote. Mandor in Rájputána, the ancient capital of the Parihárs, or Mandra in Kachh, or Mandal in Jhaláwár, would be better, or the famous Mandaví, had not its ancient site been known by another name,—Ráen. Altogether, Mandal in Guzerát, better known as Oká-Mandal, offers, from its antiquity and its position as the western district of that peninsula, the most probable site for the Mandal of Junaid.

From the expression of the historian Tabarí, that the Arabs never recovered possession of Kíraj and Mandal, there would seem to be an implication that these places lay beyond the province of Sind, and that they were at no great distance from one another. They are also mentioned together in the passage under consideration. The "Kíraj" of Tabarí and the *Futúhu-l Buldán* seems to be the same place as the "Kaj" of Birúni. The name occurs again as "Kíraj" and "Kúraj" in the *Chach-náma* (pp. 189, 197), and was probably situate in, if not named from, Kachh, though the exact site of the town cannot now be established.

The position of Oká-Mandal on the opposite coast is a sufficient reason why it should be mentioned in connection with Kíraj, supposing that place to have been in Kachh; and, in the absence of more certain information, I should, for this, as well as the other reasons above given, feel disposed to consider it as the Mandal noticed by the Arab historians of the Sindian conquest.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Manjábarí.*

[Such appears to be the preferable mode of spelling the name which appears in Istakhri as Manhánarí (p. 27), in Ibn Haukal as Manhatara, and in Idrisi as Manábarí (p. 77). It is described as being on the west of the river, three days' journey south from Sadusán (Sihwan), and two days short of Debal,—the two maps agree with this account. The route from Mansúra to Debal crosses the river at this place. It has been supposed to be the Minnagara of the ancients.—See the next article "Minnagara."]

<sup>1</sup> Gildemeister, *Script Arab. de rebus Indicis*, pp. 69, 71, 214.—Tod, *Rajasthan*, Vol. I. pp. 39, 100, 725.—Hamilton's *Gazetteer*, 4to. Vol. I. pp. 651, 656, 661.—Humboldt, *Geog. Vet. Script. Min.*, Vol. I.—*Periplus*, p. 23.

*Minnagara.*

Vincent thinks that the Minnagara of Ptolemy, and of the Periplus usually ascribed to Arrian, is the Manjābarī of the Arab geographers. D'Anville supposes Minnagara to be the same as Mansūra. C. Ritter says it is Tatta, so does Alex. Burnes, because Tatta is now called Sa-Minagur, and Mannert says, Binagara should be read for Minnagara. These high authorities place it on the Indus. But although goods were landed at Barbarice, the port of the Indus, and conveyed to Minnagara "by the river," there is no reason why Minnagara should have been on that river.

The Periplus merely says, "Minnagara is inland." *μεσόγειος ἡ μετρόπολις αὐτῆς τῆς Σκύθιας Μινναγάρ.* Again, the Periplus says, the "Metropolis of the whole country, is Minnagara, whence great quantities of cotton goods are carried down to Barygaza," or Broach, which could scarcely have been the place of export, if Minnagara had been on the Indus. But even allowing it to have been on the Indus, there is every reason to suppose it was on the eastern bank, whereas Manjābarī is plainly stated to be on the western.

Lassen derives the name of this capital of Indo-Scythia from the Sanskrit *Nagara*, a town, and *Min*, which he shows from Isidorus Characenus to be the name of a Scythian city. The Sindomana of Arrian may, therefore, owe its origin to this source. C. Ritter says *Min* is a name of the Sacas; if so, there can be little doubt that we have their representatives in the wild Minas of Rājputāna, who have been driven but little to the eastward of their former haunts.

Minnagara is, according to Ptolemy, in Long. 115. 15. Lat. 19. 30, and he places it on the Nerbadda, so that his Minnagara, as well as that of the second quotation from the Periplus, may possibly be the famous Mándúgarh (not far from the river), and the Mánkīr which the early Arab Geographers represent as the capital of the Balhará. [See the article "Balhará."]

The fact appears to be that there were two Minnagaras—one on, or near, the Indus; another on the Nerbadda (Narmada). Ptolemy's assertion cannot be gainsaid, and establishes the existence of the latter on the Nerbadda, [and this must have been the Minnagara of



which the Periplus represents Broach to be the port]. The one on, or near, the Indus was the capital of Indo-Scythia, and the Binagara, or Agrinagara, of Ptolemy. We learn from the *Tuhfatul Kirám* that in the twelfth century Minagár was one of the cities dependent on Múltán, and was in the possession of a chief, by caste an *Agri*, descended from Alexander: When we remember that Arrian informs us that Alexander left some of his troops, (including, no doubt, Agrians), as a garrison for the town at the junction of the Indus and Acesines, this affords a highly curious coincidence, which cannot, however, be further dilated upon in this place.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Narána.*

[*Extract of General Cunningham's Archæological Report for 1864-5,—Page 1.*]

“In his account of the geography of Northern India, the celebrated Abú Rihán makes the city of *Narain* the starting point of three different itineraries to the south, the south-west, and the west. This place has not been identified by M. Reinaud, the learned historian of ancient India, but its true locality has been accurately assigned to the neighbourhood of Jaypur. Its position also puzzled Sir H. Elliot, who says, however, that with one exception “*Narwar* satisfies all the requisite conditions.” But this position is quite untenable, as will be seen by the proofs which I am now about to bring forward in support of its identification with *Nárdyan*, the capital of *Bairát*, or *Matsya*.

According to the Chinese pilgrim, Hwen Tsang, the capital of the kingdom of *Po-li-ye-to-lo*, which M. Reinaud has identified with *Páryátra*, or *Bairát*, was situated at 500 *li*, or 83 $\frac{2}{3}$  miles, to the west of Mathura, and about 800 *li*, or 133 $\frac{2}{3}$  miles, to the south-west (read south-east) of the kingdom of *She-to-tu-lo*, that is, of *Satádrú*, on the Sutlej—The bearing and distance from Mathura point unequivocally to *Bairát*, the ancient capital of *Matsya*, as the city of

<sup>1</sup> Compare Ritter, *Die Erdkunde von Asien*, Vol. IV. part 1, p. 475, and Vol. V. p. 181. *Ptol. Geogr. Lib. VII. c. I, tab. 10.* Vincent, *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 349. D'Anville *Antiq. de l'Inde*, p. 34. Mannert, *Geog. der Griechen und Rómer*, Vol. V. pp. 107, 130, 136. Hudson, *Geog. Vet. Scriptores Græci Min.* Vol. I. Burnes' *Travels into Bokhara*, Vol. III. p. 79. *Journal R. A. S. Vol. I. p. 31.* C. Lassen, *De Pentapotamia Ind.* p. 57. *Allgemeine Encyclop.: Art. Indien*, p. 91. Arriani, *De Expedi: Alex: Lib. VI. 15.*

Hwen Tsang's narrative; and this being fixed, we may identify the capital of *Satadru*, or the Sutlej Provinces, with the famous Fort of *Hansi*, which successfully resisted the arms of Mahmúd of Ghazni. According to the *Tabakát-i Násiri*, Hansi was the ancient capital of the Province of Siwálík, and up to the time of its capture by Mas'úd had been considered by the Hindus as impregnable.

Abú Rihán, the contemporary of Mahmúd, places *Narána*, the capital of *Karzát*, at twenty-eight parasangs to the west of Mathura, which, taking the parasang at three and a half miles, would make the distance ninety-eight miles, or fourteen miles in excess of the measurement of Hwen Tsang. But as the narratives of the different Muhammadan historians leave no doubt of the identity of *Narána*, the capital of *Karzát*, with *Naráyana*, the capital of *Bairát*, this difference in the recorded distance from Mathura is of little moment. According to Abú Rihán, *Narána*, or *Bazána*,<sup>1</sup> was called *Naráyan نارایان* by the Musulmans, a name which still exists in *Naráyanpur*, a town situated at ten miles to the north-east of *Bairát* itself. From Kanauj to *Narána*, Abú Rihán gives two distinct routes:—the first direct, *via* Mathura, being fifty-six parasangs, or 196 miles, and the other to the south of the Jumna being eighty-eight parasangs, or 308 miles. The intermediate stages of the latter route are, 1st., *Asi*, 18 parasangs, or 63 miles; 2nd., *Sahina*, 17 parasangs, or 59½ miles; 3rd., *Jandara* (*Chandrá*), 18 parasangs, or 63 miles; 4th., *Rajauri*, either 15 or 17 parasangs, 54 or 59½ miles; and 5th., *Bazána*, or *Narána*, 20 parasangs, or 70 miles. As the direction of the first stage is especially recorded to have been to the south-west of Kanauj, it may be at once identified with the *Assai Ghát* on the Jumna, six miles to the south of Etawa, and about sixty miles to the south-west of Kanauj. The name of the second stage is written *Salina*, سهینیا, for which, by the simple shifting of the diacritical points, I propose to read *Sahania*, سهانیا, which is the name of a very large and famous ruined town, situated twenty-five miles to the north of Gwalior, of which some account will be given in the present report. Its distance from the *Assai Ghát* is about fifty-six miles. The third stage named *Jandara* by M. Reinaud, and *Chandra* by Sir Henry Elliot, I take to be *Hindon*, reading چندون for چندرا. Its distance from *Sahaniya* by the *Khetri Ghát* on the Chambal river is

<sup>1</sup> [Reinaud's reading.]

about seventy miles. The fourth stage, named *Bajori*, still exists under the same name, twelve miles to the south of *Mácheri*, and about fifty miles to the north-west of *Hindon*. From thence to *Narainpur* and *Bairát*, the road lies altogether through the hills of *Alwar* or *Mácheri*, which makes it difficult to ascertain the exact distance. By measurements on the lithographed map of eight miles to the inch, I make the distance to be about sixty miles, which is sufficiently near the twenty parasangs, or seventy miles of *Abú Rihán's* account.

According to the other itineraries of *Abú Rihán*, *Nardna* was twenty-five parasangs to the north of *Chitor* in *Mewár*, fifty parasangs to the east of *Multán*, and sixty parasangs to the north-east of *Anhalwára*. The bearings of these places from *Bairát* are all sufficiently exact, but the measurements are more than one-half too short. For the first distance of twenty-five parasangs to *Chitor*, I would propose to read sixty-five parasangs, or 227 miles, the actual distance by the measured routes of the Quarter-Master General being 217½. As the distance of *Chitor* is omitted in the extract from *Abú Rihán*, which is given by *Rashidu-d Dín*,<sup>1</sup> it is probable that there may have been some omission or confusion in the original of the *Tárikh-i Hind* from which he copied. The erroneous measurement of fifty parasangs to *Multán* is, perhaps, excusable on the ground that the direct route through the desert being quite impassable for an army, the distance must have been estimated. The error in the distance of *Anhalwára* I would explain by referring the measurement of sixty parasangs to *Chitor*, which lies about midway between *Bairát* and *Anhalwára*. From a comparison of all these different itineraries, I have no hesitation whatever in identifying *Easána* or *Nardna*, the capital of *Karsát* or *Guzrát*,<sup>2</sup> with *Nárdyanpur*, the capital of *Bairát* or *Vairát*. In *Firishta* the name is written either *Kibrát*, كبرات as in *Dow*, or *Kairát*, كيرات as in *Briggs*, both of which names are an easy misreading of *ويرات* *Wairát* or *Vírat*, as it would have been written by the *Muhammadans*.

• • • • •  
According to *Abú Rihán* the town was destroyed, and the people

<sup>1</sup> [*Rashidu-d Dín* gives the distance as fifteen parasangs, see p. 60.]

<sup>2</sup> [See the variant readings in p. 59—to which may be added كئوروات, from *Sir H. Elliot's MS.*]

retired far into the interior. By Firishta this invasion is assigned to the year A.H. 413, or A.D. 1022, when the king (Mahmúd), hearing that the inhabitants of two hilly tracts named *Kairát* and *Nárdin* (or *Bairát* and *Nárdyan*) still continued the worship of idols (or lions in some manuscripts), resolved to compel them to embrace the Muhammadan faith. The place was taken and plundered by Amír 'Alí." ]

*Nírún.—Sákúra.—Jarak.*

Amongst the many places of which it is difficult to establish the true position in ancient Sind, Nírún or Nairún is one of the most perplexing, for several reasons. Its first syllable, even, is a controverted point, and while all the French authors uniformly write it Byroun, after Abú-l Fidá,<sup>1</sup> the English equally persist in following Idrisi<sup>2</sup> (p. 78), and writing it Nírún and Nerún. What imparts a presumptive correctness to the French reading is, that it is set down as the birthplace of the celebrated Abú Rihán al Birúni. But here, *in limine*, several strong objections may be raised,—that Abú Rihán was a Khwárizmian, and is so called by the best authorities,—that throughout his descriptive geography of India, he is more deficient in his account of Sind than in any other part,—that he nowhere mentions it as his birthplace,—and that no one ever heard of any Birún in Sind, though many local traditions speak of a Nírún, and concur in fixing its locality. Abú-l Fidá certainly writes it Birún, but there is often an assumption of accuracy about him which has been far too readily conceded by the moderns; for he was merely a distant foreigner, who never left Syria except to go to Mecca and Egypt, and he was therefore compelled to copy and rely on the defective information of others. Istakhri, Ibn Haukal, and the *Ashkálú-l Bilád* are not quite determinate in their reading, but the *Chach-náma* and the *Tuhfatú-l Kirám* never write it in any other form than with the initial N, followed by *yá*, which leaves us still in doubt whether the word be Nairún, Nírún, or Nerún; but it is certainly neither Birun, nor Birún, nor Bairún, nor Byroun.

Other considerations with respect to the name of Abú Rihán, will be found in the Note devoted to that philosopher, in the second volume of this work.

<sup>1</sup> *Géographie d'Abou-l Fidá*, p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> *Géographie d'Edrisi*, Tom. I. p. 16.

Under the dynasty of the Ráís, Nírún was included within the government of Bráhmañábád (p. 158). The inhabitants of Nírún solicited from the Arabs a cartel of protection, as their city was "on the very road of the Arabs to Sind" (p. 157). After the conquest of Debal, "Md. Kásim directed that the catapults should be sent by boat towards the fort of Nírún (p. 47), and the boats went up the stream called Sindh Ságara,<sup>1</sup> while he himself advanced by way of Sisám"<sup>2</sup> (p. 157). When Md. Kásim went from Debal "to the fortress of Nírún, which is twenty-five parasangs distant, he marched for six days, and on the seventh arrived at Nírún, where there is a meadow which they call Balhár, situated on the land of Barúzi,<sup>3</sup> which the inundations of the Indus had not yet reached (p. 158), and the army consequently complained of being oppressed by thirst. This drought was seasonably relieved through the efficacy of the general's prayers,—“when all the pools and lakes which were round that city were replenished with water.” He then “moved towards Siwistán (Sihwán) by several marches, until he reached Bahraj or Mauj,<sup>4</sup> thirty parasangs from Nírún” (p. 158). After his expedition to Siwistán and Eúdhya, he was directed by Hajjáj to return to Nírún, and make preparations for crossing the Indus (p. 163). He accordingly

<sup>1</sup> [Sir H. Elliot read this name as Dhand Ságara; but the MS. of the E. I. Lib. gives it distinctly as “Sind-ságar,” and this has been adopted in the text. Sir H. Elliot's copy seems rather to read Wahand, or Wahind-ságar, a name which is also admissible, see p. 256. It is called in the text an *dh*, or “water,” which has been rendered by “stream,” as it is manifest that the only water communication between Debal and Nírún must have been by one of the channels of the Indus. According to Capt. McMurdo, Debal was situated on the most western branch of the Indus, called “Ságara,” up which Muhammad Kásim conveyed his engines. *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 23, 32.]

<sup>2</sup> [Both MSS. agree in reading “Sisám” as the name of the place by which Muhammad Kásim proceeded, but it can hardly be the place of that name to which he advanced after the capture of Siwistán (pp. 160, 161).] Biláduri merely mentions the advance to Nírún (p. 121).

<sup>3</sup> [This sentence has unfortunately slipped out of the translation as printed at p. 158.] The word again occurs—“from the camp of Barúzi,” and must be the name of a place. If the reading had not been plain in both instances, I should have preferred “Nírúni.”

<sup>4</sup> [Sir H. Elliot's MS. of the *Chach-náma* gives this name as “Bahraj,” but the E. I. Library copy has “Mauj,” and this reading is confirmed by the MS. of the *Tuhfat-u-l-Kirán* (p. 7). On the other hand, Istakhri's map as given by Moeller lays down “Bahraj” in the locality indicated by the *Chach-náma*. A conflict of authority leaving the true reading doubtful, though “Bahraj” seems preferable.]

moved back by several difficult marches "to the fort which is on the hill of Nirún,"<sup>1</sup> where there was a beautiful lake and charming grove (p. 163). This fort was the nearest point to the capital of the Khalif. After crossing the Indus, a garrison was left at Nirún, to keep open the communications in the rear and protect the convoys (p. 144).

Istakhrí (p. 28) and Ibn Haukal tell us that "Nirún lies between Debal and Mansúra, but nearer to the latter, and that any traveller who wishes to go to Mansúra, must cross the river Indus at Manjábari, which is on the western bank, and stands opposite to Mansúra" (p. 37). The subsequent geographers copy these authors, as usual, adding little further information. Idrisí places it distinctly on the western bank (p. 78). Abú-l Fidá says it is fifteen parasangs from Mansúra, and fixes it in latitude 26° 40', on the authority of the Kánún of Birúni.<sup>2</sup>

The name of Sákara or Ságara, which is mentioned above, requires a few words of notice. The *Chach-náma* merely mentions that "the fleet of Md. Kásim came to anchor in the lake of Ságara;" but the *Tuhfatu-l Kírám* says, "having placed his manjaniks on boats, he sent them to the fort of Nirún, by way of the water of Sákúra, while he himself marched by land."<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere, we are informed in the same work, that "Debal, now called Thatta, was in the land of Sákúra."<sup>4</sup> Again, Tharra, which was a strong fort near Thatta, was "in the land of Sákúra."<sup>5</sup> Again, Dewal, Bhambúr, Bagár, and Tharra were each "excellent cities in the land of Sákúra."

In the *Ayin-i Akbari* Sákúra is entered as a Pergana in Sirkár Thatta; and in the *Tárikh-i Táhiri* it is also spoken of as a Pergana, lying under the Makálí hills, in which Thatta itself was included<sup>6</sup> (p. 257). Mas'údi speaks of a Ságara or Shákira (p. 24), two days' journey from the town of Debal; and it is added that both branches of the Indus disembogue into the sea at that place. It does not seem improbable that we have the same word in the Sagapa

<sup>1</sup> Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicis*, p. 179. He insists upon reading Birún. M. Reinaud considers the original to be ambiguous in this passage.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> *Géographie d'Abou-l Fida*, Texte Arabe, p. 348.—D'Anville, *Eclaircissements sur la Carte de l'Inde*, p. 37, et seq.

<sup>3</sup> MS. p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> MS. pp. 20, 48.

of Ptolemy and Marcianus Heracleotes, for they call it "the first and most westerly mouth of the river Indus."<sup>1</sup>

We may consider the stream of Sákúra to correspond with the prolongation of the Gisrí or Ghárá creek, which at no very distant time must have communicated with the Indus above Thatta. Indeed, Mr. N. Crow, writing in the year 1800, says, "By a strange turn that the river has taken within these five and twenty years, just above Tatta, that city is flung out of the angle of the inferior Delta, in which it formerly stood, on the main land towards the hills of Buluchistán."<sup>2</sup>

The position here assigned to the Sákúra, points out the direction where we are to look for Nírún, to which, by means of that stream, there seems to have been a water communication—at least approximate, if not direct.

It is quite evident that Nírún was on the western bank of the Indus. Not only do we find Muhammad Kásim going there in order to make due preparations for "crossing" that river, not only do we find Dáhir, on receiving the intelligence of the capture of Debal, directing Jaisiya to "cross over" from Nírún to Bráhmanábád without delay (MS. p. 102), but it is also so represented both in the text, and on the maps, of Istakhrí and the *Ashkálu-l-Bild*. Nevertheless, M. D'Avezac, in the map prefixed to the *Memoire sur l'Inde*, places it on the eastern bank. His authority stands deservedly high, but can be of no value against the positive testimony here adduced to the contrary.

How then it came in modern times to be considered identical with Haidarábád it is impossible to say, but so it is laid down unhesitatingly from the *Tuhfatul Kirám*, down to the latest English tourist.<sup>3</sup> Even if it could be accounted for by supposing that the Faláilí then constituted the main stream of the Indus, we should nevertheless find that the distances assigned to Nírún from various places named would not make it correspond in position with Haidarábád.

<sup>1</sup> *Geog.*, Lib. vii.—*Periplus*, p. 32, in Hudson's *Geograph. Græci Minores*, Vol. I.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Sindh*, p. 162.—See also Capt. McMurdo, *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *T. Kirám*, MS.—*Tad*, *Annals of Rajasthan*, Vol. I. p. 218.—McMurdo, *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 30, 234.—Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara*, Vol. III. p. 31.—Elphinstone, *History of India*, Vol. I. p. 604.—Burton, *Sindh*, pp. 131, 376. The latter says its ancient name is not only Nerun's Fort, but Patalpúr. If so, we can be at no loss for Pattala.

And here it is obvious to remark, that the establishment of its locality depends chiefly upon the sites which are assigned to other disputed cities, more especially to Debal and Mansúra. I have elsewhere stated my reasons for considering Debal to be represented by Karáchí, and Mansúra by Haidarábád. Much also depends on the real value of the farsang,<sup>1</sup> which greatly varied in different places, even in neighbouring provinces. As it was probably modified in Sind by the local *kos*, we may ascribe to it the small standard of two miles and a half, which we know it to have had upon the Tigris, according to the latest and most accurate investigations. Or, without assigning to these roughly estimated distances an accuracy which they were never intended to bear, we may consider the Sindian parasang to vary from two to three miles, so as in no instance to be less than the one, or more than the other. It is usual, and doubtless more correct, to fix the standard at a higher value than even three English miles; but this is evidently quite inapplicable in Sind, and would be even more decisive against the identity of Debal and Thatta, than the present hypothesis.<sup>2</sup>

Guided by all these considerations, I am disposed to place Nírún at Helái, or Heláya, a little below Jarak, on the high road from Thatta to Haidarábád. The correspondences in other respects appear exact, in every instance of comparison.

It has a direct communication by a road over the hills with Bela and would be the first place in the valley of the Indus which the Arabs could reach by land, and therefore nearest to the capital of the Khiláfat.

Lakes abound in the neighbourhood, and are large enough, especially the Kinjar, to have admitted Muhammad Kásim's fleet.

<sup>1</sup> On the Persian farsang, the Greek parasang, or Arabic farsakh, see the *Metrop. and Penny Cyclop.*, v. "Parasang."—Ainsworth's *Preface to Travels in the Truck of the Ten Thousand*.—Grote's *Hist. of Greece*, Vol. XI. pp. 19-22.—Ouseley's *Orient. Geog.*, p. xxii.—Rennell's *Geog. of Western Asia*, I. xli.—Reinaud, *Geog. d'Abou-l Fida*, Tom. I.—Freytag, *Lex. Arab.*, s.v.—Forbiger, *Handbuch der alt. Geog.* Vol. I. p. 555. In Khúzistán it is reckoned at three miles and three quarters, —*Journ. R. Geog. Soc.*, Vol. IX. p. 31. This is also the length assigned by Ouseley and Kinneir. On the Tigris we have it given as only two miles and a half.—*Trans. Bombay Geog. Soc.*, Vol. X. p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> Mas'údi (p. 21) is represented as laying down the Sindian parasang at eight miles. The same passage is rendered by Reinaud as "yodjanas," which would also imply a long parasang.—*Mémoire*, p. 59.



Nírún is represented as twenty-five parasangs from Debal. (The real distance is seventy British statute miles between Helái and Karáchí.)

Nírún was situated on a hill, which would admit of its being identified with very few other places of note near the Indus. It lay between Debal and Mansúra, but was nearer to the latter. (This position also corresponds with that of Helái). It was fifteen parasangs from Mansúra. (Thirty-five miles is the distance between Helái and Haidarábád.)

We need scarcely pursue the comparison farther. We may rest assured that Nírún was, if not at Helái, at least at no great distance from it, and was certainly not Haidarábád. It is worthy of remark that Helái itself is a place of undoubted antiquity, and there are two remarkable hills in its neighbourhood covered with ruins, representing perhaps the Hyala of Diodorus.<sup>1</sup>

Next to Helái, Jarak offers many points of probability. It is only twelve miles from Helái, and therefore the distances already laid down, with no great profession of exactness, would answer nearly equally well. Its commanding position, on a ledge of rock overhanging the Indus, necessarily denotes it to have been always a site of importance, and this is confirmed by the evidence afforded by several substantial remains of masonry on the banks of the river, which still arrest the observation of the traveller at that place.

#### *Sadúsán.*

The *Tárikh-i Alfí*, in a passage relating to Sultán Jalálu-d dín's proceedings on the Indus, mentions that Sadúsán was subsequently called Sístán. Though the writer here commits the common error of confounding Sístán with Sihwán, or Siwistán, on the Indus, yet he leaves us in no doubt what correction to apply, and we thus derive from him an interesting piece of information; for the position of Sadúsán, which is so frequently mentioned in the Arab accounts of Sind, has not hitherto been ascertained.

#### *Sámúí.—Tughlíkábád.—Kalá-kot.*

Sámúí deserves notice from the attempt which has been made to establish it as the celebrated Minnagara of the ancient geographers. It was the capital of the Jáms of the Samuna dynasty, and, according

<sup>1</sup> *Biblioth. Histor.*, Lib. xvii. cap. 104.

to the *Tuhfatul Kirám*, it was founded by Jám Pániya,<sup>1</sup> under the Makalí hills, about three miles north-west of Thatta.

Subsequently, the fort of Tughlikábád was built by Jám Taghúr or Tughlik, on the site of the older Kalá-kot, about two miles south of Thatta; but that, as well as its predecessor, was left unfinished by its founder (p. 272). By a strange vicissitude, the name of Tughlikábád is now comparatively forgotten, and that of Kalá-kot erroneously called Kalán-kot (the great fort), though for a time superseded, has restored the just claims of Rájá Kalá, and still attracts the attention of the traveller. Lt. Burton calls it Kallián-kot. I fear to differ from so good a local authority, but believe Kalá-kot to be more strictly correct.

The ruins of Sámúi, Samúiya, or Samma-nagar, "the city of the Sammas," are to be traced near Thatta; and, under the wrong and deceptive spelling of Sa-minagar, have induced Col. Tod, Sir A. Burnes, and many who have too readily followed them—including even Ritter, who considers the question settled "incontestably,"—to recognise in that name the more ancient and more famous Minnagara. The easy, but totally unwarrantable, elision of the first and only important syllable has led to this fanciful identification.<sup>2</sup>

*Sindán, Súbára or Súrabáya, and Saimúr.*

[These three towns were all south of Kambáya, and the first two were ports. Saimúr, though a place of trade, is not distinctly said to be a port, but it is laid down on the sea-shore in the map. Abú-l Fidá says that Sindán was also called Sindábúr, but this is hardly in accordance with Al Birúni and Rashídu-d din (pp. 66, 68). He also notices the variant forms of Sáfára and Sáfála for Súbára. The route as given by Istakhri, Ibn Haukal and Idrisi is—

Kambáya to Surabáya, four days;

Súrabáya to Sindán, five „

Sindán to Saimúr five „

And the first two add, Saimúr to Sarandíb, 15 days.

Idrisi also states Broach to be two days from Saimúr. Al Birúni

<sup>1</sup> [This is the "Jám Júna, son of Bábiniya," of Mir Ma'súm.]

<sup>2</sup> Tod, *Rajasthan*, Vol. I. p. 86; II. 220, 256, 312; and *W. India*, pp. 466, 481. — Burnes, *Travels*, Vol. III. pp. 31, 79; and *Cabool*, pp. 16-18.—Lt. Burton, *Simáh* p. 388; and *Unhappy Valley*, Vol. I. p. 105.—*T. Kirám*, MS. pp. 19, 20, 82, 84.—Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 475.—McMurdo, *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, I. 30, 232.

makes the distance from Broach to Sindán fifty parasangs, and from Sindán to Súbára six parasangs. Abú-l Fida says that Sindán was the last city of Guzerát, and the first of Mausbár (Malabár), three days' journey from Tana. It is hardly possible to reconcile all these statements, but there seems to be sufficient evidence for making Sindán the most southerly. It was on a bay or estuary a mile and a-half from the sea, and the modern Damán is probably its present representative. Súbára was similarly situated at the same distance from the sea, and finds a likely successor in Surát. Istakhr's statement would make Saimúr the most southerly, but this is at variance with Mas'údi and Al Bírúni, who say that it was in Lár (the country round Broach), and with Idrisi's statement of its being at only two days' journey from Broach. But it is not easy to see how it could have been only two days from Broach and yet five from Sindán. Notwithstanding the incongruity of these statements, it must have been a place of considerable size and importance. It is the only one of these three towns that has received notice by Kazwini. His account of the place is given in page 97 *supra*, but it supplies no data on which to fix the locality. Abú-l Fidá does not mention it, and the *Marásidu-i Ittilá'* affords no help, for it merely describes it as a city of Hind, bordering on Sind near to Debal.]

*Túr.—Muhatampúr.—Dirak.—Vijeh-kot.*

Túr was the ancient capital of the Súmra dynasty, called also by the name of Mehmetúr, and written by the local historians as Muhatampúr and Muhammad-Túr. It was situated in the Pargana of Dirak, and its destruction has been mentioned in the Extracts from the *Tárikh-i Táhiri* (p. 256). But its real ruin dates only from 'Aláu-d dín's invasion of Sind.

The ancient Pargana of Dirak is represented by the modern divisions of Cháchagám and Badban on the borders of the Tharr, or sandy desert between Parkar and Wanga Bázár. There is a Pargana of Dirak still included in Thatta, which may be a portion of the older district of that name.

Another capital of the Súmras is said to have been Vijeh-kot, Wageh-kot, or Vigo-gad (for it is spelt in these various forms), five miles to the east of the Púrán river, above the Allah-band.

The site of Túr has been considered to be occupied by the modern

Tbarri, near Budina, on the Gúngrú river. There are, to be sure, the remains of an old town to the west of that place; nevertheless, the real position of Túr is not to be looked for there, but at Shákápúr, a populous village about ten miles south of Mírpúr. Near that village, the fort and palace of the last of the Súmras is pointed out, whence bricks are still extracted of very large dimensions, measuring no less than twenty inches by eight.<sup>1</sup> Other fine ruins are scattered about the neighbourhood, and carved tomb-stones are very numerous. Fragments of pearls and other precious stones are occasionally picked up, which have all apparently been exposed to the action of fire. The people themselves call this ruined site by the name of Mehmetúr, so that both the name and position serve to verify it, beyond all doubt, as the ancient capital of the Súmras.

The curious combination of Muhammad-Túr, is an infallible indication that "Mehmet" and "Muhatam" are merely corruptions of "Muhammad," for this name is wretchedly pronounced in Sind. The present mode is *Mammet*—our own old English word for an image, or puppet, when in our ignorance we believed *Maometric*, or the religion of the false prophet, to be synonymous with idolatry, and *Mahound* with the Devil. So Shakespere, in *Romeo and Juliet*, says—

"A whining mammet, in her fortune's tender."

And Spenser, in his *Faerie Queene*—

"And oftentimes by Termagant and Mahound swore."

The still grosser corruption of Muhammad into "Baphomet," or "Baffomet," is not to be laid to the charge of our nation. This was the name of the idol, or head, which the Templars are falsely alleged to have worshipped,—*quoddam caput cum barbá quod adorant et vocant salvatorem suum*. Raynouard argues that this word originates from a misprint, or mispronunciation, of Muhammad; but Von Hammer and Michelet lean to a Gnostic origin, which we need not stay to consider, being satisfied that "Baffomet" is only another, and still more extravagant disguise, under which Europeans have exhibited the name of Muhammad.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Bég-Lár-nama*, MS. p. 8.—*Tuhfatul Kírám*, MS. pp. 162, 166.—Dr. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Sind*, p. 134.—Capt. McMurdo, *Journ. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 24, 226, 233.

<sup>2</sup> Raynouard, *Monuments hist. rel. à la condamnation des Templiers*, pp. 261-302; and in Michaud's *Hist. des Croisades*, Tom. V. p. 672; and in *J. des Savants*, for March and April, 1819.—Von Hammer, *Mysterium Baphometi revelatum in Fundgruben des Or.*, Vol. VI. pt. i.—Michelet, *Histoire de France*, Tom. III. p. 145.

## NOTE (B.)—HISTORICAL.

*The Rái Dynasty.*

The *Chach-náma* (p. 138) mentions only the three immediate predecessors of the usurper Chach, and in this it is followed by the *Túrikh-i Sínd*. It states that "Rái Siharas, the son of Díwáj (called also Sháhí-Sháhí) was defeated and slain by the army of king Nímroz,<sup>1</sup> which entered Kirmán from the direction of Fárs; and that he was succeeded by his son Rái Sábásí." It will be observed from the annexed extract, that the *Tuhfátu-l Kirám* gives two additional reigns, which are not, however, referred to any specific authority of ancient date.

"*Dynasty of the Ráis.*—Their capital was the city of Alor, and the boundaries of their country were—on the east, Kashmír and Kanauj; on the west, Makrán and the shore of the sea of 'Umán, that is, the port of Debal; on the south, the port of Súrat (Suráshtra); and on the north, Kandahár, Sistán, the hills of Sulaimán and Kalkánán. As the commencement of this dynasty has not been ascertained, I content myself with mentioning some of the names which are known.

"*Rái Díwáj.* He was a powerful chief, whose absolute rule extended to the limits above mentioned. He formed alliances with most of the rulers of Hind, and throughout all his territories caravans travelled in perfect security. On his death, he was succeeded by his son,

"*Rái Siharas*, who followed the steps of his father in maintaining his position in happiness, comfort, and splendour, during a long reign. His celebrated son was

"*Rái Sihási*, who also swayed the sceptre with great pomp and power. He followed the institutions of his ancestors, and accomplished all his desirea.

"*Rái Siharas II.* was his son and successor. King Nímroz raised an army for the purpose of attacking him, and the Rái, having

<sup>1</sup> [Sir H. Elliot considers Nímroz to be the name of the king, but it is quite open to read the words "Badshah Nímroz" as "king of Nímroz." This reading seems preferable, and has been adopted in the translation of the *Chach-náma*, p. 139.]

advanced to the borders of Kích to meet it, selected a field of battle. The flame of war blazed from morn to midday, when an arrow pierced the neck of the Rái, so that he died. King Nímroz, after plundering the camp, returned to his own country. The army of Siharas assembled in a body, and seated his son Sáhásí upon the throne.

“*Rái Sáhásí II.* excelled his ancestors in estimable qualities. Having, within a short time, settled affairs within the borders of his kingdom, he enjoyed rest and peace in his capital. He remitted the taxes of his subjects, on condition that they should raise (or repair) the earthwork of six forts: viz., Uchh, Mátela, Seorát, Mad (or Mau), Alor, and Siwistán. He had a chamberlain named Rám, and a minister named Budhíman. One day, Chach, son of Síláj, a Brahman of high caste, came to Rám, the chamberlain, who was so pleased with his society, that he introduced him to the minister.”

The names of these rulers are thus given by Capt. Postans, in two different papers in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, and on the authority of the same work, the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* :—

No. cxi, 1841, p. 185.—“Rahee Dewahey, Rahee Siheersin, Rahee Sahurse, Rahee Siheersin the 2nd, Rahee Sahee.”

No. clviii, 1845, p. 79.—“Rahi Dawahij, Sahiras, Rahi Sahasi, Rahi Sahiras the 2nd, Rahi Sahasi the 2nd.”

In an earlier number of the same *Journal* (No. lxxiv, Feb., 1838, p. 93), James Prinsep observed, “*Diwáj* seems a corruption of *dwija* ‘the Brahman;’ and *Sahurs* resembles much the genitive *sáhasa* of our Saurashtra coins, of whom the first is a *swámiputra*, or son of a Brahman; but the date seems too recent. See Vol. VI. p. 385.” But it appears from the passage just quoted, that it was a Bráhman dynasty which superseded the family of Diwáj, and there is no reason to suppose that Diwáj was himself a member of that caste.

The same Persian work, from which the above extract is taken, states that the reigns of these five Ráis lasted for the long period of one hundred and thirty-seven years, and that Chach, by his victory over Mahrat, Ráná of Chitor, established himself on the throne about the first year of the Hijra. It will be seen from the following Note, that as this date must of necessity have been placed too early,

the year 10 H. has been preferred, as the era of Chach's accession, and the extinction of the Ráí dynasty.

Pottinger, on the authority of a native work called the *Majma'-i Wáridát*, states that the dynasty had endured for two thousand years; which, as we know from Ptolemy and the Periplus that the country was subject to frequent revolutions at the early period of our era, and at the time of Alexander was under no single ruler, must be regarded as pure fiction. If we allow that there were really five reigns, there is no great improbability in assuming 137 years, as above mentioned, for the correct period of their duration; and thus we should obtain the Christian year 495 as that in which the dynasty commenced.

It is generally assumed that Khusrú Naushirwán was the king of Persia by whom Siharas II. was slain; but as Naushirwán died in 479 A.D., it would leave, at the very least, 53 years necessary for the reign of Sáhast II.—even supposing that his predecessor was killed in the very last year of Naushirwán, which we know cannot have been the case, as that potentate had been, for some time previous, employed in the western portion of his large empire. It is therefore quite evident, that king Nímroz<sup>1</sup> has been wrongly interpreted to mean that great Persian monarch; and we must therefore use Nímroz in its usual application of Sijistán, and allow the opponent of Siharas to be no more formidable a personage than the governor, or ruler, of that province; or, if we must necessarily have a Persian king—notwithstanding that no one of the name of Nímroz ever sat on the throne—then Khusrú Parviz (591-628 A.D.) an equally great conqueror, would answer all the requirements better; for we know that the eastern provinces towards the Indus revolted in the reign of Hormuz, his father and predecessor, and his recovery of them seems indicated by his having 960 elephants in his train—which could only have been procured from India.

Doubtless, Naushirwán did invade Sind or its borders,—because the fact is vouched for by unquestionable authority in the best

<sup>1</sup> In one passage he is styled "Bádbáh Nímroz," and a few lines afterwards "Sháh Fárs Nímroz." It will be seen from a passage quoted in the succeeding note, that Hormuz is represented as "the son of Fárs" in the *Chach-nama*; it would appear therefore that in that work "Fárs" is identical with "Naushirwán."

Persian annalists, and is shown by the relations, political, commercial, and literary, which appear then to have arisen between Persia and India; but it must have been during one of the earlier reigns of this dynasty; or if during the reign of Siharas II., it must have preceded the attack which resulted in that monarch's death. That he and Naushírwán were contemporary, during some portion of their reigns, is by no means improbable—for the latter reigned 48 years; and if we allow 40 for the reign of Sáhásí II., and 40 likewise for the reign of Siharas II.—the same period which Chach enjoyed, though his first years were signalized by internal rebellions and foreign invasions—we shall then find the 20 first years of Siharas's correspond with the 20 last years of Naushírwán's reign.<sup>1</sup>

It would detain us too long to enter upon any speculations respecting the country and race whence this dynasty derived its origin. I will merely remark, that the Scythian barbarians from Sind, who expelled the Gehlotas from Balabhipúra in the beginning of the sixth century,—the Yue-tchi, who re-established themselves on the Indus about the same time,—the Ephthalites, or white Huns, whom Cosmas declares at that period to have ruled upon the banks of that river,—and the Sáh dynasty of Suráshtra,—all offer points of relation, comparison, and contact, to which a separate dissertation might be devoted.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare Firdúsí, *Sháh-náma*, ed. Macan, p. 1632; Pottinger, *Travels in Belochistan*, p. 386; Schlegel, *Indische Biblioth.*, Vol. I. p. 203; De Guignes, *Hist. des Huns*, Tom. II, p. 469; Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, Vol. I. p. 141; Tod, *Annals of Rajasthan*, Vol. I. pp. 232-9; C. F. Richter, *über die Arsao. und Sassan. Dyn. ap. Erák. v. Asien*, Vol. IV. part i., p. 524; Gladwin, *Ayeeen Akbery*, Vol. II. p. 118; *As. Res.*, Vol. IX.; *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Vol. III. p. 395; Elphinstone, *Hist. of India*, Vol. I. p. 400; Bohlen, *das alte Indien*. Vol. II.; *Ancient Univ. Hist.* Vol. IX. pp. 305-9, 312, 318; L. Dubeux, *L'Univers Pittoresque*, "La Perse," pp. 327, 328.

<sup>2</sup> Melch. Thévenot, *Rec. d. Voyages curieux*, Part i. pp. 21, 22; Montfaucon, *Coll. nova Patrum*, Vol. II. pp. 132, 179, 337-9; *As. Res.*, Vol. IX. p. 113; Tod, *Ann. of Raj.*, Vol. I. pp. 216-9; II. 311-2; *Western India*, pp. 83, 147-9, 214, 268, 271; Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 407; T. Benfey, *Indien*; Lassen, *Indische Alterthümer*, Vol. II.; F. Baudry, *Encycl. Moderne*, Tom. XVIII., col. 103; Reinaud, *Fragments Arabes*, p. xxx.; *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 104, 124-7; *Journal A. S. B.*, Vol. IV. pp. 480, 684; VI. 338; 1837, pp. 377, *et seq.*; *Journal R. A. S.*, Vol. IV. p. 398; VI. 351, 439; B. Nicholson, *ib.*, Vol. XIII. pp. 146-163; V. le St. Martin, *Études de Géographie ancienne*, Tom. I., p. 245; Thomas' Prinssep.



*The Bráhman Dynasty.*

Though we have no reason to complain of any want of detail respecting the political transactions of this dynasty, yet we are left in considerable doubt respecting the chronological adjustment of the few reigns which it comprises, and even the very name of Chach is a subject of some uncertainty. Gladwin has "Juj;"<sup>1</sup> Briggs has "Huj;"<sup>2</sup> the two Manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Royale have "Hoj;"<sup>3</sup> Reinaud spells the name "Tchotch;"<sup>4</sup> Renouard leans to "Jaj," as he considers it a corruption of Yajnya;<sup>5</sup> S. de Sacy gives reasons for considering it to be "Hijaj;"<sup>6</sup> Pottinger writes "Chach;"<sup>7</sup> and he is followed by all English authors. This is certainly in conformity with native usage, and we have several existing instances of the same combination—as Chachpúr, Cháchar, Cháchagám, Chachí, Chachar, and similar names of places in the valley of Indus.

It is to this usurper I am disposed to attribute the introduction of the game of chess to the western world; and this question invites us to some further considerations respecting the correct mode of writing his name. Although Firdúsí informs us, that it was an ambassador of the king of Kanauj who introduced this game at the court of Naushírwán,<sup>8</sup> the statement of Ibn Khallikán seems more to be relied on, when he says that Sassa, son of Dáhir,<sup>9</sup> invented the game during the reign of the Persian king Sháhrám. It is true that we have to notice here an error in the parentage, as well as a contradiction with himself; for, in another place, he assigns the invention to Ballhít, whom he makes a contemporary of Ardashír, son of Bábak, who reigned four centuries before Sháhrám<sup>10</sup>—but the main statement seems to be upheld by independent testimony, and it

<sup>1</sup> *Aycen Akbery*, Vol. II. p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> *Perishta*, Vol. IV. p. 401.

<sup>3</sup> *Payments Arabes*, p. xxvii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* and *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 126-153.

<sup>5</sup> *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, v. "Scind."

<sup>6</sup> *Journal des Savants*, 1840, p. 225.

<sup>7</sup> *Travels in Behkistan*, pp. 317-9.

<sup>8</sup> *Shah-nama*, ed. Macan; Vol. IV. pp. 1719-1734.—Hyde, *Historia Shahiudii*, pp. 69-92, reprinted in the *Syntagma dissertationum*, Vol. II.—Freret, *Mém. de l'Acad.*, Tom V. p. 250.—Görres, *Heldenbuch von Iran*, Vol. II., p. 452.—Böhlen, *das alte Indien*, Vol. II. p. 67, *et seq.*

<sup>9</sup> According to the Chach-náma (p. 152) Chach was the son of Sílásj, son of Basábas.

<sup>10</sup> De Slane, *Biographical Dictionary*, Vol. III. p. 71, *et seq.*; Gildemeister, *de reb. Indica*, p. 141; Hyde, *ut supra*; N. Bland, *Journal R. A. S.*, Vol. XIII. pp. 13, 14, 20, 26, 62. [D. Forbes, *History of Chess*]

will be seen, from Tabarí's sequence of these Persian reigns, that Chach must necessarily have been contemporary with Sháhrám, or Shahr Irán, or Shahriyár, as he is otherwise called.

The name of "Sassa" assumes the various forms of "Sissa," "Sahsaha," "Súsá," "Sisa," and "Sa'sa'." Mr. Bland, in his learned article quoted below, says they are all obviously corruptions of Xerxes, or of a name which has served as its origin—not the Persian king, but a philosopher so named, who is said by Polydore Virgil and others to have flourished in the reign of Evil-Merodach at Babylon. I look upon this as too recondite, and consider that the transposition of the parentage above alluded to, as given by Ibn Khallikán [and Biláduri<sup>1</sup>], is more than counterbalanced by the superior authority of Tabarí; who, while he omits all notice of Chach, under that identical name, yet mentions Sassa, (who cannot possibly be meant for any other person than Chach), and speaks of Dáhir, his son, as being his successor.<sup>2</sup> Firishta also speaks of Dáhir as the son of Sa'sa', so that we are fully entitled to consider "Sassa," as the Arabic mode of representing "Chach"—just as we have "Shanak" for the Hindí "Chank," "Shatranj" for "Chatur-anga," "Sín" for "Chín," "Shásh" for "Chách," a town on the Jihún,<sup>3</sup> and many other similar conversions in the Arabic—since, there being no palatine letter corresponding with *ch* in that language, recourse can only be had to the sibilants; as may frequently be observed even in the Persian also, where no such necessity exists.<sup>4</sup>

Another preliminary question to settle respecting Chach, relates to his tribe and descent. There could have been no hesitation on this point, had it not been for the Chinese traveller, Hwen Tsang, who states that, at the time of his visit to Sind, the king was of the "Shu-to-lo" race.<sup>5</sup> This has been variously interpreted to mean a "Kshattriya,"<sup>6</sup> a "Súdra,"<sup>7</sup> and a Rájput of the "Chatur," or

<sup>1</sup> [Biláduri mentions "Sasa," "son of Dahir," *ante*, p. 125.]

<sup>2</sup> Tabarí, in *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 176, 179.

<sup>3</sup> *Sháh-náma*, ed. Macan, pp. 982, 1659; *Geogr. d'Abou-l-Féda*, texte Arabe, p. 494.

<sup>4</sup> See J. A. Vullers, *Institut. Linguae Persicae cum Sansc. et Zend. comparatae*, pp. 13, 26, 47.

<sup>5</sup> *Foe-koue-ki*, ed. Remusat, p. 393.

<sup>6</sup> "Rex e stirpe Xatrorum;" Gildemeister, *de reb. Ind.*, p. 14.

<sup>7</sup> "Le roi, qui, sans doute, était Tchotch, appartenait à la caste des Soudra;" Reinaud, *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 153. [See Stanislas Julien, *Hwuen Thsang*, Tome II., 170.]

"Chitor," tribe.<sup>1</sup> This latter is on the supposition that it refers to the king who was succeeded by Chach, and who was related to the ruler of Chitor—but this is not admissible, for the Chinese Buddhist did not commence his travels till 628 A.D.,<sup>2</sup> and after traversing the whole of Chinese Tartary, Turkistán, Northern Afghánistán, Kashmir, the valley of the Ganges, the Eastern and Western Coasts of the Peninsula, and Guzerát, could not have reached Sind much before 640, when Chach was fully established upon the throne. If we could introduce the traveller into Sind before Chach's accession, I should prefer "Kshatriya," or the modernized "Chattri," to any other interpretation of "Shu-to-lo,"—but, seeing that not a single Chinese name within, or on the borders of Sind, admits of any positive identification, we need not trouble ourselves about the meaning of this doubtful word. Our Arab and Persian authorities leave us no room to doubt that Chach was a Bráhmañ—at least by descent, if not also by religious persuasion; and the present Sáraut (Sáraswata) Bráhmañs of Sind call him as one of their progenitors.

[According to the *Chach-náma*, Chach was a Brahman who was introduced to Sáhasí Rái by his Chamberlain. Being taken into service, he won the confidence of the Rái, and the more tender regards of the Rání, his wife. He became Chamberlain, and, on the death of the Rái, he ascended the vacant throne, and married the widow, whose love he had previously rejected. The irregular succession provoked the resentment of Mahrat, chief of Jaipúr (or Chitor), a relation of the deceased Rái, who marched with his army to destroy the usurper and recover "his inheritance." In great perplexity Chach conferred with the Rání, who shamed him into resistance by proposing to change garments, and herself to lead the army against the foe. Chach then went forth to battle, and when the forces met, Mahrat came forward and proposed, as the matter was purely a personal one, to settle the dispute by single combat. Chach represented that he was a Brahman, and unaccustomed to fight on horseback. His magnanimous foe then alighted to meet

<sup>1</sup> Lt. Burton, *Sindh*, p. 380.

<sup>2</sup> Kilproth says he travelled between 630 and 660.—*Reise des Chinesischen Buddhistenpriesters H. T.* etc. Reinaud says, between 628 and 646.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 145.—M. Stan. Julien, in his valuable translation just published (1853), fixes the period more accurately between 629 and 646.

him on equal terms, when Chach treacherously sprung upon his horse and slew his adversary before he could recover from the surprise. After this Chach appears to have felt no Brahmanical repugnance to war and bloodshed.]

With respect to the period of his reign, we learn from the *Chach-náma* (p. 151) that Chach in or about the year 2 ɛ.—and about the fourth year after his accession<sup>1</sup>—advanced to Kirmán, being instigated to that measure by the fact of the Persian throne being then occupied by a woman.

Again, we learn (MS. p. 70) that Chach had been ruler of Sind for thirty-five years, when Mughaira attacked Debal, some time between the years 13 and 16 ɛ.

After Chach had reigned forty years, he was succeeded by his brother Chandar, who died in the eighth year of his reign (p. 152-4).

Chandar was succeeded by his nephew Dáhir, who was slain in the month of Ramazán, 93 ɛ. (p. 170).

The *Tárikh-i Sind* (MS. pp. 14-30) has briefly abstracted the account in the *Chach-náma*, but has given no date throughout, and has carelessly omitted all notice of Chandar.

The *Tuhfat-ul Kírám* gives a far better abstract of the *Chach-náma*. It represents (MS. p. 6) that Chach, after killing Mahrát, the prince of Chitor, established himself on the throne in the year 1 ɛ.—that he reigned forty years (*ib.*)—that Chandar, who succeeded him, died in the eighth year of his reign (*ib.*)—that Dáhir was killed in the year 93 ɛ., after having reigned thirty-three years (MS. p. 15)—and that the whole period of the Bráhmaṇ dynasty lasted ninety-two years (*ib.*)—which, however, is a manifest inconsistency, because in the detail, no more than eighty-one years, at the most, are assigned to the three reigns.

There seems reason to believe that these discrepancies can be reconciled by two very slight corrections in the reading of the *Chach-náma*.

Instead of "thirty-five years," in the first quotation, we should

<sup>1</sup> It may be proper in this place to remark, that Al Birúni mentions the establishment of a Sindian era, which commences with the winter solstice of 625 A.D.—3 A.H. As M. Reinaud justly remarks, that the commencement of a new era generally indicates a change of dynasty, he is disposed to attribute the establishment of the Bráhmaṇ dynasty to this year.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 147.

read "three or five years," as the period that Chách had reigned, when Mughaira attacked Debal. The form of expression is very common in denoting an indefinite period; and, as the disjunctive particle *or* is, in such uses of distributive numerals, always omitted, the difference in the reading becomes scarcely perceptible.

And in the first quotation, instead of "about the year 2 H.," I would read "about the year 10 H."—*dah* for *do*. The reading of *do* is quite out of the question, for there certainly was no female reign at so early a period as the second year of the Hijra, and none even before the tenth, if indeed so early. The confusion respecting these ephemeral reigns of the later Sassanians is notorious, and especially respecting the order of the three queens, Túrán-dukht, Azurmi-dukht, and Dukht-zanán—the last of whom is generally altogether omitted, and is perhaps identical with Azurmi-dukht;—but no author attempts to place either of them before 10 A.H. Now, since the *Chach-náma* represents that the queen mentioned by him was one of the successors of Kísra-bin-Hormuz-bin-Fárs, who had been murdered—alluding, of course, to Khusrú Parviz—and since we learn from a passage in Tabarí that one of Kísra's daughters was Dukht-zanán, who succeeded to the Persian throne for a short time in the year 13 H.;—and since the *Bauzatu-s Safá* assigns the reign of Túrán-dukht, another of his daughters, to the year 14 H.;—we may assume as certain that the expedition of Chach towards Kirmán occurred in one or other of those years.<sup>1</sup>

These simple emendations bring us close enough to the truth, to satisfy us with respect to the general accuracy of the *Chach-náma*. Where there is so much room for doubt, and where even Tabarí is not quite consistent with himself, or in conformity with others, even if the *Chach-náma* should be in error three or four years—and we have no right to assume that such is the case—there would still be no ground for impeaching the veracity of that valuable chronicle; and we are thus enabled with considerable confidence to assign to each event of the Bráhman dynasty of Sind its proper date, according to the Hijra computation.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As all three queens—if, indeed, there were three—were daughters of Khusrú Parviz, and as all their reigns are comprised within two, or, at most, three years, it matters little which we select.

<sup>2</sup> For the doubts which prevail respecting the proper period, sequence, and names

	A.H.
The accession of Chach to the throne of Sind.....	10
His expedition to Kirman, in the fourth year .....	14
Mughaira's attack, in the fifth year .....	15
Chach's death, after a reign of forty entire years.....	51
Chandar's death, in the eighth year of his reign .....	59
Dahir's death, after a reign of thirty-three entire years	93

*The advances of the Arabs towards Sind.*<sup>1</sup>

Scarcely had Muhammad expired, when his followers and disciples, issuing from their naked deserts, where they had hitherto robbed their neighbours and quarrelled amongst themselves, hastened to convert their hereditary feuds into the spirit of unanimity and brotherly love. Their energies, at all times impetuous, were now solely concentrated upon executing the injunctions of the "king of fierce countenance, understanding dark sentences,"<sup>2</sup> that they should enforce belief at the point of the sword, which was emphatically declared to be "the key of heaven and of hell."<sup>3</sup> Terror and devastation, murder and rapine, accompanied their progress, in fulfilment of the prophetic denunciation of Daniel, that this descendant

of the Sassanian princes between Siroes and Yazdijird, see—besides Mirkhond, Khondamir, and the Persian authorities—J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orient. Clement.-Vat.*, Tom. III., p. 419; Etychii *Annales*, Vol. II. pp. 253, 357, 408; Malcolm, *History of Persia*; Dubeux, *L'Univers Pittoresque*, "La Perse," pp. 333-6; Weil, *Gesch. der Chalifen*, Vol. I. pp. 63-65, and the Tables in the *Ancient Univ. Hist.*, Vol. IX. pp. 211-277; Dr. Smith's *Dict. of Biog.*, v. "Sassanides;" Moreri, *Grand Diction. Historique*, Tom. IV., p. 136, v. "Perse;" D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.*, v. "Sassanian," and *Enc. Metrop.* "Early Or. Hist.," p. 414. [Mordtmann in *Zeitschrift. D. M. G.*, Vols. VIII. and XII.; M. K. Patkanian in *Jour. Asiatique*, 1866, p. 220.]

<sup>1</sup> [A note in Sir H. Elliot's private copy shows that he intended to revise this article, after an examination of Tabari, and, in fact, to make Tabari's account the basis of his own. The editor was at first disposed to realize as far as possible this intention, but as the whole of Tabari's history is now in course of translation, and will ere long be published, under the auspices of the Royal Asiatic Society, it has seemed preferable to let Sir H. Elliot's work stand as he himself penned it. There is in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society a MS. History of Sind, from the commencement of the Arab conquest. It enters into full details drawn, like Sir H. Elliot's, from Sindian authorities.]

<sup>2</sup> Daniel, ch. viii. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Chapters ii., iv., viii., ix., xxii., xvii., lxi., etc., of the *Koran*. See also Sale, *Kuran*, Prelim. Disc., p. 194; Lane, *Selections from the Koran*, p. 70; Reiland, *De Jure Militari Moham.*, p. 5, et seq.

of Ishmael<sup>1</sup> "shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people; and through his policy, also, he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and stand up against the Prince of Princes."<sup>2</sup>

And so it was, that, within twenty years, they made themselves masters of Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Persia. The conquest of Persia was a mere prelude to further extension in the east; and though a more difficult and inhospitable country, as well as internal dissensions, checked their progress for some years afterwards, yet it was not in the nature of things to be expected that they should long delay their attacks upon the rich and idolatrous country of India, which offered so tempting a bait to their cupidity and zeal. Accordingly, attention was early directed to this quarter, and it will be our business now, in collecting some of the incidental and scattered notices which betray the settled purpose of the Arabs to obtain a footing in India, to trace the slow but certain progress of their arms, until it issued in the conquest of Sind by Muhammed Kásim.

*Abú Bakr*, A.H. 11-13. A.D. 632-634.

*'Umar*, A.H. 13-23. A.D. 634-643.

Under the Khiláfat of 'Umar,—A.H. 15 or 16,—a military expedition set out from 'Umán, to pillage the coasts of India. It appears to have proceeded as far as Tána, in Bombay. As 'Umar had not been consulted on the expedition, he forbade that any more should be undertaken to such distant parts; and to 'Usmán Bin Ásí Sakiff, governor of Bahrain and 'Umán, under whose orders the piratical vessels had been despatched, he signified his displeasure in very marked terms:—"Had our party," he wrote, "been defeated,

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon's gratuitous scepticism respecting the Ishmaelitic origin of the Arabians has been well exposed in App. I. to Forster's *Mahometanism Unveiled*. See also Faber's *Calendar of Prophecy*, and Fry's *Second Advent of Christ*. Occasionally, however, these authors carry the argument too far. Brucker has also arraigned the Bible genealogy of the Arabs, *Hist. Crit. Philosoph.*, Vol. I. p. 214. Muhammad's own Ishmaelitic descent may admit of doubt; but that does not affect the question respecting the Arabs in the northern part of the peninsula. See Sprenger, *Life of Muhammed*, p. 18; Sale, *ubi sup.* p. 11; Reinaud's *Sarrazins*, 231.

<sup>2</sup> *Daniel*, ch. viii. 24, 25.

be assured that I would have taken from your own tribe as many men as had been killed and put them all to death" (*supra* p. 116).

About the same time, Hakam, the brother of 'Usmán, who had been placed in charge of Bahrain, sent an expedition against Broach, and despatched his brother, Mughaira Abú-l 'Así, to the bay of Debal, where he encountered and defeated his opponents, according to the *Futúhu-l Buldán* (*supra*, p. 116); but the *Chach-náma* represents that he was slain. That work also mentions that the naval squadron was accompanied by troops, that Debal was occupied by merchants, and that the governor, Sámbar, son of Diwáj, had been nominated to that post by Chach, who at that time had ruled thirty-five<sup>1</sup> years in Sind (MS. p. 70).<sup>2</sup>

Shortly after, Abú Músá Asha'ri, who had been one of the companions of the prophet, and was otherwise conspicuous in the history of that period, was appointed governor of 'Irak (Basra), when Rábi, bin Ziyád Hárisí, one of his officers, was sent to Makrán and Kirmán. Orders were also despatched to Abú Músa, from the capital of the empire, directing him to afford all the information in his power respecting Hind, and the countries leading to it. As he had lately learnt the disastrous result of Mughaira's expedition, he wrote in reply to say, that "the king of Hind and Sind was powerful and contumacious, following the path of unrighteousness, and that sin dwelt in his heart." Upon which, he received peremptory orders not by any means to enter upon a holy war with that country.<sup>3</sup>

It is notorious that 'Umar had always a particular horror of naval expeditions, and it is probable that it arose from this untoward defeat. This repugnance is usually attributed to a later period, when, upon the conquest of Egypt by 'Amrú bin 'Así, the Khalif wrote to his lieutenant for a description of the sea; who replied:—"The sea is a great pool, which some senseless people furrow, looking like worms upon logs of wood." On receipt of this answer, it is said, 'Umar forbid all navigation amongst the Musulmánas, and transgressors were severely punished. Mu'áwiya was the first

<sup>1</sup> *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. p. 9; Gladwin's *Ayem Akbery*, Vol. II. p. 118; *Mémoires sur l'Inde*, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> [This is the statement of the MS., but in page 412 reasons are given for proposing to read "3 or 5" instead of 35.]

<sup>3</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS. p. 70.



Khalif under whom this prohibition was relaxed, and who despatched maritime expeditions against the enemies of his empire. The original cause of the restriction was probably that which has been already indicated, and its continuance may perhaps be ascribed to the unskilfulness of the Arabs upon the element to which the subjects of the Greek empire were accustomed from their birth. Had the Musulmán along the shores of the Mediterranean been as expert as the Arab navigators of the Indian ocean, there would have been no need to feel alarm at the result of actions upon the high seas.<sup>1</sup>

In the year 22 ھ, 'Abdú-lla bin 'Amar bin Rabi' invaded Kirmán, and took the capital, Kuwáshír,<sup>2</sup> so that the aid of "the men of Kúj and Balúj"<sup>3</sup> was solicited in vain by the Kirmánis. He then penetrated to Sistán, or Sijistán, and besieged the governor in his capital, who sued for peace when he found that "his city was as a tent without ropes." After this he advanced towards Makrán. In vain, also, did the chief of that country obtain the aid of the ruler of Sind, for their united armies were surprised and defeated in a night attack. With an ardour augmented by his success, 'Abdu-lla requested leave to cross the Indus; but the Khalif, true to his cautious policy, which restrained his lieutenants both on the northern and western frontiers, opposed this still more distant adventure.<sup>4</sup>

The invasions of this year are confirmed by Hasan bin Muhammad Shirází, who is a careful writer; but the names of the generals are differently represented. "In the year 22 ھ. Sijistán was conquered by 'Amrú bin al Tamímí and 'Abdu-lla bin 'Umar Khattáb. In this year also, Makrán was conquered by 'Abdu-lla bin 'Abdu-lla bin 'Unán, who had moved against that place from Kirmán. The ruler, who in the native language was styled Zambil, and was also king of Sind, was killed."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A passage in Procopius, *Bell Pers.*, i. 19, 20, seems to show that, in the time of Justinian, the Homerites of the Erythrean sea were no great navigators. The question has been examined in another note.

<sup>2</sup> See Vuller's *Geschichte der Seidschucken*, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> The Arabic and Persian Lexicons say, they were barbarous tribes, inhabiting the mountainous borders of Makrán, and descended from the Arabs of Hijáz. In the latter are of course to be recognized the modern Bulúch.

<sup>4</sup> *Tárikh-i Guzida*, quoted in *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> *Muntakhab-ul Tauárikh*, under the Khiláfat of Umar. The name of Zambil will be treated of under the History of the Ghaznivides.

The names are otherwise given in the *Habibu-s Siyar*. Kirmán was conquered by Suhail bin Udí and 'Abdu-lla bin Autibán, Sijistán by 'Asim bin 'Amrú Tamimí, and Makrán by Hakkam bin 'Amar Saubí. The conquests are also ascribed to a year later. Shohrug, the lieutenant of Fárs, was forced to yield his province to the victorious Musulmán; upon which, Mujáshia bin Mas'ud took possession of the cities of Sirján and Jiruft, while 'Usmán bin Abú-l 'Así advanced to Istakhar. In the same quarter, Sauria bin Zanním, employed with a separate division on the route from Istakhar to Kirmán, experienced a more determined resistance. In besieging one of the strongholds into which the natives had thrown themselves, he was suddenly attacked by a sally from the garrison, as well as by a numerous body of Kurds who had advanced to their relief, and was only saved through the aid of a miracle. In the end, however, the Musulmán were victorious. These are evidently all the same transactions, disguised by change of names,—the "Kurds" of the *Habibu-s Siyar* being the "Kúj" of the *Guzida*.

Dr. Weil, following Tabarí, gives other variations, and remarks upon Abú-l Fidá's and Elmacin's (Al Makín's) omission of the conquest of the Persian provinces in the south. The general's name is 'Abdu-lla bin Attab. "Kufej," or "Kufess," is given instead of "Kúj." The invasion of Makrán is ascribed to 23 H., in which same year, it is said, the conquest of Fárs was brought to a conclusion. The capture of Shíráz is also mentioned, although it is ordinarily supposed not to have been built till seventy years afterwards by Muhammad Kásim.<sup>1</sup>

'Usmán, A.H. 23-35. A.D. 643-655.

'Usmán bin Abú-l 'Así was not very rapid in his conquest of the province of Fárs, for he was repulsed before Istakhar, and it is not till the year 26 H., that we find him taking Kázerún and the still famous Kila'-i sufed, or white fort, between Istakhar and the Persian Gulph.<sup>2</sup> The whole province does not seem to have been reduced till 28 H.

In A.H. 30, a formidable insurrection took place at Istakhar, when

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. pp. 95-98.

<sup>2</sup> *Ferishta*, Vol. I. p. 2; Price, 139, 156. *Rauzat-u-s Safá*

the Musulmán governor fell a victim to the fury of the people. The fugitive king of Persia, Yazdijird, hastened to the scene, in the hope of retrieving his miserable fortunes; but after being nearly surprised among the ruined columns of the ancient palace, he was defeated with great loss by 'Abdu-lla bin 'Umar and 'Usmán, near that capital, and compelled to fly to Kirmán, and afterwards to Sijistán and Khurásán. The citadel of Istakhar was carried by assault, and many of the ancient Persian nobility, who had sought an asylum within that fortress, were put to the sword.<sup>1</sup>

During the next year, the pursuit of Yazdijird was followed up into Khurásán under 'Abdu-lla bin 'Amar, then governor of Basra, after obtaining the permission of the Khalif to advance into that country. The southern provinces of the Caspian not having yet been finally conquered, it was considered the more feasible route to march by way of Fárs and the borders of Kirmán, and so advance through the desert. A rebellion which then existed in the latter province was quelled by a detachment of one thousand horse under Mujáshia. Rabf bin Ziyád Hárísí was, at the same time, despatched to secure the obedience of Sijistán, in which province he received the submission of the metropolis, Zaranj; and 'Abdu-lla himself, having compelled the city of Tabbas to surrender on capitulation, entered the Kohistán, where he met with a sturdy resistance; but ultimately, with the assistance of Ahnaf bin Kais, he took Hirát, Sarakhs, Tálikán, Balkh, Tukháristán, and Naishápúr, and brought the whole province of Khurásán under subjection.<sup>2</sup>

Firishta attributes to the following year a proselyting expedition to the eastward, which is said to have been despatched from Baghdád; but as that town was not built for more than a century afterwards, no great value can attach to his sources of information. Baghdád did not become the seat of the Khiláfat till the time of Abú Ja'far Al Mansúr, in 148 A.H. 765 A.D. The three first Khalifs established themselves at Medína. 'Ali, in 36 H., chose Kúfa as his metropolis; and in 41 H., the Unmayides constituted Damascus

<sup>1</sup> Abulpharagü *Dynast*, p. 116; *Habibu-s Siyar*; Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 163; but compare also the Appendix, p. vii., in Vol. III., where the circumstances are stated differently, after Billáduri.

<sup>2</sup> Firishta, Vol. I. p. 3; Price, *Retrospect of Mahomadan History*, Vol. I. p. 161; Billáduri, in *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I., Anhang, pp. ix., x.

their capital: and so it continued during the whole period of their dynasty, which expired in 132 H., when Abú-l Abbás seated himself at Anbár, on the Euphrates;<sup>1</sup> and his successor, Al Mansúr, after remaining a few years at Háshimiya, in the same neighbourhood, finally established himself at Baghdád, where the seat of the Khiláfat continued, with occasional transfers to Sámarrá, till its extinction by Hulákú in 656 H.—1258 A.D.

The same kind of error frequently occurs in Persian authors respecting the government of 'Irák, or of the two 'Iráks, 'Arabí and 'Ajámí, in writing of the period treated of in this note. It was seldom that the government of the two 'Iráks, and rarely that the whole of even 'Irák-i 'Arabí, was centred in the same individual. This province, which may be considered to correspond with Babylonia, contained the two chief military cantonments of Kúfa and Basra. The former town was of some antiquity, and the seat of an Arabian prince before the time of Muhammad; but the latter was founded in A.H. 15, chiefly with the view of interrupting the communication with the Persian Gulph, and preventing the flight of the royal family of Persia by the sea route to India.<sup>2</sup>

It was not till the time of Mu'áwiya, that these two important places were entrusted to the charge of one person. By him their government was bestowed upon his bastard brother, Ziyád, of whom we shall find frequent mention in the following paragraphs. By the succeeding Khalif they were, after some interval, conferred upon 'Ubaidu-lla bin Ziyád.<sup>3</sup> The two governments were once more combined in the person of Hajjáj, who was invested with greater power than any of his predecessors.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was the original capital of the kings of Hira, before they removed to the latter town. It was destroyed by the soldiers of Julian. Respecting its position, see Dr. Gustav. Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 35. Its successive ruins at various periods are to be seen the Castle of Felugia. See also D'Anville, *L'Euphrate et le Tigre*, p. 71; D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.*, v. "Coufah."

<sup>2</sup> Compare Weil, *Gesch. der Chal.*, Vol. I. pp. 39, 72, 75, 84, and Anhang, p. ix.; Ritter, *Erkundung von Asien*, Vol. X.; Renouard, Art. "Persia," in *Encyclop. Métropolitana*; Preston, *Makmát of Al Hariri*, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 117; Ockley, *History of the Saracens*, pp. 369, 387, 391.

<sup>4</sup> The succession to these governments may be traced in the following passages of the first volume of Price's *Mohammedan History*; Kúfa, pp. 128, 137, 152, 153, 168, 184, 191, 192, 262, 379, 383-9, 392, 426, 445, 524, 536, 543; Basra, pp. 123, 146, 159, 164, 184, 191, 192, 230, 349, 379, 381, 385, 389, 392, 429, 439, 446, 461,

To revert to the eastern conquests—Dárábgard, which together with Fasá was taken in 23 H., subsequently revolted, and was again taken in 23 H.<sup>1</sup>

Abdu-lla 'Amar, who was a cousin of the Khalif, and had succeeded the popular Abú Músá Asha'ri in the government of Basra, thinking the opportunity favourable for extending the Muhammadan conquests in the east, obtained permission to detach Hakím bin Jaballa al 'Abdí to explore Sijistán and Makrán, as well as the countries bordering on the valley of the Indus; but it appears that Hakím reported so unfavourably of the vast regions which he examined, that all idea of conquest in that direction was abandoned.—“Water is scarce, the fruits are poor, and the robbers are bold. If few troops are sent there they will be slain; if many, they will starve” (*supra*, p. 116). The discord which prevailed among the Musulmán's after the death of 'Usmán, was an additional reason for not prosecuting any adventures in so remote a region; but private adventure does not seem to have been debarred, and was, no doubt, prosecuted under the tacit consent of the Khalif.<sup>2</sup>

'Alí, A.H. 35-40. A.D. 655-660.

Hasan, A.H. 40-41. A.D. 660-661.

Under the succeeding reign of 'Alí, it is related, on the authority of 'Amar bin Háris bin 'Abdu-l Kais, that Tághar bin Dá'ir was appointed to the charge of the frontier of Hind, and an army was placed under his command, comprising a select body of nobles and chiefs. Towards the close of the year 38 H., they marched by way of Bahraj and Koh-Páya, obtaining on the road great booty and many slaves, until they reached the mountains of Kaikán, or Kaikánán, where they met with a stout resistance from the inhabitants, of whom no less than twenty thousand had assembled to intercept their progress through the passes. But when the Arabs shouted out “Alláhu akbar,” and their voices re-echoed from the hills to the right and left, the infidels, hearing these shouts of triumph, were

460, 529, 543, 548. And in the first volume of Weil's *Geschichte der Chalifen*; Kufa, pp. 85, 135, 171-2, 176, 195, 369, 411, 428, Anh. p. vi.; Basra, pp. 72, 173, 195, 269, 277, 353, 366, 411, 611.

<sup>1</sup> Biladuri, ap. Weil, *Gesch. der Chal.*, Vol. I. Anhang, p. ix.

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 172; *Chach-náma*, MS. p. 72; *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS. p. 9.

confounded and alarmed. Some came forward and embraced Islám and the rest took precipitately to flight. From that time to the present, says the credulous author, voices proclaiming that God is great, "Alláhu akbar," are heard at the same season throughout these mountains. It was upon this occasion that Hárís bin Marra, distinguished himself by his bravery. "They were engaged in this victory when they were informed of the martyrdom of 'Alí; and on their return, when they arrived at Makrán, they learnt that Mu'áwiya bin Abí Sufyán, was Khalif."

This is, no doubt, the same expedition which Biládurí (p. 116) attributes to Harab bin Marra Al 'Abdí,—that is, a man of the ancient and powerful tribe of 'Abdu-l Kais (the *Abucsi* of Ptolemy), which was established in Bahrain, and devoted itself chiefly to piracies on the high seas. The same country has always been prolific of such enterprises, until they were effectually repressed by the British Government in India. The name of Al 'Abdí shows that the preceding narrative is founded on the authority of a member of that tribe, and 'Amar, being perhaps a son of the very Hárís, the hero of the story, family pride may have suppressed all notice of the defeat. Harab's adventure commenced and ended at the same times which are mentioned in the preceding paragraph, but the result is represented very differently. At the opening of the campaign, he was so successful, that in a single day he divided one thousand captives amongst his adherents. Nevertheless, he was in the end completely defeated in the country of Kaikán, and only a few Arabs survived to tell the tale of their disasters.

Col. Tod mentions that the generals of 'Alí made conquests within the kingdom of Sind itself, which were abandoned at that Khalif's death; but he does not give his authority for this improbable statement.<sup>2</sup>

#### DYNASTY OF THE UMMAYIDES.

A.H. 41-132. A.D. 661-750.

1. Mu'áwiya, A.H. 41-60. A.D. 661-679.

Under the Khiláfat of Mu'áwiya, the first of the Ummayides, we

<sup>1</sup> *Chach-nama*, MS., p. 73; *Tuhfat-u-l Kirám*, MS., p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Annals of Rájasthan*, Vol. I., p. 242.

are informed by a respectable authority, that 'Abdu-r Rahmán conquered Sind in the year 42 H.' It seems, however, probable that the expedition here alluded to is the one which occurred two years later, under Muhallab, one of 'Abdu-r Rahmán's officers, and which is more fully recorded in a subsequent Note upon the advances of the Arabs on the Kábul frontier.

In A.H. 46, 'Abdu-lla bin Suár, who was about that time entrusted with the command of the Indian frontier on the side of Kaikán, and "who was so generous and hospitable that no other fire but his own was ever lighted in his camp," enriched himself with the spoil taken from the eastern borders; and when he returned to Mu'áwiya, presented that Khalif with some of the horses of Kaikán. He remained some time with Mu'áwiya, and then returned to Kaikán, where, being attacked by the Turks with all their forces, he was slain in the conflict (p. 117).<sup>1</sup>

The *Chach-náma* adds, amongst other details of this expedition, which need not be here given, that Mu'áwiya appointed 'Abdu-lla bin Sawáriya, at the head of four thousand cavalry, "to the government of Sind," and said, "in the country of Sind there is a mountain which they call Kaikánán. There the horses stand very high, and are well made in all their proportions. They have before this time been received among the spoils taken from that tract. The inhabitants are treacherous, and are protected by their mountain fastnesses from the effects of their rebellion and enmity." He sent also 'Amar bin 'Abdu-lla bin 'Amar to conquer Armáel. After sustaining a complete defeat from the Kaikánis (called Turks by Biláduri), who swarmed around, and closed their egress by the passes, the remnant of the Arab army returned to Makrán.

This is related on the authority of "Muhlat, who heard it from Hindalí, who reported it on the authority of Kásim, who said, 'I heard it from Nasr bin Sufyán.'" This Hindalí is frequently mentioned in the *Chach-náma* as a transmitter of these traditions.<sup>2</sup>

The statement of the next incursion is somewhat confused.

Upon the death of 'Abdu-lla, Sinán bin Salma was appointed to

<sup>1</sup> *Tarikh-i Yaqúti*, sub ann. 42 H.

<sup>2</sup> Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 291.

<sup>3</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., pp. 74, 75; *Zuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS., p. 9.

succeeded him; but Mu'áwiya wrote to Ziyád, the powerful governor of 'Irák, who also held the lieutenancy of Khurásán, Sijistán, Bahrain, and 'Umán, besides Kúfa and Basra, directing him to select a man better suited to command on the marches of India. Accordingly, Sinán was superseded by Ahnaf Kais, "the ablest among the true believers," who went to Makrán, but was removed after a period of two years and one month. Hindalí is again one of the authorities for this account.<sup>1</sup>

By Biládurí (p. 117) this is otherwise represented. Ziyád bin Abú Sufyán raised Siná bin Salama to the command of the Indian frontier. He was a man of merit, and feared God, and was the first who obliged soldiers to affix to their oath the penalty of divorce from their wives. On proceeding to assume charge of his functions, he reduced Makrán, and founded cities in that country. He established his residence there, and exacted a rigorous account of the revenues of the province. By Ibn Al Kalbí this conquest is attributed to Hakím, above mentioned.

Ziyád then raised Ráshid bin 'Amrú, of the tribe of Azd, to the command. Ráshid went to Makrán, and thence made a successful inroad upon Kaikán; but was subsequently slain in an attack upon the Meds. He is said to have been succeeded by the Sinán, before noticed, who exercised his functions for two years (p. 117).<sup>2</sup>

"Abú-I Hasan heard from Hindalí, who had heard from Din-i Aswad," that when Ziyád had suspended the son of Salama from his functions, Ráshid bin 'Umar Al Khizrí, a man of good birth and of noted courage, was summoned to the presence of Mu'áwiya, who seated him by the side of his throne, and entered into long and familiar discourse with him. He pointed out to his officers that Ráshid was an excellent man, to whom their obedience was due, and that they should aid him in the battle, and not leave him alone in the field.

When Ráshid arrived at Makrán, he had an interview with Sinán, respecting whom he asseverated with an oath that he was a great man, well worthy to head an army in the day of battle. Sinán had received orders from Mu'áwiya to meet Ráshid on the road, and to

<sup>1</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Weil, *Gesch. der Chal.*, Vol. I. p. 291.



communicate to him full information respecting the state of Hind and Sind. When Ráshid had duly learnt this, he determined on prosecuting his route towards the frontier; and having received the revenue which had been assessed upon Koh-Páya, he went on to Kaikánán, where he collected the tribute due for the current and preceding years, and brought away much plunder and many slaves.

After a stay of one year, he returned by way of Šiwistán, and reached the hills of Mandar and Bahraj, where the inhabitants had assembled to the number of fifty thousand to obstruct his passage. The contest raged from morning till evening, when Ráshid was martyred.

Ziyád appointed Sinán to take his place, and bestowed great honours upon him, notwithstanding he had so lately been disgraced, because, as our author says, he had been blessed at the time of his birth by the prophet, who had himself bestowed the name of Sinán upon him. After advancing to Kaikánán, he met with great success, and established his rule in several countries, and at last reached Budha, where he was by some treachery put to death.<sup>1</sup>

Ziyád then conferred the command of the Indian frontier upon Al Manzar bin al Jarád al 'Abdí, who was surnamed Al Asha'as. He invaded Núkán (Búdha?) and Kaikán; and the Arabs were enriched with booty,—for the whole country became a prey to their devastations. They seized upon Kusdár, where they made many captives. Al Manzar died in that town (p. 117).<sup>2</sup>

2. *Yazid I.*, A.H. 60-64. A.D. 679-683.

3. *Mu'awiya II.*, A.H. 64. A.D. 683.

In the year 61 H., we find mention of another governor of the Indian frontier, of the name of Al Manzar, or Al Munzir; but as the one before mentioned had been appointed by Ziyád, who died in 53 H., and as the second Al Manzar, or Al Munzir, was appointed by 'Ubaidu-lla bin Ziyád, who succeeded his father, after a short interval, in the government of 'Irák, including both Kúfa and Basra, and as, moreover, the parentage is represented as entirely different, we must needs conclude that they are different personages. The one with whom we now have to deal was son of Hár, son of Bashar,

<sup>1</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., pp. 77, 78; *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS., p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Weil, *Geschichte der Chal.*, Vol. I., p. 232.

who "put on the vesture of government under evil auspices," for, as he was journeying, his mantle was caught in a splinter of wood, and was rent; and 'Ubaidu-lla bin Ziyád, who had nominated him, predicted, on that account, that he would not return alive from the journey he had undertaken;<sup>1</sup> but he had selected him, as no one was his equal in constancy and courage. And true it was, that no sooner had Al Munzar arrived within the borders of Búrání, than he fell sick and died.<sup>2</sup>

His son, Hakkam, was in Kirmán, when his father died. He was treated with kindness by 'Ubaidu-lla, who presented him with three hundred thousand dirhams, and appointed him to succeed his father for six months, during which period he is represented to have conducted himself with energy and boldness.<sup>3</sup>

One of the commanders appointed to the Indian frontier by 'Ubaidu-lla, was Harri al Báhalí. He engaged with great fervour and success in the border warfare, and acquired immense booty (p. 118).<sup>4</sup>

4. *Marwán I.*, A.H. 64-65. A.D. 683-684.

5. *'Abdu-l Malik*, A.H. 65-86. A.D. 684-705.

To the year 65 H. Colonel Tod attributes a Muhammadan invasion of Rájputána, by way of Sind, in which Mánik Rái, the prince of Ajmír, and his only son were killed. But the whole story is puerile and fictitious; independent of which, the Arabs had quite enough to do nearer home.<sup>5</sup>

When 'Abdu-l Malik, the son of Marwán, ascended the throne, his dominions were circumscribed within the limits of Syria and Palestine, rebellion being rife in the various provinces. The east was especially affected by these internal commotions. Kúfa was in the hands of Muktár and the Shí'ites, who had taken up arms to avenge the death of Husain, the son of 'Alí. The Azárikans, or followers of Náfí' ibn Azrak, had established themselves in the provinces of Fárs, Kirmán, and Ahwáz, and Arabia and Khurásán

<sup>1</sup> And as Samuel turned about to go away, Saul laid hold upon the skirt of his mantle, and it rent. And Samuel said unto him, "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day."—1 Sam. xv. 27, 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., p. 72; *Tuhfatu-l Kirán*, MS., p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> Weil, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Annals of Rájasthan*, Vol. II. p. 444.

obeyed 'Abdu-lla ibn Zubair, the rival claimant of the Khiláfat, who was in possession of Mecca. Within eight years after ascending the throne, 'Abdu-l Malik triumphed successively over all his enemies, re-established the authority of the Ummayyides over the Muhammadan empire, and began to restore the foreign relations of Islám, which had greatly declined during the early vicissitudes of his reign.

'Ubaidu-lla bin Ziyád, one of the ablest of his generals, invaded the territory of Kúfa, but was defeated and slain, in 67 H., by the army which advanced against him under Muktár. This disaster was not retrieved till four years afterwards, by 'Abdu-l Malik's obtaining possession of Kúfa. Meanwhile, Muhallab had defeated the Azárikaus, whom he had pursued into the very heart of Kirmán, and deprived them of their conquests in Fárs and Ahwáz. He then deserted 'Abdu-lla's cause, and submitted to 'Abdu-l Malik. Khurasán was obtained by similar corruption and treachery, and 'Abdu-lla was slain at Mecca by the army commanded by Hajjáj bin Yúsuf Sakífí. Thenceforward, 'Abdu-l Malik had leisure to attend to the extension of the empire towards the east.

To this especial object was directed his nomination of his successful general, Hajjáj, to be governor of 'Irák, who commenced his rule by conferring the charge of Makrán upon Sa'id bin Aslam Kalábí. Sa'id, however, had unfortunately to encounter the rivalry of Mu'áwiya and Muhammad, the sons of Haras, surnamed the 'Alláfi, from the title of 'Alláf, which was borne by one of their ancestors (p. 118).

As the 'Alláfi, or 'Allánis as they are styled in the *Chach-náma* are conspicuous in the subsequent history of Sind, that work dwells more particularly upon their history. It appears that upon Sa'id's arrival at Makrán, he put to death a man of the name of Safhúf bin Lám al Hamáuí. This man was claimed as a relative and fellow-countrymen of the 'Alláfi, who came from 'Umán, and they determined to seek satisfaction for his death. Accordingly, they attacked Sa'id, who was then on his return from collecting the revenues of his jurisdiction, killed him in the fray, and took possession of Makrán. Hajjáj then ordered Sulaimán 'Alláfi, one of the leading men of that tribe, to be seized, and sent his head to the family of

Sa'id. At the same time, more vigorous measures were taken to assert the authority of the government, and Mujjâ' was directed to proceed to Kirmân. He sent forward 'Abdu-r Rahmân bin Asha's to lead the advance, but he was waylaid by the 'Allâfis, and slain. They did not, however, think proper to engage in further collisions with the government, but fled to Sind in 85 H., where they sought the protection of Dâhir, who received them kindly, and entertained them in his service.<sup>1</sup>

The 'Allâfis remained in Sind till the arrival of Muhammad Kâsim, when they came forward and sued for forgiveness, which was accorded to them, as will be seen in the translated Extracts from the *Chach-nâma* (p. 168).

Sa'id was succeeded by Mujjâ', the son of the Si'r Tamini, most probably the same Mujjâ' above mentioned, who is called in the *Chach-nâma* and the *Tuhfatu-l Kirâm*, the son of Sa'id, as well as the son of Safar in the former, apparently by error of the transcriber. He despoiled the border districts, and took many prisoners from the territory of Kandâbel, the entire conquest of which was not effected till some years afterwards by Muhammad Kâsim. Mujjâ', after holding his office for the period of only one year, died in Makrân, about the same time as the Khalif 'Abdu-l Malik (p. 118).<sup>2</sup>

#### 6. *Walid I.* A.H. 86-96. A.D. 705-715.

Under this powerful prince the Khilâfat attained the greatest extent of dominion to which it ever reached. A little previous to the accession of Walid, Muhammad, son of Hârûn, was appointed to the Indian frontier, where he was invested with full powers to conduct operations as he thought best.<sup>3</sup>

He was directed to search out the 'Allâfis, and to seize them by every means within his power, in order that the blood of Sa'id might be avenged by their death and destruction. Accordingly, in the beginning of the year 86,<sup>4</sup> he secured one of the 'Allâfis, who was put to death by direct orders of the Khalif, and his head was despatched to Hajjâj, with a letter, in which the governor promised,

<sup>1</sup> *Chach-nâma*, MS., pp. 80, 81; and *Tuhfatu-l Kirâm*, MS., pp. 7, 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Chach-nâma*, MS., p. 82; *Tuhfatu-l Kirâm*, MS., pp. 7, 9; Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 504.

<sup>3</sup> *Chach-nâma*, MS., p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Firishita says he was not appointed till 87 H.—*History of Sind*.

“if his life were spared to him, and his fortune propitious, he would seize all the rest of that obnoxious tribe.” He was engaged, according to one author, for five years, according to another, for five months, in the important occupation of “conquering the rivers and forests.”<sup>1</sup>

Under the auspices of the cruel tyrant, Hajjáj, who, though nominally governor only of 'Irák, was in fact ruler over all the countries which constituted the former Persian kingdom, the spirit of more extended conquest arose, which had hitherto, during the civil wars, and before the re-establishment of political unity under 'Abdu-l Malik and his son Walíd, confined itself to mere partial efforts on the eastern frontiers of the empire. By his orders, one army under Kutaiba, after the complete subjugation of Khawárazm, crossed the Oxus, and reduced, but not without great difficulty, Bukhára, Khojand, Shásh, Samarkand, and Farghána—some of which places had been visited, though not thoroughly subjected, at previous periods, by the Muhammadan arms. Kutaiba penetrated even to Káshgár, at which place Chinese ambassadors entered into a compact with the marauders.<sup>2</sup> Another army had, by Hajjáj's directions, already operated against the king of Kábul, and a third advanced towards the lower course of the Indus, through Makrán.

The cause of this latter expedition was the exaction of vengeance for the plunder, by some pirates of Debal, of eight vessels, which the ruler of Ceylon had despatched, filled with presents, pilgrims, Muhammadan orphans, and Abyssinian slaves, to propitiate the good-will of Hajjáj and the Khalif. The pirates are differently named by the authorities whom we have to follow. The *Futúhu-l Buldán* says they were “Med.” The *Chach-náma* says they were “Tankámara.” The *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* says they were “Nankámara;” but in a subsequent passage gives the name more distinctly as “Nagámara.” 'Abdu-lla bin 'Isa, who wrote a commentary upon the *Díwán* of the poet Jarír, towards the close of the fourth century of the Hijra, says they were “Kurk,” for which a marginal reading

<sup>1</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., pp. 82, 83; *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Hammer, *Gemäldeaal*, Vol. II. pp. 123, 124; Abel Rémusat, *sur la Geog. de l'Asie centrale*, pp. 94-106. Compare also, respecting the relations between the Persians and Chinese, De Guignes, *Histoire des Huns*, Tom. I., pp. 54-59; Fréret, *Mémoires de l'Acad.*, Tom. xvi., pp. 245-255; *China in Univ. Pittoresque*, Asie I, 297

substitutes "Kurd." Reiske states his inability to comprehend what tribe is meant by this name. Reinaud says, "Kurds" are out of the question;<sup>1</sup> but that "Kurks" are mentioned by Ibn Al Asir, under the annals of 151 H., as having made a descent upon Jidda, and that two years afterwards a flotilla was despatched from Basra to make an attack upon the "Kurks," whom he surmises to be probably natives of Coorg, to the east of Mangalore.<sup>2</sup> But these are an inland nation, and cannot possibly have been engaged in maritime expeditions. Whoever they were, they must have been inhabitants of Debal, or its immediate neighbourhood, and though the name be extinct now, the Kurk, Kerk, or Kruk, may possibly represent a tribe which flourished at one time near the mouth of the Indus.<sup>3</sup>

The Meds are familiar to us, as being frequently mentioned by Ibn Haukal and the early writers on Sind.<sup>4</sup> The name of Tangámara presents great difficulties; but as there is a variation about the first letter, and as the omission of diacritical points would admit of the word being read Sangámara, it may be proper to point out, if that should be the correct reading, the identity of the two first syllables with those of Sangada, which Arrian tells us was the name of the mainland in the neighbourhood of Krokala.<sup>5</sup> How far the name extended does not appear, but it is curious that, to our time, it seems to be preserved beyond the eastern mouth of the river, in the celebrated pirate-coast of the Sanganians, or Sangárs, who for centuries have committed their ravages on the shores of Sind and Guzerát, until their total suppression under our government.<sup>6</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> They are, however, a very migratory race. We find them in Khurásán, Kábul, Fárs, Kirmán, the Desht-i be-daulat, and even in Sind, in the province of Kachh Gandáva, where they are classed as Bráhúis. It is also worthy of remark, that Ibn Haukal speaks of some of the inland Jats as being "like unto the Kurds."—Gilde-meister, *Scriptor. Arab. de rebus Indicis*, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> See separate note respecting the Kerks.

<sup>4</sup> The Meds are also treated of in a separate note.

<sup>5</sup> Ἐκ δὲ Κροκάλων ἐν δεξιῇ μὲν ἔχοντες ὄρος . . . Ἑλλων . . . ἡ δὲ χῆρος ἦεν Σάγγαδα.—*Noarchi Parapliis*, p. 5, in Hudson's *Geograph. Minores*, Vol. I.

<sup>6</sup> The principal station of the Sangárs is Juckow, in Kachh. Al. Hamilton says:—"The next province to Catchnaggen (Cach-nagar) is Sangania. Their seaport is called Baet, very commodious and secure. They admit of no trade, but practice piracy." Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages*, Vol. VIII. p. 310. See also Orington

may be remarked, also, that there is a tribe called Sangúr still dwelling on the coast of Makrán, at Malán and Batt.

It is probable, therefore, that the several authorities may be right in part, and that the different piratical tribes of the mouths of the Indus may have joined in the expedition which gave Hajjáj grounds for demanding reparation from Dáhir, the ruler of Sind.

Upon his declaring his inability to restrain their excesses, Hajjáj earnestly solicited from the Khalif permission to exact due vengeance from Dáhir and his subjects, offering to pay, from his own resources, double what would be exhausted from the public treasury. But the Khalif replied:—"The distance is great, the requisite expenditure will be enormous, and I do not wish to expose the lives of Musulmán's to peril."<sup>1</sup> In the same spirit of caution, or forbearance, Músa was checked in his career of conquest in Spain; and when the remonstancé was disregarded, a second envoy, despatched with more peremptory orders, seized the bridle of his horse in the presence of the whole army, and led him away to Damascus to answer for his contumacy.<sup>2</sup>

When, at last, the repugnance of the Khalif had been overcome by the urgent remonstrances of Hajjáj, and by his generous offer of double payment, which was at a subsequent period rigorously demanded, Ubaidulla bin Nabhán, was sent against the sea-port of Debal, where he met with defeat and death (p. 119).<sup>3</sup>

Hajjáj then wrote to Budail, of the Bajalí tribe, directing him to advance against Debal. As Budail was at 'Umán, M. Reinaud considers it probable that he proceeded by sea to his destination; but the *Chach-náma*, though somewhat confused, is fuller than the *Futúhu-l Buldán*, and tells us that Budail was ordered to proceed to Makrán, that Muhammad Hárún was directed to place three thou-

and D'Anville. Tod says the name was not that of any particular nation, but simply "Sangamdharians," the pirates of the "Sangams," or sacred embouchures of rivers. — *West. India*, p. 442. "Sankha," or "Sankhadwár," the old name of Bet, offers an equally probable origin. Mac Pherson (*Ann. of Comm.* I., 172) suggests Sangara, the joined canoes mentioned in the Periplus.

<sup>1</sup> Abú-l Fidá, *Annal Mosl.*, Vol. I. p. 107; *Chach-náma*, MS. p. 85; *Tuhfatul A'iram*, MS. p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Condé, *Hist. de la Dom. de los Arabes en Esp.*, ap. De Mariès; Reinaud, *Sarracins*, xviii.; Crichton, 336.

<sup>3</sup> Biláduri, *Fragments Arabes*, p. 190.

sand men at his disposal, for the purpose of proceeding to Sind, and that 'Abdu-lla bin Kahtán Aslamí was ordered to join him from 'Umán, which he accordingly did at Nairún. Budail advanced at the head of three hundred men from Makrán, and was joined on the way by the reinforcements from Muhammad Hárún. In the battle which ensued, Budail, after fighting gallantly, was thrown from his horse, surrounded by the enemy, and killed, and many Musulmán's were taken captive. The *Futúhu-l Buldán* and the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* represents the action as having taken place at Debal, but the *Chach-náma* is not clear upon this point.<sup>1</sup>

Hajjáj was sorely afflicted at this disastrous result of his expedition, and vowed that he would take ample vengeance for the various indignities which had been heaped upon him. As the people of Nairún dreaded the consequences of Hajjáj's anger, and reflected that their city stood on the very road by which the Arabs would enter Sind, their governor, who was a Samaní, or Buddhist, sent privily some confidential messengers to Hajjáj, promising to remit tribute regularly, and soliciting from him some writing, under which Nairún might be secured from further annoyance at the hand of the Musulmán's. This bond was readily granted, and the Samaní was enjoined to obtain the freedom of the prisoners taken in the late action, with the threat of "putting to the sword of Islám the lives of all infidels as far as the borders of China, if this demand was not complied with."

After this, 'Umar bin 'Abdu-lla requested that the government of Hind might be confided to him, but he was rebuked by Hajjáj, and told that the astrologers, after being consulted, had pronounced that the conquest of that country could be effected only by the hand of Muhammad Kásim.

Muhammad Kásim, as he is universally styled by the Persians, but by Biládurí, "Muhammad bin Kásim Sakifí," and by Abú-l

<sup>1</sup> Briggs gives the leader's name as "Budmeen." Reinaud as "Bodáyl." Lt. Postans as "Bazil." The *Chach-náma* as "Bazil," or "Buzail." [Biládurí gives it distinctly "Budail."] As "Budail" is an old Arabic name, it is probably the correct reading in this passage. Compare Ferishta, Vol. IV. p. 403; *Fragments Arabes*, p. 190; *Journal A.S.B.*, No. clviii., p. 85; *Chach-náma*, MS., pp. 85, 86; *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS., p. 8; Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I., p. 504; Sale, *Korán*, Vol. I. p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS., p. 86; *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS., p. 8.



Fiddá, "Muhammad bin Al Kásim," was in the bloom of youth, being only seventeen years of age, when this important command was conferred upon him. It is probable that, although he is represented to have already administered the province of Fárs with ability, he obtained his appointment less from personal merit, than from family interest, for he was cousin and son-in-law of Hajjáj; but the result showed the wisdom of the selection. His rapid career of conquest along the whole valley of the Indus, from the sea to the mountains, has been fully narrated in the translations from the *Futúhu-l-Baldán* and *Chach-náma*. From them it is evident, that his successes, like those of his contemporary, Tárik, in Spain, were as much attributable to his temper and policy as to his courage and strategy. There was, though by no means little—as Debal and Multán bear witness—yet much less, wanton sacrifice of life than was freely indulged in by most of the ruthless bigots who have propagated the same faith elsewhere. The conquest of Sind took place at the very time in which, at the opposite extremes of the known world, the Muhammadan arms were subjugating Spain, and pressing on the southern frontier of France, while they were adding Khwárazm to their already mighty empire. In Sind, as in Spain, where submission was proffered, quarter was readily given; the people of the country were permitted the exercise of their own creeds and laws; and natives were sometimes placed in responsible situations of the government. Much of this unwonted toleration may, in both instances, have arisen from the small number of the invading force, as well as from ignorance of civil institutions; but we must still allow the leaders credit for taking the best means of supplying these deficiencies, and seeking assistance from the quarters most able to afford it.<sup>1</sup>

The two authorities above-mentioned differ from each other in some particulars, and the *Chach-náma*, which is the source of the Persian accounts, furnishes a few details, wearing, especially towards

<sup>1</sup> Respecting Spain, see De Marlès *Histoire des Arabes en Espagne*, Tom. I. p. 14; III. 401; Lockhart's *Spanish Ballads*, xvii. Tárik's moderation was by no means imitated by his early successors. The soldiery plundered the towns, devastated the country, and profaned the churches. A native historian has remarked that the miseries of the vanquished constituted the happiness of the victors.—Mariana, *De rebus Hispania*, Lib. vi., c. 19.

the close, the appearance of embellishment ; but there is no startling discrepancy in the general history of the conquest, of which the broad features are preserved with fidelity in both narratives.

The Persian authorities, following the *Chach-náma*, mention that Muhammad Kásim penetrated to Kanauj, which, as the borders of that country then extended nearly to Ajmír, is no improbable circumstance, if we do not construe the expression to signify literally that the city of Kanauj was conquered. But even the possession of that great capital would not have satisfied the ambitious aspirations of Hajjáj; for he had ordered Muhammad to penetrate to China; and with the view of exciting emulation between him and Kutaiba, had promised, that whichever of them arrived there first should be invested with the government of the celestial empire: a fair challenge and a fair start,—for in the self-same year, one was on the Indus, the other on the Jaxartes, in the same longitude, and at the same distance from the eastern goal, which fanaticism and avarice, as well as the desire to secure a safe and remote asylum upon the death of Walíd, had designated to these rival generals as the guerdon of success and victory.<sup>1</sup>

#### *The Progress of the Arabs in Sind.*

From faith in Firishta, who has been followed exclusively by our modern historians, it has been usual to consider that the conquest of Sind was effected by only six thousand men, who, by some misapprehension of the original, are wrongly stated to be Assyrians. The more correct statement, given by our Arab authorities, shows that, independent of an advanced guard under Abú-l Aswad Jaham, which was ordered to join Muhammad Kásim on the borders of Sind, there were six thousand picked cavalry from Syria and 'Irák, six thousand armed camel-riders, thoroughly equipped for military operations, with a baggage train of three thousand Bactrian camels, which, however, Mír Ma'súm converts into three thousand infantry. In Makrán, Muhammad Kásim was joined by the governor, Muhammad Hárún, with other reinforcements; and five catapults, together with the necessary ammunition, were transported by sea to Debal. The number of men conveyed by the naval squadron may be esti-

<sup>1</sup> *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 186; *L'Univers. Pitt. Asie*, v. 327.

mated by the fact, that we find one catapult alone requiring no less than five hundred men to work it. These heavy machines had been used by the Prophet in the siege of Táif, and had done effective service only a few years before at Damascus and Mecca, as well as in the re-conquest of northern Africa; but they were so ponderous that they could be rarely used, except where the means of transport by water existed, or but a short distance by land had to be traversed. Hence Kutaiba, in his campaign beyond the Oxus, was often compelled to regret that a long and tedious land-carriage deprived him of the advantage of these implements, which were nearly indispensable in the operations in which he was engaged.

Besides these Arab troops, we find the Jats and Meds enlisting under Muhammad Kásim's banners, which, independent of its moral effect in dividing national sympathies, and relaxing the unanimity of defence against foreign aggression, must have been of incalculable benefit to him, in his disproportionate excess of cavalry, which could be of but little service in a country intersected by rivers, swamps, and canals.

This desertion of the native princes was doubtless occasioned by the severity with which they had treated the Jats and Loháns upon the capture of Bráhma-nábád. The inhibition of riding on saddles and wearing fine clothes, the baring the head, the accompaniment of a dog, the drawing of and hewing wood for the royal kitchen, were more suited to Musulmán intolerance than the mild sway of Hindúism; and accordingly, after the conqueror's first acquisitions, we find him so indifferent about retaining the good will of his allies, that he imposed the same conditions upon them, which he enforced with even greater stringency than his predecessors.

After the news of Muhammad Kásim's success reached Damascus, he was joined by other troops and adventurers eager for plunder and proselytism; insomuch that when he left Multán, for the purpose of proceeding to Dipálpúr and the north, we find it stated in the *Tárikh-i Sind* and *Tuhfat-ul Kirán*, that he had no less than 50,000 men marching under his standard, besides those whom he had left in the forts and garrisons of Sind. Hence we may see, that paucity of numbers was by no means so much against the chance of Muhammad Kásim's success as has hitherto been supposed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Elphinstone's *History of India*, Vol. I. p. 510.

There is no occasion here to follow this conqueror through all the rapid stages of his successful career. These will be found fully set forth in the translations from the *Chach-náma* and *Futúhu-l-Buldán*, which furnish details hitherto wanting in the authorities accessible to us. Abú-l Fidá and Abú-l Faraj tell us merely that Hind was conquered by Muhammad Kásim in the year 94 H. Ibn Kutaiba, ascribes the conquest to 93 H., but gives no particulars. Elmácin (Al Makin) only tells us that Hind and Sind were conquered, and that King Dáhir was slain by the Musulmán's, and had his head cut off; and Weil gives the following as the sum of all that the great historian Tabarí has to say upon this theme: "In the year 90 (?) Muhammad ibn Kásim, whom Hajjáj had appointed to command an army, slew the king of Sind, named Dass ibn Sassa. In the year 94, Muhammad ibn Kásim conquered India. In the year 95, the farthest India was conquered, with exception of Kíraj and Alman-dal."<sup>1</sup> A like complaint has been made of the meagreness of our modern writers with respect to this interesting period of Indian history, but without just cause, for they really had no documents to appeal to.

Though Muhammad left Shíráz in the year 92 H., he does not appear to have reached Debal till the beginning of the following year. The precise date is not mentioned, yet Hajjáj replies to the announcement of its capture, on the 20th Rajab, 93 (1st May, 712 A.D.); so, as news between Sind and the capital is said to have been conveyed in seven days, the fall of Debal may be dated in the beginning of that month.<sup>2</sup>

After the conquest of the capital Alor, in Ramazán of the same year, the *Futúhu-l-Buldán* carries him no further than Multán, from which place he returns on hearing of Hajjáj's death; but the *Chach-náma* takes him to the very foot of the Kashmír hills, to the part where the Jhelam debouches from the mountains, and forms the streams and islands which cannot fail to strike the traveller with the minute correctness of Quintus Curtius, in describing (viii. 45) the scene of Alexander's decisive victory over Porus, after passing the Hydaspes. In the *Chach-náma*, the place is called *Panj-máhiái*,

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. pp. 161, 184, 183, 606; *Annales Moslemici*, Vol. I. p. 148; *Historia Dynastiarum*, p. 201; *Historia Saracenicæ*, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS., p. 1.

or "The Five Waters,"—a miniature Panjáb, in short (*supra*, p. 144). It was here that Chach fixed the boundary of Sind and Kashmir; and the planting of fir-trees, to mark the site, shows how elevated a spot these conquerors had reached in their northern progress.

The balance of authority is perhaps in favour of Jalálpúr, as the place of Alexander's crossing the Hydaspes: argument and ocular demonstration conclusively decide in favour of the upper passage; but we need not discuss the point further. The literature of the question may be ascertained by consulting the references in the note.<sup>1</sup>

The Khalif Walid died six months after Hajjáj, in Jamáda I. A.H. 96—A.D. January, 715; and as Muhammad Kásim's recal was immediately consequent upon that event, he must have remained altogether about three years and a quarter in Sind and the Panjáb.

Our authorities differ respecting the mode of Muhammad Kásim's death; but it must be admitted that there is much more probability in the statement of the *Futúhu-l Buddán* than in that of the *Chach-náma*, which is followed by all the later writers. The former states that he was seized, fettered, imprisoned, and tortured to death with the Khalif Sulaiman's sanction; the latter, that the two daughters of Dáhir, who had been sent to the capital for the Khalif's haram, complained that they had already been violated by their father's conqueror,—upon which, Walid, in a fit of wrath, ordered that he should be sewn up in a raw cow-hide, and so transmitted to Damascus. When his body was exhibited to the girls, they declared that their assertion was untrue, and that they had uttered it merely to be avenged on the destroyer of their family and country. The tale goes on to say, that the capricious tyrant, in an agony of remorse for his hasty conduct, ordered them to be immured alive. Others say they were tied to horses' tails, and so dragged about the city.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Droysen, *Geschichte Alex's*, p. 389; Burnes, *Travels to Bokhara*, Vol. 1. p. 57; Ritter, *Erakunde von Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. i. pp. 452-4; vii. p. 93; Elphinstone, *Cambul*, p. 80; Williams, *Life of Alex.*, p. 267; *Trans. R. A. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 148-199; H. T. Prinsep, *Journal A. S. Bengal*, 1843, p. 628; J. Abbott, *ibid.*; Vol. XVII. p. 1; XVIII. and 1852, pp. 219-231.

<sup>2</sup> The account given in the *Chach-náma* has been already printed. The following is from Mir Ma'súm. It will be seen that both these authorities represent the Khalif Walid as the destroyer of Muhammad Kásim. "At that time a letter came from the Khalif Walid, to this effect:—'After taking Alor, you sent to the capital, among the prisoners, two daughters of Kája Dáhir, in charge of Muhammad, the son of 'Ali

whole story certainly savours more of romance than reality, but the reason which has been advanced against it—namely, that the

Tuhmán Hamadání, accompanied by Abyssinian servants. One night the Khalif had the two girls brought into his haram, and he then gave them into the charge of the bedchamber attendants, with orders to pay them every attention, and present them when they had recovered from the fatigues of their journey. Two months afterwards the Khalif remembered these two Hindi slaves, and ordered them to be brought into his presence. An interpreter accordingly summoned them. When their veils were thrown back, the Khalif, on seeing them, became distracted with admiration of their great beauty. He then asked them their names; one said her name was Parmal-Deví, the other said her name was Súraj-Deví. The Khalif ordered the attendants to leave one of them there. She then rose and said: 'I am not fit for the bedchamber of the Khalif, because Muhammad bin Kásim dishonoured us both before he sent us to the Khalif.' When the interpreter explained this, the fire of anger and jealousy was kindled in the Khalif, and he gave orders that as a punishment for this want of respect, Muhammad bin Kásim should be wrapped up in the raw hide of an ox, and be sent to the capital. To enforce this order, the Khalif wrote some words of menace in the margin of the letter in his own hand, 'Wherever Muhammad bin Kásim may be, when this reaches him, he is to come to the capital, and make no fail in obeying this order.' Muhammad bin Kásim was at Udhápúr, when the Khalif's chamberlain brought this mandate. When he had read it he directed that officer to carry the order into effect. He accordingly wrapped Muhammad bin Kásim in a raw hide. Three days afterwards the bird of life left his body and flew to heaven. The chamberlain put the body into a box, and carried it to the capital. When he arrived in Syria, he brought the box before the Khalif on a day of public audience. The Khalif enquired if Muhammad were alive? the chamberlain replied that he had been enclosed in a raw skin, and that he died three days afterwards. The Khalif then directed the box to be taken into the female apartments, and ordered that it should be opened there in his presence. He then called for the daughters of Rája Dáhir, and said, 'Come and see how supreme are my commands; behold, Muhammad bin Kásim!' They both came forward to look at him and recognized him, and, raising their hands, they blessed and praised the Khalif. They then said, 'Kings of great justice should not proceed hastily in perilous matters, nor act precipitately upon the information of friends or enemies in the most important of all concerns.' When the Khalif enquired what was the meaning of their address, they replied: 'We raised this charge against Muhammad bin Kásim out of enmity to him, because he slew our father, and through him dominion and wealth have departed from our house, we have come as prisoners into a foreign land; the king in his anger did not weigh our words, nor distinguish between our truth and our falsehood, but issued his fatal order. The truth is, this man was to us as a father, or a brother; his hands never touched the skirts of our purity; our object was to revenge our father, and so we made this accusation. Our wishes have been fulfilled, but there has been a serious failure in the king's justice.' When the Khalif heard this, he was overwhelmed with remorse for a whole hour; but the fire of anger then burst from the furnace of his bosom, and he gave orders for the two girls to be tied to the tails of horses, and, after being dragged round the city, to be thrown into the Tígris (*Dayla*). Muhammad bin Kásim was buried at Damascus. Two years after his death the people of India rebelled, and threw off their yoke, and only from Debalpur to the Salt Sea remained under the dominions of the Khalif."

sewing up in a hide was a Tátár mode of punishment, and not Arab—constitutes no valid objection; for, though it undoubtedly was practised by the Tátárs—as when the savage Hulákú murdered the last Khalif of Baghdád—yet an earlier example might have been discovered in the Arab annals. Even before the time of the Sind conquest, we find the adherents of the first Mu'áwiya enclosing the body of the governor of Egypt in the carcass of an ass, and burning both to ashes.<sup>1</sup> And as for the general tone of romance which runs through this version of Muhammad Kásim's death, we find a case somewhat parallel in contemporary history; for, when Músa, the conqueror of Spain, was treated with similar indignity by Sulaimán—the same relentless Khalif who persecuted the conqueror of Sind,—and was lingering in misery and exile at Mecca, the head of his son, who had been murdered at Cordova, was thrown down at his father's feet, while the tyrant's messenger taunted him in the midst of his agony and despair.<sup>2</sup>

#### CONTINUATION OF THE UMMAYYIDE DYNASTY.

##### 7. Sulaimán, A.H. 96-99. A.D. 715-717.

Yazid, who was appointed to succeed Muhammad Kásim, died eighteen days after his arrival in Sind. Habíb, the son of Muballab, was then appointed to pursue the war in that country; for, in the interval, the princes in India had revolted, and Jaisiya, the son of Dahir, had regained possession of Bráhmanábád. The local historians, indeed, tell us that, for two years after the departure of Muhammad Kásim, the natives recovered and maintained possession of the countries which had been conquered from them. Habib encamped on the banks of the Indus, and the inhabitants of Alor submitted to him, after he had defeated a tribe which opposed him in arms (p. 124).

'Amar bin 'Abdu-lla is also mentioned as one of the Sindian governors during this reign.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 242.

<sup>2</sup> Cardonne, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne sous la Dom. des Arabes*. Tom. I., p. 98. Gibbon, Chap. li.

<sup>3</sup> *Tarikh-i Sind*, MS., p. 37; *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS., p. 18; *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 571.

## 8. 'Umar II., A.H. 90-101. A.D. 717-720.

The Khalif Sulaimán, who died A.H. 99—A.D. 717, was succeeded by 'Umar bin 'Abdu-l Azíz. 'Umar addressed letters to the native princes, inviting them to embrace Islám, and to swear allegiance; proposing, as the reward of their acquiescence, that they should be allowed participation in the rights and privileges of other Musulmánas. The son of Dáhir, and many princes, assented to these proposals, and took Arab names. 'Amrú bin Muslim al Bahálí was the Khalif's lieutenant on this frontier, and he was successful in the invasion of several Indian provinces (p. 124).<sup>1</sup>

## 9. Yazíd II., A.H. 101-105. A.D. 720-724.

Under the reign of Yazíd bin 'Abdu-l Malik, the sons of Muhallab fled to Sind with their families. 'Amrú sent Hálál al Tamímí in pursuit of them, and on his encountering the fugitives at Kandábel, he slew Mudrak, Mufazzal, Ziyád, and all the sons of Muhallab, including Mu'áwiya, who had placed Muhammad Kásim in chains. This happened in the year 101 or 102 H., and forms an episode of some interest in the civil warfare of the Ummayyides, which is fully recounted by the Arabic historians of that dynasty.

When Yazíd, the son of Muhallab, had fairly committed himself to a contest with his namesake, the reigning Khalif, he had, in order to extend his power, and procure an asylum in the event of defeat, despatched his agents to obtain possession of the several provinces of Ahwáz, Fárs, Kirmán, and Makrán, as far as the banks of the Indus. Kandábel, "on the remotest frontiers of the empire," he had especially consigned to the charge of Wadda ibn Hamíd al Azdí, in order that he might ensure a safe refuge for his family in case of any disaster. His defeat and death shortly ensued;—upon which, Mufazzal and his other brothers, having equipped at Basra a sufficient number of vessels for the conveyance of themselves and the surviving members of the Muhallabí family, embarked for the coast of Kirmán, whence they proceeded, as originally designed, to Kandábel. There Wadda proved treacherous to his charge, and the whole family, it is commonly said, were extirpated in the action which took place under its walls; but some

<sup>1</sup> *Mémoires sur l'Inde*, p. 191; *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS., p. 18.



members, at least, must have survived; for, besides others of the same family, we read of one Yazíd Muhallabí, fifty years afterwards, as governor of Africa, and his son, Dáúd, as governor of Sind.<sup>1</sup> The women and children were sold into slavery, from which they were only redeemed by the humanity of a generous individual, named Jarráh, the son of 'Abdu-lla.'

10. *Hashám*, A.H. 105-115. A.D. 724-743.

14. *Marwán II.*, A.H. 127-132. A.D. 744-750.

'Amrú was succeeded in the command of the Indian frontier by Junaid, son of 'Abdu-r Rahmán al Marri, in which appointment, originally made by 'Umar, the governor of 'Irák, he was confirmed by the Khalif Hashám, son of 'Abdu-l Malik.

From the mention of the "Sindian frontier," it would appear that the Arabs were still excluded from the province itself; and it is, indeed, said in the passage from the native historian quoted above, that the new converts again apostatized, and revolted against the government. Junaid proceeded to Debal, but upon his reaching the banks of the Indus, the son of Dáhir opposed his passage, on the ground that he himself had been invested by the Khalif 'Umar with the government of his own country, in consequence of having become a Muhammadan. A contest took place between them on the lake of As-sharkí, when, the vessel of the son of Dáhir being quite disabled, he was made prisoner, and subsequently put to death. Sasa, his brother, fled towards 'Irák, to complain of Junaid's conduct; but he also, having been cajoled by the perfidious promises of Junaid, was killed by that Amír.

Junaid sent an expedition against Kiraj, which had revolted. The walls having been demolished by battering rams, the town was taken by assault, and pillaged. He despatched his officers also to various other places, of which it is difficult to determine the names. They may be mentioned as Marmád,<sup>4</sup> Mandal,<sup>4</sup> Dalmaj, Barús, Uzain,

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Khaldún, in *Hist. de l'Afrique*, by M. Noël Desvergères, quoted in *Mém.*, p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> Abu-l Fidá. *Ann. Mos.*, Vol. I. p. 442, and note 207; Erpenii Elmasin, *Hist. Sarac.*, p. 78; Price, *Muham. Hist.*, Vol. I. pp. 631-643; Weil, *Geschichte der Chal.*, Vol. I. p. 603.

<sup>3</sup> Had not Broach been subsequently mentioned, I should have conceived this word to be meant for the river Nerbudda (Narmada). It may be a mere repetition of the syllable which forms the root of Marusthali, "or great sandy desert," itself the origin of Marwár.

<sup>4</sup> See Note A, page 390.

Máliba, Baharimad, Al Bailáimán,<sup>1</sup> and Jurz ; but in most instances, it is almost impossible to identify them, with any approach to certainty (p. 126).<sup>2</sup> It is sufficient to observe, that these several expeditions are represented to have been rewarded with immense booty, and that about this period the extension of the Arab conquests, both by sea and land, seems to be confirmed by passages in the Hindú, as well as the Chinese, chronicles.<sup>3</sup>

Junaid was succeeded, about 107 A.H., by Tamím bin Zaid al 'Utbi, who had been previously sent to Sind by Hajjáj. He was found to be feeble and incompetent, but generous and profuse withal, having lavished no less than eighteen millions of *távariya*<sup>4</sup> dirhams, which he found in the public treasury of Sind. He died near Debal, "at a place called Buffalo Water, because herdsmen drove their cattle into it, to protect them against the bears (*dabáb*), which infested the banks of the Mihrán." Under his government the Musulmán's evacuated some Indian provinces, and, "up to this period," says Billáduri, "they have not recovered them all, and their settlements are not so far in advance as they had been previously."

After Támím, the government was entrusted by Khalad, governor of 'Irák, to Hakim al Kalabí. The inhabitants of Hind had relapsed into idolatry, except those of Kassa. Had they also followed the pernicious example, the Arabs would have been deprived of all retreat in case of danger. Hakim built a city on the eastern borders of a lake, which he named Mahfúza, "the guarded."<sup>5</sup> He made this a place of refuge for the Musulmán's, established it as the capital, and resided in it. Hakim entrusted 'Amrú bin Muhammad bin Kásim<sup>6</sup> with an expedition beyond Mahfúza, from which he returned victorious; and when 'Amrú was, in his turn, nominated

<sup>1</sup> "Nilmán" probably. There is a "Nihán" mentioned in the *Chach-náma* (p. 160), and a "Nílma" in the *Bég Lár-náma* (p. 292). The latter is midway between 'Umarkot and Jesalmír. <sup>2</sup> *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> Tod, *Annals of Rajasthan*, Vol. I. pp. 231, 242-250, 781; Ma-twan-lin, in *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*, Tom. I. p. 196; *L'Univers. Pitt.*, *Asie* I. p. 300, *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> This word is supposed to be corrupted from the "Stater" of the Greeks [but see note, *supra*, p. 3.]

<sup>5</sup> The province of Las, above Sunufáni Bay, answers well to this safe position of retreat, in the event of Arab discomfiture.

<sup>6</sup> From this parentage we may consider him to be a son of the conqueror of Sind.

governor, he founded a city "on this side the lake, which he called Mansúra, 'the victorious,' and which is now," adds Biláduri, "the capital, where the governors reside."

Hakim recovered from the enemy some of the territories which had been lost; but, though the people were content with his government, he was murdered during his administration. The governors who succeeded continued the war against the enemy, and reduced to obedience many of the provinces which had revolted. The names of these governors are not mentioned by Biláduri; but the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* says, respecting this period, "Sulaimán, the son of the Khalif Hashám, on being put to flight in his action with Marwán, was appointed to Sind, which he ruled well, and remained there till the accession of the 'Abbásides, when he hastened to pay his respects to Saffáh. Abú-l Khattáb also was appointed to Sind by Marwán."<sup>1</sup> The *Tárikh-i Sind* also mentions this latter appointment.<sup>2</sup>

#### DYNASTY OF THE 'ABBÁSIDES.

1. *Abú-l 'Abbás as Saffáh.* A.H. 132-136. A.D. 750-754.

When the 'Abbásides succeeded to the Khiláfat, Abú Muslim entrusted the government of Sind to 'Abdu-r Rahmán, who went to Sind by way of Tukharistán, and met on the frontier Mansúr bin Jamhúr, the governor on the part of the late Ummayyide Khalif.<sup>3</sup> 'Abdu-r Rahmán was totally defeated, his army put to flight, and he himself slain (*supra*, p. 127).<sup>4</sup>

Abú Muslim then conferred the governorship upon Músa bin K'ab ut Tamímí, who, on his arrival in Sind, found the Indus placed between him and Mansúr. The rivals, however, managed to encounter each other, and Mansúr and all his troops, though far superior to their opponents in numbers, were compelled to fly; his brother was slain, and he himself perished of thirst in the sandy desert.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> This may have been the same Abú-l Khattáb who was governor of Spain in Marwán's time. There was also a contemporary Zendic leader of this name.—M. Quatremère, *Journal Asiatique*, Aug. 1836, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> Ibn Khaldún and Elmacin wrongly assert that he was appointed by Saffáh.—See Weil, *Geschichte der Chal.*, Vol. II. p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> [See note upon the coins of 'Abdu-r Rahmán and others, *supra*, p. 374.]

<sup>5</sup> Hammer, *Gemaldesaal der Lebensbeschreibungen*, Vol. II. p. 158. Weil, *Geschichte der Chal.*, *ubi supra*.

Músa, when he became master of Sind, repaired Mansúra, enlarged the mosque, and directed several successful expeditions against the infidels. According to the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, it was Dáúd bin 'Alí who expelled the Ummayyide governor.

2. *Abú Ja'far al Mansúr.* A.H. 136-158. A.D. 754-775.

About the year 140 H., the Khalif Al Mansúr appointed Hashám to Sind, who conquered countries which had hitherto resisted the progress of the Muhammadan arms. He despatched 'Amrú bin Jamál with a fleet of barks to the coast of Barada,<sup>1</sup> against which point, we are informed by Tabarí and Ibn Asír, another expedition was despatched in 160 H., in which, though the Arabs succeeded in taking the town, sickness swept away a great portion of the troops, while they were stationed in an Indian port, and the rest, on their return, were shipwrecked on the coast of Persia; so that the Khalif Mahdí was deterred from any further attempts upon India.<sup>2</sup>

A body of troops, at the time when 'Amrú was employed against Barada, penetrated into "the kingdom of Hind, conquered the country of Kashmír, and took many women and children captive."<sup>3</sup> The whole province of Multán was also reduced. At Kandábel, there was a party of Arabs, whom Hashám expelled the country. They are suspected, with some reason, to have been adherents of 'Alí.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [This name has been rendered "Nárand," in page 127, after Goeje, but as the MS. has no points, the word may be *Bárand*, *Bárid*, etc.] M.M. Reinaud and Weil despair about identifying this name. I believe it to be Barada, or Jetwár, on the coast of Guzerát, and the Bárúd, or Bárúa, of Birúnf. Perhaps, also, it may have some connection with the Bar-ace of Ptolemy, and the Periplus. Barada stretches along the south-western shore of the Peninsula of Guzerat, between the divisions of Hálár and Sorath. The port of Párbandar, in Barada, is the great emporium of this and the neighbouring coasts, on account of its favourable position. The town, which was captured in 160 H., and which is represented to have been a large one, was probably Ghúmtí, of which the ruins attract the curiosity of the traveller, and still continue to excite the devotion of the Hindús. Tradition says it stood a siege of seven or eight years, but the precise era of its destruction is not known.

<sup>2</sup> *Frag. Arabes*, pp. 3, 120, 212.—*Gesch. der Chal.*, Vol. II. p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> This does not mean the present province of Kashmír. Hwen Tsang speaks of the Panjáb, about A.D. 640, as being a dependency of Kashmír, and the upper portion of the plain-country was frequently attached to that kingdom. The Kashmírian annals ignore these Sindian victories, and even interpose the glorious reign of Lalitá-ditya. See Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicis*, pp. 10-14.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 152-4, 188-191.—Stan. Julien, *Houen Tchang*, I. 162.

<sup>4</sup> Corrig. ex Tabarí, ap. Kosegarten, *Chrestomathia*, pp. 98-104. Conf. *Fragments*, 212; *Mém.*, 193; Gildemeister, 23; Weil, II. 56; Abú-l Fidá, II. 28.

About this time, the Sindian Arabs engaged in a naval expedition against Kandahár,<sup>1</sup> at which place the idol-temple was destroyed, and a mosque raised upon its ruins. Here, again, we have greatly to reduce the distance within which these operations are supposed to have been conducted. M. Reinaud, in his earlier publication,<sup>2</sup> in which he is followed by Dr. Weil,<sup>3</sup> considered the place here indicated to be Kandhár, near the Gulf of Cambay; but, in his subsequent one,<sup>4</sup> he inclines to the opinion that Gandhára, on the Upper Indus, is meant; of which Waihind was the capital. There is little probability of either being correct, and we need not look any further than the peninsula of Káthiwár, on the north-west angle of which is situated Khandadár, one of the objects of our attack in 1809, when, unlike its neighbour, Mália, it surrendered to Col. Walker's detachment without resistance.

Under Hashám, the supreme authority was enforced with vigour throughout the whole country, and the people are represented to have lived in abundance and content.

The government of Sind was then bestowed upon 'Umar bin Hafis bin 'Usmán, a Súfrian, commonly called Hazármard.<sup>5</sup> This must have been previous to 151 H., for in that year we find him transferred to the government of Africa, where he was killed in the year 154 H. He was succeeded in the African government by Yazid bin Hátim, or bin Mazid Muhallabí, while Rúh, the brother of Yazid, became governor of Sind in 154 and 155 H. (771 A.D.). At the time of Rúh's departure for the valley of the Indus, some one observed to the Khalif Mansúr, that the two brothers had little chance of being enclosed in the same tomb. Nevertheless, upon the death of Yazid, he was succeeded in Africa by his brother Rúh, and the two brothers were actually interred by the side of one another at Kairoán.<sup>6</sup>

5. *Hárúnu-r Rashíd*, A.H. 170-193. A.D. 786-809.

We have, during this prosperous period, another instance of transfer between Africa and Sind; for Dáúd bin Yazid Muhallabí,

<sup>1</sup> [Goeje's text gives "Kandahár."] <sup>2</sup> *Fragments Arabes et Persans*, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. II. p. 56. <sup>4</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 136.

<sup>5</sup> Tabari and Abú-l Fidá place the government of Hashám subsequent to that of 'Umar.

<sup>6</sup> Ibn Asir, *Kámilu-t Tawárikh*, anno. 171, ap. *Mém.*, p. 194. The years of Rúh's Sindian administration are differently given in *Fragments*, p. 213.

who had provisionally succeeded his father in the former province, was appointed to the latter about the year 184 H. (800 A.D.), and died there while holding the office of governor.<sup>1</sup> These transfers, no doubt, were designed to prevent governors becoming too powerful and independent, by maturing intrigues, and courting popularity with the inhabitants of any particular province; but they must have also been attended with the salutary effect upon the governors themselves, of removing prejudices, suggesting comparisons, imparting knowledge, and enlarging the general sphere of their observation.

The native historians mention other governors during this reign. One, a celebrated Shaikh, called Abú Turáb, or Hájí Turábi. He took the strong fort of Tharra, in the district of Sákura, the city of Bagár, Bhambúr, and some other places in western Sind. His tomb, which bears on its dome the early date of 171 H. (787 A.D.), is to be seen about eight miles south-west of Thatta, between Gúja and Kori, and is visited by pilgrims.<sup>2</sup>

Abú-l 'Abbás was also a governor of Sind during Hárún's Khiláfat, and remained in that post for a long time. This is all the information which we derive from Mir Ma'súm respecting the Arab governors, though he professes to give us a chapter specially devoted to this subject.<sup>3</sup>

The vigour which marked this period of the Sindian government may, perhaps, be judged of by the impression which the advances of the Arabs were making upon the native princes on the northern frontier of India. Even the Khákán of Tibet was inspired with alarm at the steady progress of their dominion.<sup>4</sup>

One interesting synchronism connected with the reign of Hárún should not be omitted in this place. Tabarí mentions that this Khalif despatched, by the Arabian sea, an envoy, accompanied with numerous presents, to some king of India, representing that he was sore afflicted with a cruel malady, and requesting, as he was on the point of travelling on a distant journey into Khurásán, that the famous Indian physician, Kanka or Mánikba, might be sent to attend

<sup>1</sup> Abú-l Fidá, *Annales Moslem*, Vol. II. p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. pp. 19, 234.

<sup>3</sup> *Tárikh-i Sind*, MS. p. 38, and *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. II., pp. 163, 180.

him on his tour in that province ; promising, on the honour of a prince, that he should be permitted to return to his country immediately on the Khalif's arrival at Balkh. The physician, who was sent in compliance with this request, was so successful in his treatment, that his imperial patient was in a short time sufficiently recovered to proceed to his destination, through the passes of Halwán. Nevertheless, the Khalif died at Tús, before he had accomplished all the purposes of his journey ; but, in due time, the Indian physician, according to promise, was allowed to proceed to Balkh, whence he returned in safety to his native country ; which, if not Sind itself, was probably no great distance from it, as the embassy of invitation had proceeded by sea. Some authorities, however, represent that the physician, in the first instance, crossed over the Hindú-kush, and returned home by the Persian Gulf.<sup>1</sup>

7. *Al Mámún*, A.H. 198-218. A.D. 813-833.

During this Khiláfat, Bashar bin Dáúd, who was invested with the chief authority in Sind, raised the standard of revolt, withheld payment of the revenues, and prepared to resist the Khalif with open force. Ghassán bin Abbád, an inhabitant of Kúfa, and a near relative of the Khalif, who had about ten years previous been governor of Khurásán, Sijistán, and Kirmán, was sent, in 213 H., against the insurgent, who surrendered himself to Ghassán under promise of safe conduct, and accompanied him to Baghdád, where he obtained pardon from the Khalif.<sup>2</sup>

Ghassán then appointed "to the government of the frontier," Músa, son of the famous Yahya, the Barmekide, and younger brother of Fazl and Ja'far, the ministers of Hárúnu-r Rashíd. Músa captured and slew Bala, king of As-Sharkí (the east), though five hundred thousand dirhams were offered as a ransom (p. 128).

In another work, Músa's appointment is ascribed to Hárún's reign. He was removed, because he squandered the revenues. He was succeeded by 'Alí bin 'Isa bin Hámán.<sup>3</sup>

There appears some difficulty about this period, with respect to

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Abú Usabi'ah, in *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Vol. VI. p. 110.—Price, *Mohammedan History*. Vol. II. p. 88.—A. Sprenger, *Biographical Diet.* L. U. K., Vol. II., p. 300.

<sup>2</sup> Abú-l Fidá, *Annales Moslem.*, Vol. II. p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, M.S. p. 18.

the succession to the government of Sind. It is asserted that, previous to the arrival of Ghassán, Táhir bin Husáin, who had been the main cause of the elevation of Mámún to the Khiláfat, received Sind as a portion of his eastern government, when he was appointed to Khurásán in 205 A.H. (820 A.D.), in which province he died before he had held it two years. Others, again, say that 'Abdu-lla bin Táhir (the Obaid-ulla of Eutychius)<sup>1</sup> received the province of Sind, when he succeeded to his father's government in Khurásán. Firishta also tells us, that the Sámánís extended their incursions to Sind and Thatta; but it may reasonably be doubted if either they, or the Táhirís,<sup>2</sup> exercised any power in the valley of Indus, any more than did the Suffárides (except perhaps Ya'kúb), or the Búwaihídes, whose seats of government were much nearer, and who had many more facilities for establishing their power in that direction. There is a confusion, also, respecting the precise date of the Barmekide governor above alluded to.<sup>3</sup>

8. *Al-Mu'tasim-bi-llah*, A.H. 218-227. A.D. 833-841.

Músa, the Barmekide, after acquiring a good reputation, died in the year 221 H., leaving a son, named 'Amrán, who was nominated governor of Sind by Mu'tasim-bi-llah, then Khalif. 'Amrán betook himself to the country of Kaikán, which was in the occupation of the Jats, vanquished them, and founded a city, which he called Al Baizá, "the white," where he established a military colony. He then returned to Mansúra, and thence went to Kandábel, which was in the possession of Muhammad bin Khalíl. The town was taken, and the principal inhabitants were transferred to KUSDÁR. After that, he sent an expedition against the Meds, killed three thousand of them, and constructed a causeway, which bore the name of "the Med's causeway." Upon encamping near the river Alrúr,<sup>4</sup> he summoned the

<sup>1</sup> Eutychii *Annales*, Vol. II. p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> [See note on the Tátariya dirhams, *supra*, p. 3; Thomas' Prinsep, Vol. II. p. 118.]

<sup>3</sup> Compare M. de Sacy, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, Tom. III. p. 496.—M. de Slane, *Diet. d'Ibn-Khaldún*, Tom. I. p. 642.—*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 198.—*Fragm. Arabes*, p. 215.—Gildemeister, *de reb. Indicia*, p. 24.—Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. II. p. 228.

<sup>4</sup> [This is the reading of Goeje's text (see *supra*, p. 128), but Sir H. Elliot read "Aral," respecting which he says] This river, by some considered an artificial canal, runs from the lake Manchhar, and falls into the Indus, near Sihwán.



Jats, who were dependent on his government. "When they obeyed the call, he stamped a seal upon their hands,<sup>1</sup> and received from them the capitation tax, directing that when they presented themselves to him, they should each be accompanied by a dog, so that the price of a dog rose as high as fifty dirhams."

The meaning of this strange provision is not very evident, but we have seen above, that it originated with the Bráhman dynasty, and was approved by Muhammad Kásim. It does not appear whether the tribute-dogs were taken away by the Arabs, or whether it was intended to encourage the breed, by making it necessary that every man should have his dog. It is only for one of these two reasons that the price could have been enhanced. In the former case, they must have been taken, either for the purpose of being slaughtered<sup>2</sup> by the Arabs, in order to diminish their number, which might have amounted to a nuisance, or they were taken and kept to be used by themselves, as by the Tálpúr princes of later times, in hunting—or in watching flocks, as we see them employed to this day in the Delta, where they allow no stranger to approach a village. For the same reasons they are held in high repute in Bulúchistán.

Had any people but Saracens been rulers in Syria and Mesopotamia, we might have even surmised that these animals were an article of export, for the celebrity of Indian dogs was great among the ancient occupants of the same country, and by them they were largely imported, as they were considered the best for hunting wild beasts, and even lions were readily attacked by them.<sup>3</sup> Xerxes, as Herodotus tells us, was followed in his expedition to Greece by Indian dogs, of which "none could mention the number, they were so many" (vii. 187); and Tritachmes, the satrap of Babylon, kept

<sup>1</sup> This means, most probably, a permanent brand, which at that time was a favourite mode of marking a distinction between Christians, or Jews and Muhammadans.—*Mod. Universal Hist.*, Vol. XI. p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> This is improbable, because, however unclean they may be in the eyes of the faithful, the killing of them is considered unlawful, "since they have souls!" This decision was gravely pronounced by a Turkish mufti, on the occasion of a plague in Constantinople, when they were transported to a desert isle.—*Ibid.* Vol. X. p. 196.

<sup>3</sup> These were perhaps from the countries of the upper, rather than the lower, India. The Sind hound is described by Vigue, in his *Travels in Kashmir*, Vol. II., p. 411. Respecting the ancient estimation of these Indian dogs, see the passages from Strabo, Diodorus, Elian, Plutarch, and Græsius, cited by R. Geier, *Alexandri M. Hist. Scriptores*, p. 373; Ctesias, *Iouica*, s. 26; *Arist. Hist. Animal.* VII. 23.

such a number of Indian dogs, that four considerable towns in the plains were exempted from all other taxes, and devoted to their maintenance" (i. 192). But, as dogs are held in abomination by Muhammadans, we cannot conceive that these tribute-dogs were disposed of in this fashion. Whatever may have been the cause of this article of the engagement, it is a curious fact, that the effect seems to have survived in the very scene of these operations; for it is notorious, that the rare crime of dog-stealing is practised to the west of Aral and Manchhar, and travellers are obliged to adopt especial precautions in passing through that district.<sup>1</sup>

After this triumphant affair with the Jats, 'Amrán again attacked the Meds at several different points, having many Jat chiefs under his banners; and he dug a canal, by which the sea-water flowed into their lake, so that the only water which they had to drink became salt.

The spirit of faction which prevailed between the Nizárian and Yamánian Arabs, was the cause of 'Amrán's death, he having been appointed by 'Umar bin 'Abdu-l-'Azíz al Habbári, who espoused the Nizárian cause, and whose family, in Ibn Haukal's time, was supreme in Mansúra. It was during 'Amrán's government, that the Indians of Sindán<sup>2</sup> declared themselves independent; but they respected the mosque, which the Musulháns of the town visited every Friday, for the purpose of reading the usual offices and praying for the Khalif. Sindán had been originally captured by Fazl bin Máhán, once a slave of the family of Sáma,—the same probably that afterwards made itself master of Multán. He sent an elephant to the Khalif Mámún, and prayed for him in the Jámí' Masjid, which he erected in Sindán. At his death, he was succeeded by his son Muhammad, who fitted out a flotilla of seventy barks against the Meds of Hind, put many of them to the sword, and took Mália.<sup>3</sup> In his absence, one of his brothers, named Máhán, treacherously usurped the government of Sindán, and wrote to propitiate the goodwill of Mu'tasim; but the Indians declared against

<sup>1</sup> Masson's *Travels in Afghanistan, &c.*, Vol. II. p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> There was a Sindán fifty parasangs south of Broach, and eleven north of Tána, which is spoken of by the old Arab geographers (see p. 402). But the town here spoken of is more probably the Sindán, or Sandán, in Abrása, the southern district of Kachh. See Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicis*, pp. 46, 47.

<sup>3</sup> [This name is unintelligible in the text, it may be Máli, Káli, or Fálí].

him, and crucified him, and subsequently, as before stated, proclaimed their independence, by renouncing allegiance to the Muhammadans (p. 129).

It was in 'Amrân's time, also, that the country of Al 'Usaifân,<sup>1</sup> situated between Kashmír, Kábul, and Multán, was governed by a certain prince of good understanding. His son falling ill, the prince asked the priests of one of the idols worshipped by the inhabitants, to beseech the idol to heal his son. The priests, after absenting themselves a short time, returned, and said the idol had heard their prayers, yet the son died notwithstanding. The prince, exasperated at their fraudulent pretensions, demolished the temple, broke the idol in pieces, and massacred the ministers. He then called before him some Musulmán merchants, who developed to him the proofs of the unity of God, upon which he readily became a convert to the faith (p. 129).

Among the notices of Mu'tasim's reign, we find it mentioned that, in order to reward Ikshín, the Turk, for his seizure of the notorious fanatic Bábek, who had spread great consternation by the effects of his first successes, the Khalif bestowed upon him twenty millions of dirhams from the province of Sind—which was equal to two years' revenue; but it does not appear that Ikshín ever went there to collect it, and it was probably a mere assignment upon the general revenues, which might be paid when convenient, or altogether repudiated. The mention of a particular province is strange, under the circumstances of the time, and would seem to show that but little was received into the general treasury from that source. Ikshín, in short, was entitled to collect that amount, *if he could*, by rigid extortions in the province itself; just as, at a later period of Indian history, the miserable *jágirdár* was put off by assignments upon turbulent and rebellious provinces.<sup>2</sup> The value of such drafts, even

<sup>1</sup> If the Yúsufzâis had not been declared to have occupied their present tracts at a much later period, we might have conceived them to be here alluded to. We might even trace the earlier and extinct Assacani in this name, as written in Arabic characters. See Müzzell's note to Quintus Curtius, viii. 37.—Arrian, *India*, i.—C. Müller, *Scriptores rerum Alex.*, p. 102.—*L'Univers Pitt*, ix. Babylonia, 206.

<sup>2</sup> "I represented to Abdul Hasan, that it was His Majesty's (Jahángír's) pleasure and none of my request, and being His Majesty's gift, I saw no reason for being deprived of my right." • • • "I could not get a living that would yield me

upon the general treasury, may be estimated by an amusing anecdote related of the Khalif Al Hâdi. An eminent Arab poet having once presented to him some of his lucubrations, the prince, who was a good judge of such performances, discovered such beauties in them that he was extremely pleased, and said to him :—" Choose for your recompense, either to receive 30,000 dirhams *immediately*, or 100,000 after you have gone through the delays and formalities of the Exchequer." The poet replied with great readiness :—" Give me, I pray, the 30,000 now, and the 100,000 hereafter ;" which repartee, we are told, was so pleasing to the Khalif, that he ordered the entire sum of 130,000 dirhams to be paid down to him on the spot, without any deduction.<sup>1</sup>

15. *Al Mu'tamad-'alâ-Uah*, A.H. 256-279. A.D. 870-892.

18. *Al Mukhtadar-bi-Nah*, A.H. 295-320. A.D. 908-932.

During the nine reigns which occupied the period between Al Mu'tasim and Al Mukhtadar, the power of the Khalifs had been gradually on the decline. The Turkish guard had become more and more outrageous and arbitrary ; independent dynasties, such as the Tahirides and Suffarides, after having shorn the kingdom of some of its fairest provinces, had themselves expired ; eunuchs and even women,<sup>2</sup> had sat upon the judgment seat and dispensed patronage, while corruption and venality openly prevailed ; and now, at a later period—notwithstanding that literature flourished, and the personal dignity of the Khalif was maintained in the highest splendour—yet, not only had the Sâmânîs conquered the whole of Mâwarâu-n nahr and Khurâsân, not only had the Dalaimites penetrated to the borders of Trâk, and all northern Africa, except Egypt, had been lost for ever to the Khilâfat,

anything, the Vizier giving me always assignments on places that were in the hands of outlaws or insurgents ; except once that I had an assignment on Labor by special command of the king, but of which I was soon deprived." \* \* \* "The nobles had their assignments either upon barren places or such as were in rebellion ; Abul Hasan having retained all the good districts to himself."—Capt. Hawkins' *Narrative*, in Kerr's *Collection of Voyages*. Yet the writer, according to a compatriot who visited Agra in 1610, was "in great credit with the king, entitled by the name of a *can*, which is a knight, and keepeth company with the greatest noblemen."—Capt. R. Coserte, in Churchill's *Collection of Voyages*, Vol. VIII. p. 256.

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Universal History*, Vol. II. p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> *Elmacin*, 345.

but, as if to crown the measure of its misfortunes, the Karmatian heretics, having plundered Kúfa, Basra, and Sámarra, had possessed themselves of Mecca during the very time of pilgrimage, had massacred the pilgrims, and even carried off the sacred black stone itself, the principal and universal object of Muhammadan veneration.

Under such circumstances, the most distant provinces necessarily partook of the decline from which the heart of the empire was suffering; and Sind, neglected by the imperial government, came to be divided among several petty princes, who, though they transmitted no revenue and rendered no political allegiance to the Khalif, were, like other more powerful chiefs, who had assumed independence, glad to fortify their position by acknowledging his spiritual supremacy, and flattering him by the occasional presentation of some rarity from the kingdoms which they had usurped. Among these ostentatious displays of empty fealty in which revolted governors were wont to indulge,—comprising, in the words of Gibbon, “an elephant, a cast of hawks, a suit of silk-hangings, or some pounds of musk and amber,”<sup>1</sup> we may specially mention two loyal and characteristic offerings from India,—“a cart-load of four-armed idols,”<sup>2</sup> and “the largest and longest teak-tree which had ever been seen”<sup>3</sup> (p. 129).

The virtual renunciation of political control in Sind may be dated from the year 257 H., when the Khalif Mu'tamad, in order to divert the Sufárides from their hostile designs against 'Irik, conferred upon Ya'kúb ibn Laís the government of Sind, as well as of Balkh and Tukháristán, in addition to that of Sijistán and Kirmán, with which he had been already invested.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Decline and Fall*, Chap. li.

<sup>2</sup> *Biographical Dictionary*, L.U.K., Vol. II. p. 237; *Mém. sur l'Inde*, 289.

<sup>3</sup> *Fragmens Ar. et Pers.*, p. 216. M. Reinaud contends that the word *sdj* here means a species of dress, which had belonged to some man of extraordinary stature. This is by no means probable,—whereas a teak-tree from Sind, where so many were imported from Malabar, would have been natural and appropriate. Teak is the ζύλα σαγαλίνα of Arrian's Peripus, which Vincent conceives to be an error for σαδαλίνα. He wrongly attributes another error to the reading of σπεσαίνα—which has proved equally puzzling to Salmassius, as well as to Heeren and his Oxford translator. Both words are perfectly correct, and are derived from two native terms, *sdj* and *siam*, in use at the present day.—Vincent, *Commerce and Nav. of the Ancients*, Vol. II. pp. 378, 379; Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, Talboys, Vol. III. pp. 439; S. de Saey, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, Tom. III. pp. 473, 474; *Gildemeister*, 39; *Hofmann*, *V. Santalina and Særum*.

<sup>4</sup> Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. II. p. 438.

The two principal kingdoms which were established in Sind a few years after this event, were those of Multán and Mansúra, both of which attained a high degree of power and prosperity. It is probable that the independence of those states commenced upon Ya'kúb ibn Lais' death in 265 H. (879 A.D.), for his successors were comparatively powerless, and the Sámánis, at the commencement of their rule, had little leisure to attend to so remote a province as Sind.

Mas'údi, who visited the valley of the Indus in the year 303-4 H.—915-6 A.D., and completed his "*Meadows of Gold*" in 332 H.—943-4 A.D., furnishes a brilliant account of the state of Islám in that country. The Amír of Multán was an Arab of the noble tribe of Kuraish,<sup>1</sup> named Abú-l Dalhat al Munabba, son of Assad as Sámí, and the kingdom of Multán is represented to have been hereditary in his family for a long time, "nearly from the beginning of Islám."—meaning, probably, its introduction into Sind; and Kanauj, he asserts, was then a province of Multán, "the greatest of the countries which form a frontier against unbelieving nations."

He was descended from Sâma, son of Lawí, son of Gbálíh, who had established himself on the shores of 'Umán before the birth of Muhammad. The Amír had an army in his pay, and there were reckoned to be 120,000 hamlets around the capital. His dominion extended to the frontier of Khurásán. The temple of the Sun was still an object of native pilgrimage, to which people resorted from the most distant parts of the continent, to make their offerings of money, pearls, aloe-wood and other perfumes. It was from this source that the greater part of the revenue of the Amír was derived. Mas'údi remarks, as does Ibn Haukal, that the threat of injuring or mutilating the idol was sufficient to deter the native princes from engaging in hostilities with the Amír.

Mansúra was governed by another Kuraishí, whose name was Abú-l Mundar 'Umar bin 'Abdu-lla. He was descended from Habbár bin Aswad, who was celebrated for his opposition to Muhammad, and on the return of the prophet to Mecca in triumph, was among the few who were excepted from the terms of the amnesty which was at that time proclaimed. He subsequently became a convert, and towards the year 111 A.H., one of his descendants came to the

<sup>1</sup> The Kuraishis still muster very strong in the neighbourhood of Multán.

valley of the Indus to seek his fortune. Some time after, his family, taking advantage of the anarchy which prevailed in the country, made themselves masters of the lower Indus, and established themselves at Mansúra. Our voyager states, that he was kindly received by the Amir, as well as his minister. While he was there, he found some descendants of the Khalif 'Alí, whom persecution had compelled to seek a refuge in that distant country.

The principality of Mansúra extended from the sea to Alor, where that of Multán commenced. It was said to contain 300,000 villages, which is, of course, a ridiculous exaggeration; but the whole country was well cultivated, and covered with trees and fields. Nevertheless, the inhabitants were obliged continually to protect themselves against the aggressions of the Meds and other savage tribes of the desert.

The chief of Mansúra had eighty elephants of war. Their trunks were armed with a kind of curved sword, called *kartal*, and were covered with armour to protect them in fight.<sup>1</sup> The entire body of the animal was similarly protected, and each was attended by a detachment of five hundred infantry. Other elephants, not used in war service, were employed to carry burdens and draw chariots.<sup>2</sup>

23. *Al Mutí-li-llah*, A.H. 334-363. A.D. 945-974.

25. *Al Kádír-bi-llah*, A.H. 381-422. A.D. 991-1031.

A few years after Mas'údí, the valley of the Indus was visited by Istakhrí, and by Ibn Haukal, who has included nearly the whole of Istakhrí's relation in his own, and has entered into some further detail.

The account of Sind by Ibn Haukal, who wrote his work after the year 366 H. (976 A.D.), when he was for a second time in India, has been given in the preceding pages, and need not be repeated here. With respect to the condition of the country at the time of his visit, he observes that Multán was not so large as Mansúra, and was defended by a citadel; that the territory was fertile and produce cheap, but that its fertility was inferior to that of Mansúra, and its

<sup>1</sup> Karwín mentions a ridiculous story of a man, named Harún, who wrote a poem, in which he boasted of having contended with an elephant so armed, and having put it and its attendant host to flight, by eradicating its tusks. '*Ajáibu-l Makhlukat*, v. "Multán."

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 18; *Mémoires sur l'Inde*, pp. 213-217.

soil was not cultivated with the same care. The Amír' lived outside the town, and never entered it, except for the purpose of going to the mosque, on Fridays, mounted on an elephant. There appears to have been no native coinage, but the money in circulation was chiefly Kandahárian and Tátariyan dirhams. The dress of the Sindians was like that of the people of 'Irák, but the Amírs habited themselves like the native princes. Some persons wore their hair long, and their dresses loose, with waistbands, on account of the heat, and there was no difference between the garb of the faithful and idolaters.

The Amírs of Multán and Mansúra were independent of one another; but both deferred to the spiritual authority of the Khalif of Baghdád. The former was still a descendant of Sâma bin-Lawi, and the latter a descendant of the Habbári family.

Alor, the ancient Hindú capital, was nearly as large as Multán, surrounded by a double wall, and was a dependency of Mansúra. Its territory was fertile and rich, and it was the seat of considerable commerce. Ráhúk (or Dahúk) also, on the borders of Makrán, and to the west of the Hála range, was included in Mansúra.

There were other principalities to the west, besides these two in the valley of the Indus:—such as Túrán; which was under the authority of a native of Basra, named Abú-l Kassam, “tax-gatherer, administrator, judge, and general, who could not distinguish between three and ten:”—and Kudsár; which was governed by an Arab, residing in Kaikánán, named Mu'in bin Ahmad, who admitted the name of the 'Abbáside Khalif into the public prayers:—and Makrán; the ruler of which was 'Isa bin Ma'dán, who had established his residence in the city of Kiz, about the size of half of Multán:—and Mushki, on the borders of Kirmán; which was presided over by Matahar bin Rijá, who had an independent jurisdiction extending through three days' journey, but used the Khalif's name in the public services of religion.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Haukal observes, that at Mansúra and Multán, and in the rest

<sup>1</sup> Istakhri speaks of him as *Malik*. Ibn Haukal calls him *Amir*; but the chief of Mansúra he designates as *Malik*; so that it is evident he uses the terms in the same signification.

<sup>2</sup> Gildemeister *de rebus Ind.* p. 173.



of the province, the people spoke the Arabic and Sindian languages; in Makrán, Makránian and Persian.

With respect to those other parts of India to which the Musulmán's resorted, such as the maritime towns in the jurisdiction of the Balhará, between Cambay and Saimúr, Ibn Haukal observes that they were covered with towns and villages. The inhabitants were idolaters, but the Musulmán's were treated with great consideration by the native princes. They were governed by men of their own faith, as the traveller informs us was the case with Musulmán's in other infidel dominions, as among the Kbazars of the Volga, the Alans of the Caucasus, and in Ghána and Kaugha in Central Africa. They had the privilege of living under their own laws, and no one could give testimony against them, unless he professed the Muhammadan faith. "I have seen," says Ibn Haukal, "Musulmán's of this country invoke against other Musulmán's the testimony of natives of probity who did not profess the Muhammadan creed; but it was necessary that the adverse party should first give his consent." They had erected their mosques in these infidel cities, and were allowed to summon their congregations by the usual mode of proclaiming the times of prayer.

Such privileges could only have been conceded to men whose favour was worth gaining, and it is to be regretted that they were indisposed to show to others in similar circumstances the indulgences so readily allowed to themselves. In the Middle Ages, it was only the power and political influence of the Amalfitans, Venetians, Pisans, and Genoese, that were sometimes able to extort from the reluctant Musulmán's those immunities, which were willingly granted by the more easy and indifferent Crusaders and Greeks,—comprising the security of their changes, magazines, and churches, the recognition of their Bailos, the privilege of being tried by their own laws, and by judges of their own appointment. These republics must then have occupied in Egypt and Constantinople the same kind of position as the Arabs on the coast of India, excepting that the tenure of the former was more precarious, and more subject to the caprices of despotism, the fluctuations of trade, and the ascending or waning influence of the principal carriers.

The commercial establishments in the peninsula of India do not

seem to have excited any religious scruples in the minds of the Khalifs, or even of those casuistical divines who guided the consciences of these "Vicars of God" and their subjects. Trade was openly prosecuted in that land of infidels by Arab merchants, without any fulminations from these spiritual authorities, and probably with their encouragement. In this respect, there was a singular contrast between the sentiments that animated Muhammadans and Christians: for to Christians, on the contrary, whether merchants or princes, the permission of their "Vicar of God" was necessary, before they could traffic with infidels; as only he, in his infallibility, could authorize a departure from the most sacred injunctions of Holy Writ. Even as late as the year 1454, the dispensing power to trade with Muhammadans was exercised in favour of Prince Henry of Portugal by Pope Nicholas V., in a famous Bull, which refers to similar concessions from his immediate predecessors, Martin V. and Eugenius IV., to Kings of that country.

This intercourse with the Saracens was not merely subject to these formal, and perhaps interested, restrictions, but was strongly and honestly reprobated by many sincere believers: and not without reason, when we reflect, that some of these traders, especially the Venetians, disgraced their honour and their faith by supplying the Egyptian market with Circassian slaves, and even rendered their mercenary assistance in driving the Crusaders from Acre, the last and only stronghold left to them in Palestine:—

E non con Saracin, nè con Giudei,  
Che ciascuno suo nemico era Cristiano,  
E nessuno era stato a vincere Acri,  
Nè mercantante in terra di Soldano.<sup>1</sup>

The revenues, which the Arab princes of Sind derived from their several provinces, are pronounced to have been very small,—barely more than sufficient to provide food and clothing and the means of maintaining their position with credit and decency; and, as a

<sup>1</sup> Dante, *Inferno*, Cant. xxvii. See also *Parad.* Cant. ix. xv. The sentiment was common, and Petrarch exclaims against this venality, with equal indignation, in his *Trionfo della Fama*. On the general subject, compare Muratori, *Antiquit Ital. med. æv.*, Vol. II. col. 905-16; *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 934; Robertson, *Disquis. on Ancient India*, Notes xlv. and xlvii.; Heeren, *Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades*, Pt. ii. sec. 1; Reinaud, *Sarrasins*, 238; Breneman *de Republ. Amalf.*, 8; McPherson, *Annals of Commerce*, I. 370, 396, 435; Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Scrip.*, Vol. VI. col. 186, XII. 322, 330; XVII. 1088. 1092.

necessary consequence, only a few years elapsed before they were driven from their kingdoms, and compelled to yield their power to more enterprising and energetic assailants.

The Karmatians of India are nowhere alluded to by Ibn Haukal;<sup>1</sup> but it could not have been long after his visit, that these heretics, who probably contained within their ranks many converted natives and foreigners as well as Arabs, began to spread in the valley of the Indus. Abú-l Fidá dates the commencement of their decline from 326 H. (938 A.D.). This was accelerated by two ignominious defeats in Egypt in 360 and 363, and their overflow was completed in Trák in 375 (985 A.D.). It must have been about this latter year that, finding their power expiring in the original seat of their conquests, they sought new settlements in a distant land, and tried their success in Sind. There the weakness of the petty local governments favoured their progress, and led to their early occupation both of Mansúra and Multán,—from which latter place history records their expulsion by the overwhelming power of Mahmúd the Ghaznvide.

It appears from local histories, as well as the *Kámilu-t Tawárikh*, that Mahmúd also effected conquests in Sind. Though this matter is not commonly recorded by his historians, there is every likelihood of its truth; for, being in possession of Kusdár and Multán, the country was at all times open to his invasions. As it is well established that, after the fall of Somnát, he marched for some days along the course of the Indus, we can readily concur with the *Kámilu-t Tawárikh* in ascribing his capture of Mansúra to the year 416 H., on his return from that expedition: and, as it is expressly stated that he then placed a *Muhammadan* prince on the throne, we may safely infer that the previous occupant had rejected that faith, and was therefore a Karmatian, who, having usurped the government from the Habbári dynasty, had thus, after a duration of three centuries, effected the extinction of the Arab dominion in Sind.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Unless they were the inhabitants of "Basak, the city of schismatics."]

<sup>2</sup> Compare Mordtmann, *das Buch der Länder*; Gildemeister, *de rebus Indiciis*, pp. 163-182; Ouseley, *Oriental Geography*; *Modern Universal Hist.*, Vol. II. pp. 383, 387, 398, 415; *Mem. sur l'Inde*, pp. 233-242; *Fragm. Arabica*, p. xxiv.; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, v. "Carmath;" Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. II. p. 675; III. 11, 33, 65; De Ganges, *Hist. des Huns*; *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS. p. 21. Hanza Isfahání, ed. Gottwádt, Vol. II. p. 156, : seq.; Abú-l Fidá, *Annal. Mosl.*, Vol. II. p. 466.

*Sind under the Arabs.*

Having in the previous Note exhausted all the scanty materials which history has left us respecting the political progress of the Arabs in Sind, we may now proceed to consider some of the questions connected with the maintenance of their power in that province.

The internal administration of the country was necessarily left in the hand of the natives; as the Arabs, upon their first acquisition of territory, had brought with them no men capable of exercising civil functions. Indeed, wherever we follow the steps of these fanatics, we find them ignorant of the first principles of public economy, and compelled, by the exigencies of their position, to rely upon native assistance in the management of the finances and accounts of their subject provinces. So, indeed, in a certain measure, do the English in India; but with this essential difference, that they direct and control the ministerial officers, both of collection and record, introduce their own systems, modify or abrogate the old ones as occasion arises, and initiate all proceedings connected with the several departments of the exchequer: but the Arabs, either through indolence, pride, or ignorance, left themselves at the mercy of their subordinates, and were unable to fathom the depths of the chaotic accounts kept by their native financiers, who practised the most ingenious devices of flattery, falsehood, cajolery, and self-interest—rendered more acute by religious hatred—in order to blind their credulous dupes as to the actual resources of the countries which they governed. The rack and the threat of circumcision would sometimes extort the illicit accumulations of past years; but, in the long run, the pliant and plausible officials were the gainers; and compromises, in a little ready cash, were gladly accepted, in lieu of closer scrutiny and more accurately balanced ledgers.

Hence those charges so readily brought, and so eagerly listened to, by Khalifs as well as Amirs, of defalcations and embezzlements: hence those demands for indefinite sums from refractory servants: hence those extortionate fines, levied according to mere surmises and conjectures, since no means existed of ascertaining the real amount of revenue and expenditure. Brought up in their native deserts, with no greater knowledge of schemes of administration than was to

be obtained by studying the phylarchies of the Bedouins, and invested suddenly with dominions which they were not competent to manage, however easily they might overrun and subdue them, the Arabs were compelled to seek in the political institutions of their subjects the means of realizing the exactions which, as victors, they felt it their right to demand. The maintenance, therefore, of native officials (who were styled Bráhmans in the case of Sind) was a matter of necessity rather than choice, at least at this early period of their sway; for the guide-books mentioned by Ibn Haukal, which indicate some knowledge of statistics and finance, were the products of a much later age.

The first show of independence of such aid, even at the capital itself, was not exhibited till the reign of 'Abdu-l Malik, when he adopted an Arab currency, in supersession of the Greek and Persian money, with which trade had been hitherto carried on: though the old denominations of *denarius* and *drachma* were still retained, under the slight metamorphoses of *dínár* and *dirham*. Walid next abolished the Greek language and character from the public offices of finance, and substituted the Arabic,—thus still further freeing the Arabs from the trammels which these foreign systems had interposed. The land-tenures and personal taxes, being based upon principles introduced by the victorious Moslems, retained their Arab nomenclature.<sup>1</sup>

The original conquerors of Sind received there, as elsewhere under similar circumstances, large possessions in land (*iktá'át* or *katáya*'), which, as beneficiary grants for public services, were exempt from all taxes, except the alms (*saduka*) defined by law. They were, of course, held on the condition of continued military service, and as long as this was rendered, they never reverted to the fisc. According to the regulations promulgated by 'Umar, soldiers were not allowed to devote themselves to agriculture or any other profession, and therefore the lands of these grantees continued to be cultivated by the former possessors, now reduced to the condition of villeins and serfs.<sup>2</sup> Other soldiers, not so benefited, received stipends from the public revenue, to which they themselves contributed nothing in the shape of taxes. Four-fifths of the prize-money was invariably

<sup>1</sup> Elmasini, *Historia Saracena*, p. 77; *L'Univ. Polit. Asie*, V. *Arabie*, 406-8.

<sup>2</sup> Renaud, *Sarracins*, 272, 280.—*Biocsa*, I. 316.

distributed among them, and, indeed, at first, formed their sole remuneration, insomuch that a man who received pay was entitled neither to plunder nor the honour of martyrdom. One-fifth of the spoil was reserved to the Khalif for religious and charitable purposes, according to the injunctions of the Kurán. The man "who went down to the battle, and he who tarried by the stuff," received equal shares, and the horseman was entitled to a double portion. Had the Khalif attempted to augment his share, the hardy warriors would have resisted his claim, with the same freedom as the fierce and sturdy Gaul, when he raised his battle-axe, and reminded Clovis that the famous vase of Soissons was public spoil.<sup>1</sup>

Much also of the conquered land was, during the whole course of Arab occupation, liberally bestowed upon sacred edifices and institutions, as *wakf*, or mortmain; of which some remnant, dating from that early period, is to be found even to this day in Sind,<sup>2</sup> which notoriously swarms with sanctified beggars and similar impostors, and contains, according to the current saying, no less than 100,000 tombs of saints and martyrs, besides ecclesiastical establishments, which, under the Tálpúrs, absorbed one-third of the entire revenue of the State.

That the whole valley, however, was not occupied or assigned by the victors is evident, not only from the large amount of the land-tax—which, had that been the case, would have yielded no revenue to the government—but from the fact of many native chiefs being able to maintain their independence, amidst all the wars and turmoils which raged around them. This is manifest from the story of 'Abdu-lla bin Muhammad, the 'Alite, which has been related in the preceding note. There we find a native potentate, "only one amongst other Sindian kings," possessing much land and many subjects, to whom 'Abdu-lla was recommended to fly for protection, and who was represented as holding the name of the prophet in respect, though he continued to worship his own idols.

<sup>1</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum*, Lib. ii. c. 27. On the subject of the Muhammadan law of booty, compare *Hedaya*, B. ix. c. 2, 4; *Mishcat ul Muadibih*, Vol. II. p. 244; Defrémery, *Hist. des Samanides*, 226; Sale, *Koran*, Prel. Disc., pp. 198-201; and Vol. I. pp. 200, 207; II. 424; Reland, *De Jure Militari Muhammedorum*, Sect. 19-27; Reinaud, *Sarracins*, 254.

<sup>2</sup> [Kosegarten, *Ibn Batuta*, 22.]

The conquerors, taking up their abode chiefly in cities of their own construction, cultivated no friendly intercourse with the natives, whom they contemned as a subject race, and abhorred as idolaters. They remained, therefore, isolated from their neighbours, and when their turn came to be driven out from their possessions, they left a void which was soon filled up, and their expulsion, or extermination, was easily accomplished, and nowhere regretted.

In no place do we find any allusion to Arab women accompanying Sindian camps, or—as often occurred in other fields—stimulating the soldiers to action, when they evinced any disposition to yield to their enemy.<sup>1</sup> The battle of the Yermouk, which decided the fate of Syria, was gained as much by the exhortations, reproaches, and even blows of the women, as by the valour of the men; for thrice were the faithful repulsed by the steady advance of the Grecian phalanx; thrice were they checked in their retreat, and driven back to battle by the women,—Abú Sufyán himself being struck over the face with a tent-pole by one of those viragos, as he fled before the enemy. In the remotest east, again, we find, as early as the time of 'Ubaidu-lla, his brother's wife mentioned as the first Arabian woman who crossed the Oxus,—on which occasion, unfortunately, she disgraced the credit of her sex, no less than her exalted rank, by stealing the jewels and crown of the queen of the Sogdians. Not many years after, the sanguinary battle of Bukhára, fought in the year 90 H., between Ibn Kutaiba and the Tátars, was, in like manner with that of the Yermouk, restored by the tears and reproaches of the women who accompanied the Arab camp.<sup>2</sup> These, soldiers therefore, were prepared for immediate colonization and settlement, and must have consisted of the surplus emigrant population already settled in Khurásán. Accordingly, we find in this instance, that Baikand was converted into a fortress, and that part of the army was located in its neighbourhood, and composed several hundred military stations.

Sind, on the contrary, on account of the distance and difficulty of

<sup>1</sup> Reinaud, *Sarracina*, 18.

<sup>2</sup> So, with respect to the Germans, Tacitus says:—*Memoriae proditur quaedam acies inclinatae jam et labantes a feminis restitutae, constantia precum, et objectu pectorum, et monstrata cominus captivitate, quam longè impatientius feminarum suarum nomine timent.*—*Germania*, c. 3.

communication, and the absence of intermediate Arab colonies, was invaded by men prepared for military operations alone; and who could not possess the means of carrying their families with them, when only one baggage-camel was allowed to every four men, for the transport of their food, tents, and other necessary equipments, and when supplies ran short even before the Indus was crossed.

Subsequently, when the road was more open and free, these agreeable additions to their society may have poured in, along with the later adventurers who flocked to the new conquest; but we nowhere meet with even any incidental allusion to the circumstance, but with much that militates against its probability: so that there was, perhaps, among the descendants of the Sindian colonists, less infusion of the real blood of Arabs than in any other province subjected to their dominion.

When Muhammad Kásim, upon passing the Indus, gave to any of his soldiers so disposed leave to retire to their homes, only three came forward to claim their discharge; and of these, two did so, because they had to provide for the female members of their family, who had, with the rest, been left behind in their native country with no one to protect them. Nor were the consolations of a speedy restoration to their deserted homes held out to the first conquerors. To them the return was even more difficult than the advance, as we may learn from a passage in Tabarí, where he tells that, on the accession of the Khalif Sulaimán, he wrote to those ill-used men—the companions of the gallant hero whom he had tortured to death—in these harsh and cruel terms:—"Sow and sweat, wherever you may find yourselves on receipt of this mandate, for there is no more Syria for you." Here, then, these exiles must have remained during the ten years of his reign at least; and as they were not likely to have returned in any numbers after his death, we may conceive them congregated into several military colonies, seeking solace for their lost homes in the arms of the native women of the country, and leaving their lands and plunder to be inherited by their Sindo-Arab descendants.

These military colonies, which formed a peculiar feature of Arab settlement were styled *junúd* and *amsár*,—"armies" and "cities,"—the latter appellation implying settled abodes, contrasted with the



previous migrations to which the tribes had been habituated. In many instances they rose into important cities, as in the case of Basra, Kúfa, and Damascus, and early became the principal centres of Arab learning, law, grammar, and theology, as well as of tumult, violence, perfidy, and intrigue. The principal seats of these cantonments in Sind appear to have been Mansúra, Kuzdár, Kandábel, Baizá, Mahfúza, and Multán; and indeed, the military camp near the latter town,—whether the real name be “Jandaram” or “Jundrúz” (*Gildmeister*), “Jundráwár” (*Ashkálu-l Bild*), “Jundáwar” (*Abú-l Fidd*) or “Jandúr” (*Nubian Geographer*), seems to derive its first syllable from *jand*, the singular number of *junúd*, above mentioned.<sup>1</sup>

The local troops, which were enlisted in the country, dispersed to their own homes as soon as the necessity was satisfied for which they were raised; but there were some which assumed a more permanent character, and were employed on foreign service, with little chance of return.

That Sindian troops were levied, and sent to fight the battles of the Arabs in distant quarters, we have undoubted proof. I speak not here of the numerous Jats of Irak, Syria, and Mesopotamia, who—as I hope to be able to show in another place—were, ere long, transformed into the Jatano, or Gitano,—the Gypsies of modern Europe. These had been too long in their settlements to be called “Sindians” by a contemporary historian, like Dionysius Telmarensis, to whom the terms “Jat,” “Asáwira,” and “Sabábija,” were more familiar. This author, in his *Syrian Chronicle*, distinctly mentions “Sindian” cohorts as forming a portion of the motley army of Alans, Khazars, Medes, Persians, Turks, Arabs, etc., which made an irruption into the Byzantine territory in 150 A.H.—767 A.D.<sup>2</sup> Four years afterwards, we find a body of Sindians and Khazars—said to be slaves—attempting to seize upon the imperial treasury in Harrán. Most probably, they also composed part of these foreign levies.

In admitting these provincials into their armies, the Arabs merely

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the Jandáwal, or Chandoul, of Kábul—the separate quarter occupied by the military colony of the Kazalbásh—may have a similar origin.—[See Note on the name *Jandrád*, page 380, *supra*.]

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Sim. Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient. Clementino-Vat.*, Vol. II. p. 103; Ram-poldi, *Annali Musulmani*, Tom. IV. p. 89; *Univ. Hist.* II. 126; *Gild.*, 17.

imitated the policy of the Romans, who did the same from motives of expediency—hoping to find employment for turbulent spirits, and to neutralize the elements of rebellion, by sending foreign mercenaries into provinces remote from their native soil.<sup>1</sup> Thus we find Slavones and Berbers, Syrians and Copts, Babylonians and Persians, and even Christians and Jews, Magians and Idolaters, in the early period of the Kbiláfat, extending the Arab conquests among distant nations; just as, in the days of its decline, the Khalifs had Africans, Farghánians, Turks, Alans, etc., acting as their Prætorian guards, both in protecting them against their own subjects, and deposing their employers at their own will and pleasure:<sup>2</sup>—the difference only consisted in this, that the former constituted auxiliary corps, into which, when any foreigner was enlisted, he was adopted by some Arab tribe as a member, and being called *mandá*, or client, of that tribe, he had the same rights and privileges as if he had been born in it; whereas, Mu'tasim, when he enrolled his foreign body-guard, made the Arabian troops subordinate to his mercenaries, whom, in order to elude the law, he called his own clients—an evasive practice which was continued by his successors.<sup>3</sup>

When the profession of faith in God and his Prophet was no longer the symbol which united these furious zealots; when literature, science, philosophy, poetry, and other objects of intellectual culture, ceased to be regarded as criminal pursuits;<sup>4</sup> when opulence, luxury, and the arts which refine and embellish social life, had converted roaming and rugged soldiers into indolent and effeminate voluptuaries,—the necessity of recruiting their ranks from extraneous sources, led to a modification of their military institutions, and to the abandonment of those exclusive sentiments, which had once bound the Arabs by a common tie of fraternity in rapine and propagandism. Some of these foreign recruits were, no doubt, obtained by the hopes of ready participation in the spoils which were the invariable concomitant of Arab conquests; but most of them were

<sup>1</sup> In the Roman occupation of Britain, we find even Indian cavalry stationed at Cirencester.—Wright, *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> "Firmamentum imperii et postea pestem."

<sup>3</sup> *Biographical Dictionary, L.U.K.*, Vol. II. pp. 294, 372.

<sup>4</sup> G. O. Flügelii, *Dissert. de Arab. Script. Gr. Interpret.* p. 5; Reinaud, *Sarrazins*, l. 74, 243.

very unwilling soldiers, raised by an arbitrary conscription, and only reconciled to their fate, after long experience of their new profession, and when their distant homes had been forgotten. That the power of levying troops for foreign service was generally felt as a sore grievance by the unfortunate provincials, is evidenced by the terms for which the people of Tabaristán held out, when they capitulated to their victors; for while they agreed to become tributary in the annual sum of five hundred thousand dirhams, they stipulated that the Moslims should at no time levy any troops in their country.<sup>1</sup>

Commercial activity, also, succeeded to the zeal for war, which offered no longer the same inducements of honour and profit that had been realized by the early conquerors. A new stimulus was thus found for the spirit of adventure which still survived, in the perils and excitements of trading speculations, both by land and sea.—prosecuted at a distance and duration, which at that time it is surprising to contemplate. Sind was not backward in this season of enterprise, for she appears to have kept up a regular commercial communication with the rest of the Muhammadan empire. Caravans were often passing and repassing between that country and Khurásán, most commonly by the route of Kábul and Bámián. She also held communication with Zábulistán and Sijistán, by way of Ghazní and Kandahár. Zábulistán was, at the period of Mas'údí's visit, a large country, known by the name of the kingdom of Firoz, and contained fortresses of great strength. The people were of divers languages and races, and different opinions were even then entertained respecting their origin. In Sijistán, which has greatly deteriorated since that period, the banks of the Hendmand were studded with gardens and cultivated fields; its stream was covered with boats; and irrigation was carried on extensively by means of windmills.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Washington Irving's *Successors of Mahomet*, pp. 141 and 255; from Hammer-Purgstall's *Gemäldeaal*. It is worthy of remark, that the Tapyri, whose name is preserved in Tabaristán, are not included, in the copious catalogue of Herodotus, among those joining in the armament of Xerxes.

<sup>2</sup> This is nearly the earliest mention we have of them, even in the east. Our knowledge of these contrivances in Europe ascends no higher than 1105 of our era. In Muhammadan countries we have allusions to them as early as 645; Price, *Retrospect of Mus. History*, Vol. I. p. 140; Du Cange, *Glossarium med. et inf. Latinitatis*, v.

With respect to the routes from the North to India, Bírúní observes:—"We reach Sind from our country (Turkistán) by going through the country of Nímroz, that is to say, Sijistán, and we reach Hind through Kábul. I do not mean to say that is the only route, for one can arrive there from all directions when the passes are open." (See p. 54.)

We learn from notices in other authors, that there was commercial traffic by sea-board also. Much of the merchandize which was carried through Sind to Turkistán and Khurásán,—and thence even so far as Constantinople,<sup>1</sup> by the resumption of a route which had been much frequented at an earlier period<sup>2</sup>—was the product of China and the ports of Ceylon, 'Umán, and Malabar; from which latter province was derived, as at the present day, all the timber used in the construction of the boats which plied on the river. From Arabia, horses were frequently imported into Sind; and armies and munitions of war were sent up the mouths of the Indus, as we have already noticed with respect to the expeditions of Muhammad Kásim and some of his predecessors.<sup>3</sup> The whole coast of Kirmán and Makrán was, doubtless, studded with Arab settlements of the Azdis, who were the chief mercantile carriers from Obolla and 'Umán, and who had many brethren settled in Sind; and so it has remained, indeed, from the time of Alexander to the present Imám of Maskát, for the names of Arabis, Arabius, Arabitæ, etc., of Nearchus and the ancient geographers, were most probably derived from the opposite peninsula in the west, and are still represented by the Arabú of the coast of Makrán, like as the neighbouring Oritæ, or Horitæ, seem to survive in the modern Hor-mára and Haur.<sup>4</sup>

The toleration which the native Sindians enjoyed in the practice

<sup>1</sup> Ramusio, *Raccolta di Nav.*, Tom. I. p. 374, B.; Robertson, *India*, pp. 42, 77, 106, 121; MacPherson, *Annals of Commerce*, Vol. I. pp. 141, 194, 370; Reinaud's *Rel. des Voy.*, 42; *West*, II. 305.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, *Geog.*, lib. xi. c. 7, Vol. II. p. 427, ed. Tauchnitz; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* lib. vi. c. 17, 23; Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, Vol. I. p. 38; *Mod. Trav. India*, I. 148; *Ind. Alterthum*, II. 531, 603; *Hakluyt*, IV. 409.

<sup>3</sup> Cosmos Indicopl. ap. Montfaucon, *Coll. nov. Patrum*, Tom. II. p. 334; Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.*, Ann. 101; Kosegarten, *Chrestomathis Arabæ*, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup> See Geier, *Alexandri M. Hist. Scriptores*, p. 128; Müzzell's *Notes to Q. Curtius*, pp. 873, 874; Droysen, *Geschichte Alex's*, pp. 467-9; Vincent, *Voyage of Nearchus*, pp. 181-211; Barros, *Decadas da Asia*, Dec. iv. p. 290; Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, Vol. I. pp. 279, 297.

of their religion, was greater than what was usually conceded in other countries; but it was dictated less by any principle of justice or humanity, than the impossibility of suppressing the native religion by the small number of Arab invaders.<sup>1</sup> When time had fully shown the necessity of some relaxation in the stern code of Moslim conquest, it was directed, that the natives might rebuild their temples and perform their worship, and that the three per cent., which had been allowed to the priests under the former government, should not be withheld by the laity for whom they officiated. Dáhir's prime minister was also retained in office, in order to protect the rights of the people, and to maintain the native institutions; while Bráhmans were distributed throughout the provinces to collect the taxes which had been fixed. But, where power had, for a short time, enabled the Moslims to usurp the mastery, the usual bigotry and cruelty were displayed. At Debal, the temples were demolished, and mosques founded; a general massacre endured for three whole days; prisoners were taken captive; plunder was amassed; and an apostate was left in charge of the government, exercising co-ordinate jurisdiction with an Arab chief. At Nairún, the idols were broken, and mosques founded, notwithstanding its voluntary surrender. At Alor, though the lives of the inhabitants were spared, a heavy tribute was imposed; and though the temples were treated like "churches of the Christians, or synagogues of the Jews," yet that was no great indulgence, if we may judge from the proceedings at Jerusalem and Damascus—where the ringing of bells and building of chapels were prohibited; where the free admission of Musulmán was at all times compulsory; where the forcible conversion of churches into mosques was insisted on, without the offer of compensation; and where they were sometimes devoted to the meaner uses of cow-houses and stables. At Ráwar, and 'Askalanda, all the men in arms were put to the sword, and the women and children carried away captive. At Multán, all men capable of bearing arms were massacred; six thousand ministers of the temple were made captive, besides all the women and children; and a mosque was erected in the town.

Among the chief objects of idolatry at Multán, the *Bhavisya Purána* and *Hwen-Tsang* mention a golden statue of the Sun; but

<sup>1</sup> *Reinaud. Sarrazins*, 35.

the Arabic writers speak of the principal idol as being composed of no other more valuable substance than wood, representing that it was covered with a red skin, and adorned with two rubies for eyes. Muhammád Kasim, ascertaining that large offerings were made to this idol, and wishing to add to his resources by those means, left it uninjured; but in order to show his horror of Indian superstition, he attached a piece of cow's flesh to its neck, by which he was able to gratify his avarice and malignity at the same time. Biláduri says it was considered to represent the prophet Job, which appears an Arab misreading of Áditya, as it is correctly styled by Bírúni, for without the vowel points, there is no great difference in the original. This idol was allowed to maintain its position during the whole period of the supremacy of the Khalifs; but Bírúni informs us, that when the Karmatians became masters of Multán, they did not show themselves equally tolerant or provident respecting the valuable resources of the shrine; for their leader, Jalam, the son of Shaibán, had the idol broken in pieces, and the attendant priests massacred; and the temple, which was situated on an eminence, was converted into the Jámi' Masjid, in lieu of the one which existed before. That was closed in order to evince their hatred of the Ummayyide Khalifs, under whom it had been constructed; but when Sultán Mahmúd took Multán, and subdued the Karmatians, he re-opened the ancient mosque, upon which the new one was abandoned, and became "as a plain destined to vulgar uses."

The same idol was subsequently set up, and received the offerings of the people. How long it maintained its ancient credit is not known for certain; but at Multán, the Sun is no longer the object of worship, having yielded to the temple of Pahládpúri, now itself in ruins, but occupying, doubtless, the same lofty eminence in the citadel which was formerly consecrated to Áditya.

On counting up the cost of the Sindian expedition, Hajjáj found that he had expended 60,000,000, and had received 120,000,000 dirhams.<sup>1</sup> As that could only have been the Khalif's usual share of

<sup>1</sup> This is from the *Futúhu-l-Buldán*, and is taken as being the most exact statement. That in the *Chach-náma* differs considerably, and affords no means of comparison between actual receipt and expenditure. There is no reason to apprehend error in the transcription of these numbers, because the Arabic original does not express them in ciphers, but words.

one-fifth, the total value of the plunder obtained must have been 600,000,000 dirhams. Now, as one million of dirhams, at fivepence-halfpenny each, is equivalent to about £23,000 of our money, and as the relative value of money was ten times greater then than now, we may conceive the amount to be largely exaggerated; since the country could not by any possibility have yielded such a booty, even with the exercise of the utmost Arab violence and extortion to enforce its collection. Even if we take Hajjáj's calculation to represent the whole sum, and not merely one-fifth, we should still find it difficult to believe, either that Sind and Multán together could at that time have yielded two millions and three-quarters sterling, or that one-half of that sum could have been expended in their conquest by such a frugal and abstemious race as the Arabs, who had no need of a modern commissariat, at once extravagant and cumbersome, to follow their agile movements.<sup>1</sup>

The consideration of this question naturally introduces the subject of the public revenue of Sind. From the statements of Ibn Khurdádba, Ibn Khaldún, and Ibn Haukal, we derive some valuable notices of the revenue of the 'Abbásides, with more especial reference to the period of Mámún's reign. Ibn Khaldún's table has been given by Von Hammer, in his *Länderverwaltung*, and to this additions have been made by Dr. Sprenger, from the very rare manuscripts of the other authors, both preserved in the Bodleian library. From these authorities combined, we are able to deduce some useful inferences respecting the comparative revenue of the different provinces of the Khiláfat. Thus, we find that the province of Sind yielded annually a sum of 11,500,000 dirhams, and 150 pounds of aloe-wood, Multán being, most probably, included, as it is not mentioned among the other provinces. Of the neighbouring provinces, Makrán is set down at 400,000 dirhams; Sijistán at 4,600,000 dirhams, 300 variegated robes, and 20,000 pounds of sweetmeats;<sup>2</sup> Kirmán at

<sup>1</sup> All the calculations of Saracen booty in Egypt and Syria are even more extravagant, and justify the suspicions of Gibbon; though he had no right to arraign the accuracy of Elmacin's translator, Erpenius—"felicissimus ille Arabicarum literarum instaurator;"—as he is styled by Hottinger. I conceive that we have not yet got the proper equivalent of the early *dinar* and *dirham*. Reinaud, *Sarracina*, 104, 192; *Univ. Pitt. Asiæ*, V. *Arabic*, 317.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Khurdádba says 6,776,000 dirhams.

4,200,000 dirhams, 500 precious garments, 20,000 pounds of dates, and 1,000 pounds of caraway seeds;<sup>1</sup> Tukhárístán at 106,000 dirhams; Kábul at 1,500,000 dirhams, and 1,000 head of cattle, amounting to 700,000 dirhams more; Fárs at 27,000,000 dirhams, 30,000 bottles of rose-water, and 20,000 bottles of black currants;<sup>2</sup> Khutlan, in Hyátíla, bordering on Balkh, at 1,733,000 dirhams; Bámián at 5,000 dirhams; and Bust at 90,000 dirhams.

These amounts are to be considered merely approximate, because the revenues, unless where they were assessed at a fixed sum, varied every year according to the abundance, or scarcity, of the crop.

It may, at first, admit of doubt, whether these sums represent land-tax merely, or all the taxes in the aggregate. Ibn Khurdádba and Ibn Haukal specially say "land-tax." Ibn Khaldún uses the term "revenue." This is the more remarkable, as it will be observed from the notes, that his statements contain the lowest sums. The two accounts, of course, refer to different epochs, and frequently to different limits, which were arbitrary and fluctuating, just as our Domesday Book, having been compiled by different sets of commissioners, represents a different status in different passages, though the names of persons, classes, and tenures may be in every other respect identical. As an instance, in our Arabic record of these variations, we find it stated, under Fárs, that "Amrán bin Músa, the Barmekide, added Sind to this province, so the revenue amounted, after defraying all expenses, to 10,000,000 dirhams." The remark in itself is not particularly intelligible, but its very obscurity makes it serve the better as an illustration. It is probable that, in so large an empire, the limits of the provinces were frequently subject to alteration, to suit the views and interest of favoured governors; and that they were also, without any such personal bias, sometimes fixed on an ethnical, sometimes on a geographical, basis. Another cause of variation has been suggested—namely, that the greatest part of what had been delivered in kind in the time of Márwán, to which Ibn Khaldún refers, was paid in money in the

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Khurdádba says 5,000,000 dirhams, and under the Khusrús 60,000,000—the limits of the provinces being, of course, different. The amounts entered in the text rest on the authority of Ibn Khaldún.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Khurdádba says 30,000 dirhams, but I suspect error.



time of Ibn Khurdádba. This is probable, and is the natural course of fiscal transition all over the world.

But, after giving due weight to all these considerations, the sums set down against some of the provinces are so large—whether we take the higher or lower amount, or the earlier or later date—that we must conceive them to embrace the entire collections of every kind, and must be allowed the liberty of construing *kharaj* in its enlarged sense of ‘tribute,’ rather than its limited one of ‘land-tax,’—just, indeed, as it is so considered at the present day in Turkey.<sup>1</sup> The assessment upon Sind and Multán,—being 11,500,000 dirhams, or about £270,000,—must be considered moderate, if it is intended to comprise the land-tax, the poll-tax, the customs duties, and all miscellaneous items into the bargain; but it is not an improbable amount, when we contemplate the liberal alienations and reserves, which have been alluded to at the commencement of this Note, as well as the change in the value of money. Under the Tálpúrs, notwithstanding that many large and productive tracts were afforested by them, Sind is said to have occasionally yielded £400,000; and under the Kalhoras, tradition represents the revenue at the exaggerated amount of £800,000. At present, with security on all its borders, and tranquillity within them, it does not pay to the British Government more than £300,000, and the expenses have been hitherto more than double that sum. This deficiency, however, cannot last long, for its cultivation and commerce are rapidly on the increase.

The Arab governors may be considered in the light of farmers-general, for they usually bound themselves to pay to the Khalif the sums at which the various provinces,—after allowance made for ordinary expenses,—were set down in the public register. Where the disbursements were left to their discretion, and where the revenues were not fixed, but dependant upon the seasons, we may presume that, on the plea of frontier wars, local services, and internal tumults, very little was ever remitted to the capital from the remote provinces of the empire; for the governors themselves were the judges of these necessities—the declaration of peace or war being left to their arbitrary determination and pleasure.

<sup>1</sup> *Des Osmanischen Reichs Staatserfassung.* Cantemir, *Hist. of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 366.

The ordinary revenue, which they were entitled to collect from the provinces committed to them, was derived from the land-tax, and from the capitation-tax upon those who had not embraced the Muhammadan religion; but there were many miscellaneous cesses besides, which, in the aggregate, yielded large returns, and contributed to swell their profits.

The land-tax was usually rated at two-fifths of the produce of wheat and barley, if the fields were watered by public canals; three-tenths, if irrigated by wheels or other artificial means; and one-fourth, if altogether unirrigated. If arable land were left uncultivated, it seems to have paid one dirham per *jarib*, and one-tenth of the probable produce, but the statement is not clear upon this point. Of dates, grapes, and garden produce, one-third was taken, either in kind or money; and one-fifth (*khums*) of the yield of wines, fishing, pearls, and generally of any product not derived from cultivation, was to be delivered in kind, or paid in value, even before the expenses had been defrayed. One-fifth of the value of slaves and booty was reserved for the Khalif. The customs and transit dues, for which unbelievers had to pay a double rate, and the taxes on trades and manufactures, and handicrafts, were also important sources of public revenue.<sup>1</sup>

These taxes were according to the original institutes of 'Umar, when he assessed the Sawád, or cultivated lands of 'Irák; but, in course of time, they were everywhere greatly enhanced, even to one-half of the produce of the land, or rather according to the ability of the people to pay. In short, the rates above-mentioned were merely a nominal value put upon the land: for the collection of the revenues was, in many instances, left to rapacious farmers, who covered their contracts and benefitted themselves besides, at the expense of the cultivators. The same course of proceeding was observed by the agents of the Talpúrs to the latest period of their

<sup>1</sup> See *Biog. Dict., L.U.K.* v. "Al Mámún," where the revenue table is given at length. It is also in the *Fundgruben des Orients*, Vol. VI. p. 362, *et seq.*; and in Hammer-Purgstall's, *die Länderverwaltung unter dem Chalifate*, 39; and in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, v. "Caliph." The *Asiatic Journal*, Vol. XXX. p. 62, contains the most comprehensive of all these tables, with very useful remarks appended, to which the foregoing paragraphs are indebted. See also *L'Univers Pitt. Asie*, v.; *Arabie*, 403, 404.

rule in Sind, and was one of the chief causes which contributed to the impoverishment of the country.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the absence of an accurate measurement must have rendered all such assessments nugatory and fictitious; for it was only in the Sawád, above referred to, which was the small tract lying immediately around the future capital of the Khalifs, that there was anything like a detailed survey; and of that the merits were more due to their predecessors than themselves. Gibbon says, "the administration of Persia was regulated by an actual survey of the people, the cattle, and the fruits of the earth; and this monument, which attests the vigour of the caliphs, might have instructed the philosophers of every age." In this, he is by no means borne out by the passage which he quotes as his authority from the *Chorographia* of Theophanes; and, moreover, an extended sense has been given to "Persia," which really applies only to a remote corner of that large empire.<sup>2</sup>

Besides this ordinary land-tax, we read, in the *Chach-nama*, of other burdens laid upon Sindian cultivators, which seem to have been independent of the former: such as the *báj*, and the '*ushari*.'<sup>3</sup> Other extraordinary conditions were occasionally imposed on some

<sup>1</sup> The little confidence to be placed in the apparent moderation of recorded rates, may be exemplified by modern practice in Sind, where we are told that "it was not uncommon for the government to collect vast quantities of grain for the supply of troops, when any military expedition was on foot; in which case, the rulers made no scruple of seizing a half of the produce of the whole country, leaving the farmer to settle with the cultivator the best way he could."—Capt. McMurdo, *Journal R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> *Decline and Fall*, chap. li note 32. On the Sawád of 'Irák and Baghdad, see Abú-l Fidá, *Geogr.*, pp. 52, 307; *Marásid-ul Ibtilla*, ed. Junybol, Vol. II., p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Literally, "tithe-lands," like the *Decumates Agri* of the Romans; see Tacitus, *Germania*, cap. 29. Respecting the law of '*ushari*', see Hamilton's *Hedaya*; Harington's *Analysis*, Vol. I.; Galloway's *Law and Constit. of India*; N. B. E. Baillie's *Land-tax of India according to Muh. L. v.*

Legally, no land was subject both to *kharaáj* and *ushari*; but it may be questioned whether the Sindian '*ushari*,' though it was confessedly considered as an indulgence, is to be construed in its strict legal application. The parties from whom it was taken were the people of Nairún and the Channas west of the Indus, of whom we still find a remnant not far from Manchhar Lake, and from whom the Kalhoras are in reality descended, notwithstanding their various attempts to disguise the humiliating fact. Mr. Renouard conceives that the Kalhoras are Kurds, because the *Jahán-numá* mentions that name among the Kurdish clans. There may possibly have been some connection between them and the converted Channas, for we know that Kurds are to be found as far eastward as Gandáva.

of the tribes. We have seen above, under Mu'tasim, that the Jats dwelling beyond the river Aral were compelled to bring a dog on each occasion of paying their respects, besides being branded upon the hand. The Bhatia, Lohána, Sihta, Jandar, Máchi, and Goreja tribes had also peculiar duties devolving upon them.

Sumptuary laws, moreover, were established, and enforced with great stringency. Certain tribes were prohibited from wearing fine linen, from riding on horses, and from covering their heads and feet. If they committed theft, their women and children were burnt to death. Others had to protect caravans, and to furnish guides to Muhammadans.<sup>1</sup>

The natives were also enjoined, in conformity with an old law of 'Umar's, to feed every Muhammadan traveller for three days and nights. It must be confessed, however, that many of these laws were already established under the Bráhmañ rulers; unless, as seems not improbable, the Muhammadan aspect about these ancient institutions derives its hue from the prejudices of the historian who records them.

But whatever were the peculiar features of some of the local imposts, all the unconverted tribes were, without exception, liable to the capitation-tax (*jizya*), which, as it was a religious as well as a political duty to collect, was always exacted with rigour and punctuality, and frequently with insult.<sup>2</sup>

The levy of this impost in Sind from those who had not embraced Islám, was considered so important at the very earliest period, that we find Hajjáj sending another person into the province to collect it, even during Muhammad Kásim's government. "Abu Khufas Kutaiba bin Muslim came on the part of Hajjáj, and returned to Khurásán, after leaving his agents to collect the poll-tax from the infidels; and, after a time, Tamim bin Zaid came from Hajjáj on the same errand."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So Abú 'Ubaida, on the conquest of Emesa, imposed upon such as chose to remain in infidelity a ransom of five gold-pieces a head, besides an annual tribute; and caused their names to be registered in a book, giving them back their wives and children, on condition that they should act as guides and interpreters to the Moslems in case of need.—W. Irving, *Successors of Mahomet*, pp. 60, 281; see Kenble's *Saxons in England*, I. 294.

<sup>2</sup> Price, *Retrosp. of Muham. History*, vol. i. pp. 109.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuhfatul Kirám*, MS. pp. 18.

According to the original ordinance of 'Umar, those persons who were of any persuasion non-Muhammadan, were called *Zimmis*, or those under protection, and were assessed with a toleration, or poll-tax, at the following rates. A person in easy circumstances had to pay 48 dirhams a year, one of moderate means 24 dirhams, and one in an inferior station, or who derived his subsistence from manual labour, 12 dirhams. Women, children, and persons unable to work paid nothing. But a century had not elapsed, when 'Umar the Second, considering these rates too moderate, calculated what a man could gain during the year, and what he could subsist on, and claimed all the rest, amounting to four or five dinárs, about two pounds, a year.

As the tax ceased upon any one's becoming a Moslim—when he was enfranchised from his dependence, and was invested with the privileges of a citizen and companion—its severe enforcement was often found more efficacious than argument or persuasion, in inducing the victims to offer themselves as converts to the faith. For the professing Muhammadan had but to pay the tithe for alms, and the import and export duties of one in forty, or two and a-half per cent.,<sup>1</sup> and he was free from all other imposts; but, when the original principles of the government began to be departed from, when the once vigorous administration became feeble and degenerate, and the Khalifs appropriated to themselves a large proportion of the revenues which the Kurán had assigned to God, the Prophet, and his relations, then the Muhammadans themselves also became subject, as well as the protected people, to new tallages and cesses; insomuch that the severity of the pressure occasioned general discontent, and often resulted in revolution and bloodshed.

Hence we find Ibn Khaldún, the most philosophic of all the Arabian writers upon history and social economy, thus speaking of the effect of these exactions upon the government which introduced them:—"With the progress of luxury the wants of government and its servants increased, and their zeal diminished; so that it became requisite to employ more people, and to give them higher pay. Consequently, the taxes were gradually increased, till the pro-

<sup>1</sup> In Muhammadan Spain this duty was as high as twelve and a-half per cent. on small commodities.—See Reinaud's *Sarracins*, 260.

prietors and working classes were unable to pay them, which led to continual changes in the government."

This increased employment of officials had no reference to those maintained for the distribution of justice to the people. In a country like Sind, where the mass of the nation professed their ancient religion, there were no tribunals for the purpose of adjudicating suits between members of that despised and depressed race. The power of life and death was exercised by every chief who could maintain the slightest show of independence, as well as by the Amírs; but, under the latter, legal formalities were more rigorously, if not justly observed. The Kází, who was appointed to the judgment-seat by their orders, professed, in controversies between Muhammadans, to decide according to the precepts of the Kurán; while even between Hindús and Muhammadans the same unerring guide was appealed to, under which, of course, the former obtained a very small modicum of justice. Public and political offences, whether by one party or the other, were tried by the same standard; but in all suits for debts, contracts, adultery, inheritance, the rights of property, and the like, the Hindús—being left without any form of law or any established judicatory to appeal to—had to accommodate their own differences, and, therefore, maintained their *pancháyats*, or arbitration committees, in full efficiency. It was fortunate, under these circumstances, that the public opinion of the caste, as expressed in these domestic and self-constituted *fora*, operated more strongly upon their minds, sentiments, and actions, than rewards and punishments derived from higher and holier sanctions.

To the Hindús, indeed, the public tribunals were only the means of extortion and forcible conversion, as they have proved themselves to be to the very latest period of Muhammadan dominion in Sind, under which, there were judicial penalties for riding on horseback, especially with a saddle; under which, the wearing of beards, and the adoption of Muhammadan costume were compulsory; and under which, religious processions, and even music, were altogether prohibited.<sup>1</sup> Hence there was, and could be, no sympathy between the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Sind*, pp. 72-75; Captain McMurdo, *Journal*

conquerors and the conquered, arising from confidence in the purity of justice,—for the primary obligations, inseparably connected with the institutions of political society, were utterly ignored by the Arab rulers of Sind, and no regard was had to that, which Milton calls—

The solid rule of civil government; .

In which is plainest taught, and earliest learnt  
What makes a nation happy and keeps it so,  
What ruins kingdoms, and lays cities flat.

It is expedient that these matters should be often brought back to remembrance and pondered on; for the inhabitants of modern India, as well as our clamorous demagogues at home, are very apt to forget the very depth of degradation from which the great mass of the people have been raised, under the protection of British supremacy.

In reflecting on the causes which accelerated the downfall of the Khalif's dominion in Sind, one of the most obvious and powerful accessories which offers itself to our view, as conspiring towards that end, is the diversity of interests and feelings among the several tribes which achieved and confirmed the conquest. No long time elapsed, after the first glow of enthusiasm had died away, and given place to more sober sentiments, when the Arabs showed themselves as utterly incapable, as the shifting sands of their own desert, of coalescing into a system of concord and subordination. The passions which agitated these hordes in their ancient abodes, the hereditary feuds and blood-revenge<sup>s</sup>, which had even formed the dates of eras among their Bedouin ancestors, and which could be revived in all their bitterness by the recital of a ballad, a lampoon, or a proverb, were not allayed, but fostered, by transplantation from their original soil.<sup>1</sup> And so it was in Spain; crowds of adventurers poured in who preferred a distant fortune to poverty at home. Emigrants from Damascus occupied Granada and Cordova; Seville and Malaga were planted by settlers from Emesa and Palestine; the natives of

*R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 249-252; Lieut. Burton, *Sindh*, p. 358, and *Unhappy Valley*, Vol. I. pp. 225-229; Capt. Postans' *Personal Observations on Sindh*, pp. 159, 258; Sir A. Burnes, *Cabool*, p. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Pocock, *Specimen Histor. Arab.* pp. 43, 178; Sale, *Koran*, Vol. I. p. 233; Foster, *Mahom. Unveiled*, Vol. I. p. 6.

Yemen and Persia were scattered about Toledo; and the fertile valleys of the South were partitioned among 10,000 horsemen from Syria and 'Irák. These, as in Sind, all became so many rival factions eager in the pursuit of power, mutually rancorous and hostile, and cherishing, in the pride and petulance of their hearts, the most invidious distinctions of races and precedence.<sup>1</sup>

Even as early as the deposition and recall of Muhammad Kásim, we find him alluding to the clannish feud between the Sakifis and Sakásaks. "Had he chosen to appeal to the sword," he exclaims, "no cavaliers of the tribes of Sakásak or 'Akk could have wrested from him the country he had conquered, or laid violent hands upon his person." These were both Yamánian tribes; the first was descended from Saksak bin Ashrab, and the second was an offshoot of the great tribe of Azd, which, under Muballab, was the first to carry the Arab arms into India, and which rendered itself so conspicuous in the conquest of Khurásán.<sup>2</sup> The Sakiffi tribe, to which Muhammad Kásim belonged, was originally from Táif, about fifty miles south-east of Mecca. It continues a powerful people to this day, possessing the some fertile region on the eastern declivity of the Híjjáz chain of mountains. In the wars of the Wahábis, they defended their ancient stronghold of Táif with a spirit worthy of their ancestors.

We have seen above, under the Khiláfat of Mu'tasim, that the rancour, which prevailed between the Yamánian and Nizárian tribes, again broke out into open hostility in Sind. It was not, however, in Sind only, but wherever the Muhammadan standard was displayed, that these two great divisions were arrayed against each other; and as this feeling operated as one of the main causes of the success of the 'Abbásides against the Ummayyides, its original malignity could not fail to be aggravated in every Moslim country, as long as the remembrance of that change of dynasty survived.

What imparted additional acerbity to these feuds in Sind, was

<sup>1</sup> Crichton, *Arabia and its People*, p. 339; Dunham, *History of Spain*, Vol. IV. p. 2; Procter, *Encyclopædia Metrop.*, Vol. XI. p. 294. All of whom are indebted, more or less, originally to Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. li. *ad finem*; and he, with his usual honesty of acknowledgment, to Casiri, *Biblioth. Arab-Hispan.*, Tom. II. pp. 32, 252.

<sup>2</sup> The Imám of Muscat is an Azdi.—*Enc. Metr.* v. Oman.



the persecution of the adherents of 'Alí, which, though with some intermissions, especially about Mámún's time, was maintained with considerably rigour during the period of Arab occupation. We have in the preceding note seen some instances of these religious quarrels, and they must have been of frequent occurrence in Sind; for its position on the remote eastern frontier of the Empire, and the difficulty of access to it over mountains and barren sands, must have offered a promising asylum to political refugees, of which we have ample evidence that they readily availed themselves. Hence heterodoxy, during the period of the Khiláfat, flourished with unusual vigour in Sind and Makrán; and hence such schismatics as Khárijís, Zindíks, Khwájás, Shárites, and the like, as well as Muláhida, or atheists of various denominations, thrived, and propagated; more especially the Karmatians, who, after being first introduced through this kingdom, maintained their hold in Western and Northern India long after they were suppressed in other provinces of the Empire.

The 'Alite refugees have preserved many traces of their resort to Sind, to which we may refer the unusual proportion of Saiyid families to this day resident in that country, the names of such places as Lakk-'alaví and Mut-'alaví,<sup>2</sup> founded and still inhabited by 'Alites, and the many Saiyids of even Eastern India, who trace their first settlements to Thatta, Bhakkar, and other places in the valley of the Indus.

These vague reminiscences, indeed, may be considered to comprise one of the most enduring monuments of Arab dominion in Sind. They were almost the only legacy the Arabs left behind them; affording a peculiar contrast in this respect to the Romans, after they had held Britain for the same period of three centuries. Notwithstanding that their possession was partial and unstable, our native soil teems with their buildings, camps, roads, coins, and utensils, in a manner to show how completely they were the master-spirits of that remote province.<sup>3</sup> But with regard to the Arab dominion in Sind, it is impossible for the traveller to wander

<sup>1</sup> See Weil, II. 15; Burton, 249.

<sup>2</sup> The latter is now better known as Matári. The two great families of Lakkari and Matári Saiyids constitute the Majáwar, or attendants at the shrine of the celebrated saint, Lá'í Sháh-báz of Sihwán.

<sup>3</sup> See William of Malmesbury, *Geog. Roy. Lib.* 1. cap. i.

through that land, without being struck with the absence of all record of their occupation. In language, architecture, arts, traditions, customs, and manners, they have left but little impress upon the country or the people. We trace them, like the savage Sikhs, only in the ruins of their predecessors; and while Mahfúza, Baizá, and Mansúra have so utterly vanished, that "etiam periére ruínæ," the older sites of Bhambúr, Alor, Multán, and Sihwán still survive to proclaim the barbarism and cruelty of their destroyers. It has, indeed, been observed, as a circumstance worthy of remark, that no people ever constructed so many edifices as the Arabs, who extracted fewer materials from the quarry: the buildings of their first settlers being everywhere raised from the wrecks of cities, castles, and fortresses which they had themselves destroyed.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the descendants of the early Arab conquerors, we find it stated, by two local historians, that when 'Abdu-r Razzák, Wazír of Sultán Mahmúd, and the first Ghaznvide governor of Sind, was in the year 415 H. (1024 A.D.) directed to proceed to that country from Multán,<sup>2</sup> and that when, after having captured Bhakkar, and established his power upon a firm basis, he proceeded in 417 to Siwistán and Thatta, he found in those places, among the descendants of old Arab settlers, "only a very few, who had remained bound, as it were, to the country by family ties and encumbrances; and who, being men of learning and ability, were at that time holding posts of honour, and in the enjoyment of certain religious endowments."<sup>3</sup>

Eighteen Sindian families, or tribes, are said to have sprung from these ancestors:—the Sakifi,<sup>4</sup> Tamim, Mughairide, 'Abbásí, Sadikí, Fárúkí, 'Usmání, Pahanwar,<sup>5</sup> Mankí,<sup>6</sup> Chabria, Bin-i Asad, 'Utba,

<sup>1</sup> Crichton's *Arabia and its People*, p. 426.

<sup>2</sup> The period of his departure from Multán is not clearly stated by either authority. One seems to say 414, the other 416. Now, as Mahmúd was, during Ramazán 415, in Multán, on his way to Somnát, that appears to be a more probable year than either of the other two.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuhfat-u-l-Kudám*, MS. p. 21. Mir Ma'súm says that the Wazír turned the Arabs out of these places; but that "some who had families, and were respectable and learned men, had high situations conferred upon them according to law,"—i.e., they were appointed to judicial offices.—*Tarikh-i Sind*, MS. p. 38.

<sup>4</sup> The original Kázis of Alor and Bhakkar. From this family was descended the author of the *Chach-náma*.

<sup>5</sup> The descendants of Háris.

<sup>6</sup> A branch of the Tamim.

Bin-i Abi Sufyán,<sup>1</sup> Bájáride,<sup>2</sup> and the Bin-i Jaríma Ansárf, who were the progenitors of the tribe of Sapyá, the lords of Siwistán. To these are to be added the Jats and Bulúchís, descendants of Hárún Makrání. It will be observed that, although the families are said to be eighteen, the enumeration extends to only seventeen, unless the Sapyá and the descendants of Jaríma Ansárf are reckoned as two.

The same authority mentions, that some of the tribes now in Sind, and who appear from their names and occupations to have been originally Hindú, are in reality descendants of the Arabs. Thus, the Thím were originally Tamím; the Morya are pronounced to be descendants from Mughaira; and the Súmra are likewise held to be the offspring of adventurers from Sámarra, who accompanied the Tamím in great numbers. All these affiliations are gratuitous guesses, and about as probable as the one mentioned in the preceding paragraph, of the descent of the Jats and Bulúchís from Hárún Makrání. But that some of the inferior tribes are descendants of the Arabs is by no means opposed to reason or probability, and this more especially among those now classed as Bulúchís. The Bind, for instance, when they assert that they came originally from Aleppo and Damascus, máy have truth on their side; but we should be cautious in admitting nominal resemblances or ambitious genealogies; especially where, as in the case of the Súmras, Sammas, Dáúdputras, and Kalhoras, there has been a political purpose to serve, and sycophants ready at all times to pander to a despot's aspirations.

#### *The Súmra Dynasty.*

The assignment of this dynasty to its veritable lineage and proper period among the rulers of Sind, is one of the most difficult problems with which we have to deal in the history of Muhammadan India; and the obscurities and inconsistencies of the native accounts have by no means been cleared by the European comments which have been made upon them.

Our first informant is Mir Ma'súm, whose account has been given

<sup>1</sup> Of this tribe are many of the *darweshes* of Rail, on the right bank of the Indus, opposite to Haidarábád. Among these celebrated saints are to be included the ancestors of Shaikh Abú-l Fazl, as shown in his work, styled the *YacAkáfi*.

<sup>2</sup> Occupants of Jangár, about ten miles west from Sihwán.

at length in the Extracts from his history. He tells us (supra. p. 215,) that in the time of 'Abdu-r Rashid, Sultán Mas'úd, 443 A.H., 1051 A.D., the men of the Súmra tribe revolted from the rule of Ghazni, and placed on the throne of Sind a man of the name of Súmra. He closes his unsatisfactory account by saying:—"If any of my friends know more on this subject, let them publish it; I have said all I can upon the matter."

Abú-l Fazl gives us no information in the *Ayin-i Albari* (Vol. II. p. 120), beyond the announcement that there were thirty-six Súmra princes, who reigned 500 years.

Firishta seems afraid of venturing on this difficult and doubtful ground. He merely observes (Vol. IV. p. 411,) that, on the death of Muhammad Kásim, a tribe, tracing their origin from the Ansáris, established their government in Sind; after which, the Súmra Zamindárs reigned for 500 years;<sup>1</sup> but he adds, "neither the names nor the history of these princes are at present extant, since I have failed in my endeavour to procure them. In the course of years (although we have no account of the precise period) the dynasty was subverted by that of the Sammas,<sup>2</sup> whose chief assumed the title of Jám. During the reigns of these dynasties, the Muhammadan kings of Ghazni, Ghor, and Dehli invaded Sind, and seizing many of the towns, appointed Muhammadan governors over them."

The *Tárikh-i Táhiri* (MS. p. 25,) says their dominion lasted for only 143 years, from 700 to 843 H., that they were Hindús, that Alor was within their dominions, and that their capital was Muhammad-Túr, in the Pargana of Dirak. Dúdá is made contemporary of 'Aláu-d Din, and the popular stories relating to Dalú Rái and 'Umar Súmra are given at length.

The *Beg-Lár-náma* (MS. p. 8) merely observes that, after the Muhammadan conquest, men of the Tamim tribe governed Sind, and after some time, the Súmras succeeded them, occupying the seat of government for 505 years; their capital being Muhatampúr.

<sup>1</sup> The *Kanzul Mahfúz*, on the authority of the *Tárikh-i Bahádur-sháhi* says the Súmras lasted for 500 years after the *aulád Tamim Ansári*.

<sup>2</sup> [The words of this sentence as given by Gen. Briggs, are "the dynasty of Soomura subverted the country of another chief called Soomuna, whose chief," etc. Sir H. Elliot's emendation is obviously necessary.]

Muhammad Yúsuif says in his *Muntakhabu-t Tawárikh* that when Sultán 'Abdu-r Rashíd, son of Sultán Mahmúd, inherited the kingdom of Ghazní, the people of Sind, finding him an indolent and weak-minded monarch, began to be refractory and contumacious, and in A.H. 445 (1053 A.D.), the men of the tribe of Súmra, having assembled around Tharri, seated a man named Súmra on the cushion of government. He ruled independently for a length of time, and left as successor a son, Bhúngar, born to him by a daughter of a Zamíndár named Sád. Bhúngar, after ruling 15 years, departed to the world of eternity in A.H. 461, and left a son named Dúdá, who after a rule of 24 years, died A.H. 485;<sup>1</sup> then Sanghar reigned for 15 years; Hafif, 33 years; 'Umar, 40 years; Dúdá II. 14 years; Pahtú, 33 years; Genhra, 16 years; Muhammad Túr, 15 years; Genhra II. several years; Dúdá III. 14 years; Táí, 24 years; Chanesar, 18 years; Bhúngar II. 15 years; Hafif II. 18 years; Dúdá IV. 25 years; 'Umar Súmra, 35 years; Bhúngar III. 10 years. Then the government fell to Hamír, who was deposed by the tribe of Samma, on account of his tyranny.<sup>2</sup>

The latest native authority is the *Tuhfatu-l Kirdm* (MS. pp. 21, 26, 126), which, in one passage, says that the Súmra tribe sprang from the Arabs of Sámira, who arrived in Sind in the second century of the Hijra, accompanying the Tamím family, who became governors of Sind under the 'Abbásides; that the whole term of their sway may be reckoned at 550 years, as they were mere nominal tributaries during the last two centuries of the 'Abbáside government, and enjoyed full independence when the greater part of Sind was held by the officers of the Ghaznvide and Ghori kings.

In another passage we are informed that they were invited to Sind by Chhota Anráni, who being grieved at the injustice of his brother, the famous Dalú Rái, repaired to Baghdád, and obtained from the Khalif one hundred Arabs of Sámira, whom he brought to Sind, together with Saiyid 'Alí Musaví, who married Dalú Rái's daughter, and left descendants, now inhabiting the town of Mut'alavi.

When Gházi Malik, in the year 720 H. (1320 A.D.), marched towards

<sup>1</sup> [See the passage from Malet's translation of Mir Ma'súm, *supra*, p. 216.]

<sup>2</sup> [This passage is quoted in the *Tuhfatu-l Kirdm*, and another translation of it will be found at page 344.]

Dehli with an army collected from Multán and Sind, overthrew Khusrú Khán, and assumed the title of Ghíásu-d dín Tughlik Sháh, the tribe of Súmra took advantage of his being occupied with the affairs of those distant parts, and collecting together from the neighbourhood of Tharrí, chose a person named Súmra as their ruler. He established perfect tranquillity throughout the country, and married a daughter of a Zamíndár, named Sád, who made pretensions to independence. His wife bore him a son named Bhúngar by whom he was succeeded. His son Dúdá succeeded him, and acquired possession of the country as far as Nasrúpúr. He left an infant son, named Singlár. Tári, daughter of Dúdá, assumed the reins of government till Singhár became of age. He, when installed in power, marched towards Kachh, and extended his territory as far as Nángnai. As he died childless, his wife Hímú appointed her own brothers to the governorship of the cities of Túr and Tharrí. A short time after this, another Dúdá, a Súmra, governor of the Fort of Dhak, assembled his kinsmen from the neighbourhood, and destroyed Hímú's brothers. While this was going on, Pahtú, a son of Dúdá, raised an insurrection, and held authority for a short time; after which, a man named Khairá obtained the principality. Then Arníl undertook the burden of government, but as he proved to be a tyrant, the tribe of Samma rose against him, and slew him in A.H. 752 (1351 A.D.). So far the "confusion worse confounded" of the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*.<sup>1</sup>

The attempts of European authors to explain these discrepancies are not successful.

Pottinger informs us that "Hakims were regularly sent from court (Ghazni) to this province, until the reign of Musaoód, the son of Muhmood, when a great tribe, called Soomruh, appeared in arms and expelled all the partizans of the king; but their chief, whose name was Sunghar, immediately making an apology for this outrage, and offering to pay tribute to the amount of the revenues before collected, he was pardoned, and appointed governor, in the stead of the person he had deposed. The tribute was paid with great regularity for one hundred and fifty years after this arrangement, when the Empire of Ghuznee was overturned by the Ghoorian

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 343.

dynasty ; on which the Soomruhs, in whose tribe the government of Sinde had gradually been allowed to become hereditary, declared themselves in a state of independence, and although they were repeatedly worsted in the wars that followed this declaration, yet they managed to preserve their liberty till the final extinction of the race, or at least the princes of it, in the person of Duhooda, who died without children, in the year of the Hijree, 694, about 335 years from the time his ancestors had first made themselves so conspicuous.

“On the demise of Duhooda, numerous candidates for the vacant government started up, and it was a continual struggle for nearly a century who should succeed to it. Among the last of them, two brothers, called Kheeramull and Uruknull successively held it for a time, but at length the tyranny of the latter became insupportable, and the head of the tribe of Sumuh went to his palace, accompanied by the ministers of the country, and put him to death. The populace with one accord elected this chief, who had relieved them from so dreadful a scourge, their king, and he was accordingly placed on their throne, with the title of Jam, or leader, which he was said to have adopted from his family being descended from the celebrated Jaushed, king of Persia.”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Bird, relying on some Persian authorities, including the *Tārīkh-i Sind*, tells us that the Súmras, who became first known in the Indian history in the reign of Mahmúd of Ghazní, were originally Muhammadans descended from Aboulahíl, an uncle of the Prophet, and that one of the tribe who, in the beginning of the eleventh century of our era, obtained power in Sind, married into the family of Samma, and had a son named Bhaonagar. The chief who had been thus placed at the head of the tribe was named Hallah, the son of Chotah, a descendant of Omar Sumra, first of the family mentioned in their history. Contemporary with Chotah was Deva Rái, sometimes called Dilu Rái, the ruler of Alore. “The son born to Hallah had for his descendants Dodar, Singhar, Hanif, and others, who appear to have originally possessed the Dangah pergunnah in the Registan, or sandy desert, from whence they extended themselves into the pergunnahs of Thurr, Sammawati, Rupah, and

<sup>1</sup> *Travels in Beloochistan*, pp. 391.

Nasirpur." Dr. Bird adds, that nothing satisfactory regarding them is to be found in any Indian author, except the statement of their descent from the family of the Prophet, in which, therefore, he seems to concur. "They derive their name," he continues, "from the city of Saumrah, on the Tigris; and appear to have sprung from the followers of Tamim Ansari, mixed with the Arab tribes of Tamim and Kureish." \* \* \* "In Masudi's time, many chiefs of the Arabs descended from Hamzah, the uncle of the prophet, and Ali, his cousin, were then subject (to the chief of Mansúra.). To these ancestors we may trace the Saiyids of Sinda, and the family of the Sumrahs."<sup>1</sup>

The difficulty of solving this question is shown by so confused a statement written by a well-informed author.

Elphinstone observes that, "Kásim's conquests were made over to his successor Temím, in the hands of whose family they remained for thirty-six years, till the downfall of the Ummayyides, when, by some insurrection, of which we do not know the particulars, they were expelled by the Súmras, and all their Indian conquests were restored to the Hindús; part of the expelled Arabs, according to Firishta, having found a settlement among the Afghans." And, again, that "after the expulsion of the Arabs in 750 A.D., Sind, from Bhakkar to the sea, was ruled by the Súmra Rájputs, until the end of the twelfth century; that it is uncertain when they first paid tribute to the Muhammadans, probably, the beginning of that century, under Shahábu-d dín, or his immediate successor." Here, the whole period of the 'Abbáside governors, and of the independent rulers of Multán and Mansúra and the Karmatians, is entirely neglected. So important an omission by such a writer teaches us, as in the preceding paragraph, how obscure are the annals with which we have to deal.<sup>2</sup>

In calling the Súmras Rájputs, Elphinstone is without doubt correct, for notwithstanding the assertions of the local writers, the real fact must be admitted, that the Súmras are not of Arab descent at all, and that this fictitious genealogy was assumed by them, when

<sup>1</sup> *Sketch of the History of Cutch*, Appendix vi.; *Visit to the Court of Sinda*, p. 10; and again, *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. pp. 126.

<sup>2</sup> *History of India*, Vol. I. pp. 228, 511.



the majority of the tribe were converted to Islám; and that, as the name of Sámarra offered a sufficiently specious resemblance, that town was adopted as the probable seat of their origin, though it was not built till after the supposed period of their emigration.<sup>1</sup>

That the Súmras were not Moslims during at least the early period of their sway, seems to be proved by their names, though this argument is not quite decisive, for down to modern times in Sind, Muhammadan converts have been occasionally allowed to retain their Hindú names. Still, reasoning generally, the retention of Hindú names points, *primá facie*, to the probability of the retention of the native religion. Now, when we come to examine the Bhúngars and Dúdás among the Súmras, we find that even to the latest period, with one, or at most two, doubtful exceptions, they are all of native Indian origin. The fact of their being called "Hamír," in Sindian ballads (a probable corruption of "Amír") scarcely militates against this, as it was, both in ancient and modern times, a distinctive appellation of the rulers of Sind, and was only superseded where, as in the case of the Jáms, there was a more familiar title of local origin. The ascription of so honourable an address and so high a lineage, is easily accounted for by the natural tendency to aggrandisement which has actuated all bards and minstrels, from Demodocus and Tyrtæus to the last prizeman of the Cambrian Eisteddfodd. That many of the tribe still continue Hindús, roaming as shepherds through the *thals* of Jesalmír and the Upper Dhat country to the east of Sind, we know from personal communication. Even if it might be admitted that, in the present day, they had forgotten their Arab origin, and lapsed into Hindúism from their former creed; still, that could not have occurred at the very earliest period of their history, within a century or two of their emigration, and before their high and holy origin could possibly have been forgotten.

The Súmras of the desert are one of the subdivisions of the Pranára Rájputs, and from frequently combining with their brethren the 'Umars, gave name to a large tract of country, which is even still recognized as 'Umra-Súmra, and within which Alor is situated.

<sup>1</sup> The various modes of writing and pronouncing the name of this town are given in the *Marasid-i Ittá'*, ed. Juyneboll, II. 6, 27, but not one admits of a *w* in the first syllable.

Renouard surmises that they may be "Som-Rái," that is, of the Lunar race, but, being without question of the Pramára stock, they are necessarily Agni-kulas. Their successors and opponents, the Sammas, were of the Lunar race.

It is not improbable that the Lúmrís, or Númarís, of Bulúchistán may be of the same stock, who, when they derive their lineage from Samar, the founder of Samarkand, may have been originally nothing but Súmras. This, however, would not be admissible, if they really have that consanguinity with the Bhátís which they profess, and which would throw them also into the Lunar family.<sup>1</sup>

It is not only from passages which professedly treat of the Súmras that we know them to be Hindús, but from an incidental notice in foreign historians, such as the authors of the *Jahán-kushá* and the *Jám'û-t Tawárikh*; where, in writing of the expedition of Jalálu-d dín to Sind, in 621 A.H. (1221 A.D.), they mention that, when he was approaching Debal, the ruler of that country, Hasrar, took to flight, and embarked on a boat, leaving the Sultán to enter the place without a contest, and erect mosques on the sites of the Hindú temples which he destroyed. This Hasrar is, in Firishta's account of the same expedition, named Jaisi, which, if it be correctly written, is more probably a titular than a personal designation; for we learn it was the name borne by the son of Dáhir, who ruled in the same province, and was so called from the Sindí word *jai*, "victory." It seems, however, not improbable that the name is neither Hasrar, nor Jaisí, nor Jaisar, but Chanesar, the popular hero of some of the Sindian legends respecting the Súmra family. Neither of the three other names is to be found amongst those of the Súmra rulers, and written without the diacritical points, they all vary but little from one another. Admitting this to be the case, we obtain an useful synchronism in the Súmra dynasty, notwithstanding that the local ballad of Dodo and Chanesar makes them contemporaries of 'Aláu-d dín, a name more familiar to native ears than Shamsu-d dín, the actual ruler of Dehli at that period, and his predecessor by nearly a whole century.

<sup>1</sup> Tod, *Annals of Rájasthán*, Vol. I. pp. 92, 93; II. 310-12; *Encyc. Metropol.* Vol. XXIII. p. 780; *Journ. R. Geog. Soc.*, Vol. VII. p. 14; Masson, *Journey to Kelát*, pp. 298, 355.

There is, however, one very curious passage in an author, whom we should have little expected to afford any illustration to the history of Sind, which would seem to prove that, before they apostatized from their ancestral faith to Islám, the Súmras had intermediately adopted the tenets of the Karmatian heresy. In the sacred books of the Druses, we find an epistle of Muktana Baháu-d dín, the chief apostle of Hamza, and the principal compiler of the Druse writings, addressed in the year 423 H. (1032 A.D.), to the *Unitarians of Multán and Hindústán in general, and to Shaikh Ibn Súmar Rájá Bal in particular.*<sup>1</sup> Here the name is purely Indian, and the patronymic can be no other than our Súmra. That some of that tribe, including the chiefs, had affiliated themselves to the Karmatians is more probable than the other alternative, suggested by M. Reinaud,<sup>2</sup> that certain Arabs had adopted indigenous denominations. It seems quite evident from this curious coincidence of names, that the party particularly addressed was a Súmra; that this Súmra was a Karmatian, successor of a member of the same schism, who bore in the time of Mahmúd a Muhammadan name (Abú-l Fath Dáúd), and whose son was probably the younger Dáúd mentioned in the letter; and that the Karmatians of the valley of the Indus were in relation and correspondence, not only with those of Persia and Arabia, but with the Druses, who adored Hákim, the Fátimide Khalif of Egypt, as a God.

That the Karmatians obtained many converts to their infidel opinions is rendered highly probable by the difficulty of accounting for their rapid conquest of Sind by any other supposition. Being merely refugees from Bahrein and Al Hassa after their successive defeats, mentioned in another note, and their subsequent persecution in Arabia, they could scarcely have traversed an inhospitable country, or undertaken a long sea voyage, in sufficient numbers, to appear

<sup>1</sup> He calls Rájá Bal the true descendant of Bothro and Hondelhela, and mentions many other members of his family, some of whom have Arab, and others Indian names, eulogising their faith and virtues. "Oh, illustrious Rájá Bal, arouse your family, the Unitarians, and bring back Dáúd the younger into the true religion; for Mas'ud only delivered him from prison and bondage, that you might accomplish the ministry with which you were charged, against 'Abd-ulla, his nephew, and against all the inhabitants of Multan, so that the disciples of the doctrines of holiness, and of the unity, might be distinguished from the party of bewilderment, contradiction, ingenuity, and rebellion."

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 256.

suddenly with renovated power in Sind. Many Hindú converts doubtless readily joined them, both in the hope of expelling their present masters, and in the expectation of receiving a portion of their ancient patrimony for themselves, after the long exclusion under which they had groaned. One of the Bulúch clans, indeed, still preserves the memory of its heresy, or that of its progenitor, in retaining its present title of Karmatí.

Independent of the general dissemination of Shíá' sentiments in the valley of the Indus, which favoured notions of the incorporation of the Godhead in Man, the old occupants of the soil must, from other causes, have been ready to acquiesce in the wild doctrines of the heretics, who now offered themselves for spiritual teachers, as well as political leaders. Their cursing of Muhammad; their incarnations of the deity; their types and allegories; their philosophy divided into exoteric and esoteric; their religious reticence; their regard for particular numbers, particularly seven and twelve; the various stages of initiation; their abstruse allusions; their mystical interpretations; their pantheistic theosophy, were so much in conformity with sentiments already prevalent amongst these willing disciples, that little persuasion could have been required to induce them to embrace so congenial a system of metaphysical divinity, of which the final degree of initiation, however cautiously and gradually the development was concealed, undoubtedly introduced the disciple into the regions of the most unalloyed atheism. So susceptible, indeed, must the native mind have been of these insidious doctrines, that Hammer-Purgstall and others, who have devoted much attention to these topics, have very reasonably concluded that the doctrines of these secret societies,—such as the Karmatians, Isma'ílians or Assassins, Druses, Bâtínís, and sundry others, which at various periods have devastated the Muhammadan world, and frequently threatened the extinction of that faith,—though originally based upon the errors of the Gnostics, were yet largely indebted to the mystical philosophy and theology of Eastern nations, and especially of India, where the tenets of transmigration and of absorption into the Deity were even more familiar both to Buddhists and Bráhmans than they were to these miserable schismatics.

The Hindú population, therefore, though they had much to dread from them, if it continued obstinately in the path of idolatry, was likely to offer a rich field of proselytism to such zealous fanatics as the Karmatians, or "people of the veil," whose creed could not have been less attractive to an ignorant and superstitious multitude, from its eluding in many instances the grasp of human apprehension, and from its founder being announced, in profane and incomprehensible jargon, to be "the Guide! the Director! the Invitation! the Word! the Holy Ghost! the Demonstration! the Herald! the Camel!"

Assuming, then, that this Ibn Súmar, the ruler of Multán in 423 H. (1022 A.D.), was in reality a Súmra, we must date the commencement of the Súmra dynasty at least as early as that period, and most probably even before Mahmúd's death, in the lower course of the Indus; for it has already been observed, on the authority of Ibn Asír, that Mahmúd on his return from Sommát, in 416 H., (1025 A.D.), placed a Muhammadan chief in possession of Mansúra; for that the incumbent had abjured Islámism. So that the expelled ruler must necessarily have been a Karmatian, or a Hindú; and, in either case, doubtless a Súmra, who, in the distractions of the Ghaznvide Empire, would have allowed no long time to elapse before he recovered the dominions from which he had been expelled.

This re-establishment might have been delayed during the reign of Mas'úd, who is expressly mentioned by Baihákí as comprising all Sind within his dominions. The Súmras, indeed, may possibly have allowed a titular sovereignty to the Ghaznvides, even down to the time of 'Abdu-r Rashid in 443 H. (1051 A.D.); or paid tribute as an acknowledgment of fealty; but after that time, the advance of the Saljúks on the northern frontier of the empire, and the internal disorders of the government, must have offered too favourable a conjuncture for them to profess any longer an even nominal subordination to distant monarchs unable to enforce it.

The Súmra power could at no time have been extensive and absolute in Sind; and the passage translated above at p. 340, from the *Tuhfatu-l Kirdm*, showing seven tributary chiefs in Sind in the time of Násrud-dín, represents perhaps the true state of the country during a great portion of the so-called Súmra period. Moreover, this unfortunate province was subject to perpetual incursions from

the Ghorian, Khilji, and Tughlik dynasties of Dehli and the Panjáb, as well as the still more ruinous devastations of the Moghals. The retreats in their native deserts offered temporary asylums to the Sindians during these visitations, till it pleased the stronger power to retire, after ravaging the crops and securing their plunder: but, beyond the personal security which such inhospitable tracts offered, the Súmras could have enjoyed little freedom and independence, and can only claim to rank as a dynasty, from the absence of any other predominant tribe, or power, to assert better pretensions to that distinction.<sup>1</sup>

#### *The Samma Dynasty.*

In considering the annals of this race, we are relieved from many of the perplexities which attend us during the preceding period. After expelling the Súmras in 752 A.H. (1351 A.D.), the Sammas retained their power, till they were themselves displaced by the Arghúns in 927 A.H. (1521 A.D.). Some authorities assign an earlier, as well as later, date for the commencement of their rule. The *Beg Lár-náma* says 734 A.H. (1334 A.D.), making the dynasty last 193 years. The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* says 843 A.H. (1439 A.D.), giving it no more than 84 years. The *Tuhfatul Kirám* says 927 H., which gives 175 years.

The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* is obviously wrong, because when Sultán Fíroz Tughlik invaded Sind in 762 A.H. (1361 A.D.), he was opposed by a Prince whose title was Jám, one borne by Sammas only, not by Súmras,—and this we learn from a contemporary author, Shams-i Siráj, whose father himself commanded a fleet of 1000, out of 5000, boats employed upon the expedition. The power of the Jám may be judged of by his being able to bring a force of 40,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry to oppose the Sultán of Dehli, whom he kept

<sup>1</sup> Compare Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Assassinen*, Book i., and *Fundgruben des Orients*, Vol. VI.; *Biog. Universelle*, v. "Carmath;" Renouard, *Encyc. Méropolitaine*, Vol. XVIII. pp. 301, 308; M. Jules David, *Syria Moderne*, pp. 195-7; M. Silvestre de Sacy, *Exposé de la religion des Druzes*, Tom. I. p. cxxxi, II. 341; and *Journal des Savants*, ann. 1813; the entire work of De Sacy has been copiously abstracted in the first and second Volumes of Col. Churchill's *Mount Lebanon*, 1853; Weil, *Gen. der Chalifen*, Vol. II. p. 214, III. 65; Sale, *Koran*, Prel. Disc., Vol. I. p. 252; *Secret Societies of the Middle Ages*, pp. 37-44; Bohlen, *Das alte Indien*, Vol. I. p. 206.

at bay for two years and a-half. Ten years previous, we also know from contemporary history that, upon Muhammad Tughlik's invasion, the chief of Thatta was a Sámra, and not a Samma. We may, therefore, safely concur with the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* in taking the year 752 H. as that of the accession of the Sammas, which was, indeed, coincident with that of Sultán Fíroz, for his reign commenced while he was yet in Sind, and this change of dynasty was probably in some measure contingent upon his success in that province, before he advanced upon Dehli.

All these authors concur in fixing the extinction of the Samma dynasty in 927 H. (1521 A.D.).

Native writers have done their best to render the origin of this tribe obscure, in their endeavours to disguise and embellish the truth. The extracts from the *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* will show the propensity of the Sindian mind to wander into the region of fable and romance. Nothing can be made out of such arrant nonsense. In another passage the author throws discredit on the Arab descent, and inclines to that of Jamshíd. The Arabic origin from Abí Jahl has been assigned, in order to do honour to the converts from Hinduism, The Jhárcjas of Kachh, who are of Samma extraction, prefer claiming the distant connection of Shám, or Syria. The descent from Sám, the son of the prophet Núh, has been assigned, partly for the same reason of nobilitation, partly that a fit eponymos might be found for Samma; and Jamshíd, or Jam (for he is known under both forms indiscriminately), has been hit upon, in order that a suitable etymology might be obtained for the titular designation of Jám.

Tod derives the word Jám from Samma, but the correctness of this etymology may be doubted, for it was not the designation of the family generally, but merely of the chiefs. Indeed, Jám is a title still borne by many native rulers in these parts—such as the Jám of Bela, the Jám of Nawánagar, in Suráshtra, the Jám of Kej, the Jám of the Jokyas, a Samma tribe, and others—and has no necessary connection with Persian descent, much less with such a fabulous monarch and legislator as Jamshíd. In the same manner, it has been attempted to engraft the genealogy of Cyrus on the ancient Median stock, by detecting the identity between Achæmenes and

Jamshíd ;<sup>1</sup> but here, again, notwithstanding that the hypothesis is supported by the respectable name of Heeren, we are compelled to withhold our assent, and are sorely tempted to exclaim—

Alfana vient d'equus, sans doute ;  
Mais il faut avouer aussi,  
Qu'en venant de la jusqu' ici  
Il a bien changé sur la route.

What the Sammas really were is shown in an interesting passage of the *Chach-náma*, where we find them, on the banks of the lower Indus, coming out with trumpets and shawms to proffer their allegiance to Muhammad Kásim. Sámba, the governor of Debal, on the part of Chach, may be considered the representative of the family at an earlier period.<sup>2</sup>

They were then either Buddhists or Hindus, and were received into favour in consideration of their prompt and early submission. They form a branch of the great stock of the Yádavas, and their pedigree is derived from Samba, the son of Krishna, who is himself known by the epithet of "Syáma," indicative of his dark complexion. Sammanagar, on the Indus, was their original capital, which has been supposed by some to be the Minagara of the Greek geographers, and is probably represented by the modern Sihwán. Sihwán itself, which has been subject to various changes of name, may, perhaps, derive that particular designation (if it be not a corruption of Sindomana), from the Sihta, themselves a branch of the Sammas, mentioned in the *Chach-náma*, and also noticed at a later period of Sindian history, as will appear from some of the preceding Extracts. The name is also still preserved amongst the Jhárejas of Kachh. The more modern capital of the Sammas, during part of the period under review, and before its transfer to Thatta, was Sámúf, mentioned in another Note. Since the Sammas became proselytes to Islám, which occurred not earlier than 793 H. (1391 A.D.), their name, though it still comprises several large erratic and pastoral communities, is less known than that of their brethren, or descendants, the Samejas, and the demi-Hindú Jhárejas, of Kachh, who do

<sup>1</sup> Schnitzler, *Encyc. des Gens du Monde*, Tom. I. pp. 144; Wahl, *Allgemeine Beschreibung des Pers. Reichs*, pp. 209; *Zendavesta*, I, 14; Heeren, *Asiatic Nations*, Vol. I. pp. 377.

<sup>2</sup> *Chach-náma*, MS. pp. 70, 109.



honour to their extraction by their martial qualities, however notoriously they may be deficient in other virtues.

It being admitted that the Sammas are unquestionably Rájputs of the great Yádava stock, and that they have occupied the banks of the lower Indus within known historical periods, there seems nothing fanciful in the supposition that their ancestors may be traced in the Sambastæ and Sambus of Alexander's historians. The name of Sambastæ, who are represented as a republican confederacy, is doubtful, being read Abastani in Arrian, and Sabarcae in Quintus Curtius; but Sambus, of whose subjects no less than 80,000 (let us hope Diodorus was more correct in saying 8,000) were wantonly slain by that mighty destroyer—

“That made such waste in brief mortality.”

and whose capital was the Sindonalia, Sindimona, or Sindomana above named, appears under the same aspect in all three authors, with the closer variation of Samus in some copies,<sup>1</sup> and may fairly claim to have represented an earlier Samma dynasty in Sind than that which forms the subject of this Note.<sup>2</sup>

### *The Arghún Dynasty.*

The family of the Arghúns derive their name, as stated at p. 303, from Arghún Khán Tarkhán, the grandson of Hulákú, the grandson of Changiz Khán. Amír Basrí is there said, in general terms, to be one of the descendants of Arghún Khán. The descent more accurately traced, is as follows:—

Arghún Khán.	Amír Elchí.
Uljáitú Sultán Muhammad	Amír Ekú Tímúr.
Khudábanda.	Amír Shakal Beg.

He is *Sallas* in Plutarch, *Sabotas* in Strabo; and under the further disguises of *Ambigarus* in Justin, and *Ambiras* in Orosius.

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Tarikh-i Sind*, MS. p. 31; *Beg-Lár-náma*, MS. p. 9; *Tarikh-i-Tahiri*, MS. pp. 42, 51; *Tuhfat-ul-Kiram*, MS. pp. 15, 37, 166; Shams-i Siráj, *T. Firozshahi*, MS.; Z. a. Barni, *T. Firozshahi*, MS.; Tod, *Annals of Rajasthan*, Vol. I. p. 86; II. pp. 220, 226, 312; and *Travels in W. India*, pp. 464, 474; Dr. Burnes, *History of Cutch*, Introd. pp. xi. xiv, 1, 73; Vincent, *Comm. and Nar. of the Ancients*, Vol. I. pp. 151, 155; Droysen, *Geschichte Alexan.'s des Grossen*, pp. 446-9; Ritter, *Erkundung von As.*, Vol. I. pt. i. pp. 473-4; Diod. Siculus, *Biblioth. Histor.*, Lib. xvii, cap. 102, 103; Arrian, *Anab.*, Lib. vi. cap. 16; Q. Curt. Rufus, *De Gest. Alex.*, Lib. ix. cap. 32; C. Müller, *Scriptores Rerum Alex. M.*, p. 71; R. Geier, *Alex. M. Histor. Scriptores*, p. 174.

Bartak Beg.  
 Mír Shekhú Beg.  
 Mahmúd Beg.  
 Yár Beg.  
 Mír Farrukh Beg.

Míram Beg.  
 Ahmad Walí.  
 Farrukh Beg.  
 Amír Basrí.

The Arghún dynasty of Sind consisted of only two individuals—Shujá', or Sháh, Beg, and his son Mirzá Sháh Husain, with whom the family became extinct. The relations of the former with the Emperor Bábar, when possession of the province of Kandahár was contested between them, and of the latter with the Emperor Humáyún, when that unfortunate monarch took refuge in Sind for nearly three years, constitute their reigns as of some importance in the general history of India, especially when we consider that the memoirs of Bábar are defective in the period alluded to.

The duration of their rule is variously stated at 35, 36, and 41 years. The last period is correct only if we date from 921 H. (1515 A.D.), when, according to the *Tárikh-i Táhirí*,<sup>1</sup> Sháh Beg invaded and occupied a portion of Upper Sind: but as the final conquest of Lower, as well as Upper Sind was not effected from the Sammas till 927 H. (1521 A.D.), it is more correct to assume 35 years as the period.

All authorities concur in representing that the Arghún dynasty—Sháh Husain having died childless—closed in 962 A.H. (1554-5 A.D.)<sup>2</sup>

#### *The Turkhán Dynasty.*

When Kúng, Khán of the Keraité Mongols, and celebrated in Europe under the name of Prester John, had, at the instigation of the jealous enemies of Changíz Khán, at last resolved to destroy that obnoxious favourite; two youths, named Ba'ta and Kashlak, who had overheard the discussion of the measures which were determined upon for execution on the following day, instantly flew to the camp of Changíz Khán, and disclosed to him the circumstances of the premeditated attack and his critical position. Being thus

<sup>1</sup> The *Turkhán-náma*, following the chronology of the *Tárikh-i Sind*, says that this first invasion occurred in 924 H.

<sup>2</sup> Compare *Tárikh-i Sind*, MS. p. 136; *Beg-Lar-náma*, MS. p. 30; *Turkhán-náma*, MS. p. 24; *Tárikh-i Táhirí*, MS. pp. 14, 51, 76, 81; *Tuhfat-u-l Kirám*, MS. pp. 42, 52.

forwarned, he was able to defeat the scheme, and after defending himself against great disparity of numbers, escaped the danger which impended over him. Upon proceeding to reward his gallant companions in the conflict, Changiz Khán conferred upon the two youths, to whose information he was indebted for his life, the title of Tarkhán, expressly ordaining that their posterity for nine generations should be exempted from all question for their offences, that they should be free from taxes and imposts, and permitted to enjoy all the plunder they should acquire in war, without being obliged to resign any part of it to the Khán. From these are said to be descended the Tarkháns of Khurásán and Turkistán.

Another set of Tarkháns were so denominated by Tímúr. When Tuktamish Khán was advancing against that potentate, he was gallantly opposed by Ekú Tímúr, who fell in the unequal conflict; but his surviving relatives, whose gallantry and devotion had been witnessed by Tímúr, were honoured by him with the title of Tarkhán, and it was enjoined, amongst other privileges, that the royal servitors should at no time prohibit their access to his presence, and that no criminal offence committed by them should be subject to punishment, until nine times repeated. From these are said to be descended the Tarkháns of Sind.

Others say, Tímúr bestowed the title upon a set of men who gave him shelter in his youth, when he lost his way in a hunting expedition.

Another origin is ascribed to this name, which is evidently fanciful, namely, that it is a corrupt mode of pronouncing "tar-khún," quasi, "wet with the blood (of enemies)."

Though it is probable that the Tarkháns of Sind may, as the local histories assert, be able to trace their origin to Ekú Tímúr, who, as we have seen in the preceding Note, was the great grandson of Arghún Khán, and who was the member of the Imperial family from whom the Arghúns also were descended,—yet the Tarkháns of Khurásán and Turkistán cannot all be descended from the family of Ba'ta and Kashluk, because Arghún Khán was himself a Tarkhán, and we find the title borne by others who could have had no connection with those favoured youths. Thus, Tarkhán, prince of Farghána, hospitably entertained the last monarch of Persia; and

thus, among the events of 105 H. (723 A.D.), Tabari makes frequent mention of the Tarkhâns as officers under the Khâkân of the Khazars, to the west of the Caspian sea. Bábu-l Abwâb was garrisoned by a thousand Tarkhânís, the flower of the Tâtár tribes. One chief's name was Hazár-Tarkhâní; and other instances might easily be adduced of the antiquity of the title.

We find the name descending to a late period of the annals of India, and scions of this family still reside at Nasrúp and Thatta; but the dynasty of the Tarkhâns of Sind may be considered to have expired in the year 1000 H., when Mirza Jání Beg resigned his independence into the hands of Akbar's general, the Khán-i Khánán, after the kingdom had remained with the Tarkhâns for a period of 38 years.

The *Tárikh-i Túhiri* extends their rule even to 1022 H., or rather, it should have been 1021 H., when Ghází Beg Tarkhán died at Kandahár; but he was only an imperial officer, having no independent jurisdiction, and entitled merely a Jágidár. Even then, it is impossible to make, as that authority does, the Tarkhán period reach to 53 years; so that, as before mentioned, we must date the extinction of Sind as an independent kingdom, from 1000 A.H. (1591-2 A.H.), and thenceforward the consideration of its affairs merges in the general history of the Timúrian empire.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Shah Beg's Capture of Thatta.*

The *Tarkhán-náma* states, that when Sháh Beg advanced to the capture of Thatta, the river, meaning the main stream of the Indus, ran to the north of that city. If this statement be correct, it shows that a most important deviation must have occurred since that period in the course of the river. But I believe that the assertion arises from a mere mis-translation of the *Tárikh-i Sind*, of Mir Ma'súm, which is generally followed *verbatim* in the *Tarkhán-náma*.

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Modern Universal History*, Vol. III. p. 250; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, Tom. I. p. 44; *Shajrat ul Atrak*, p. 71; *Journal R. A. S.* Vol. XI. p. 123, XII. p. 344; Price, *Retrospect of Muham. Hist.*, Vol. I. p. 470, II. 483, III. 117; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, v. "Tarkhán;" *Zafar-náma*, MS.; *Rauzat-u Sofá*, MS.; *Habibu-s Siyar*, MS.; *Tárikh-i Túhiri*, MS. pp. 14, 76; *Tarkhán-náma*, MS. pp. 4, 23, 51, 69, 118; *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, MS. pp. 52, 62; Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I. p. 500.

Mir Ma'sûm says (p. 138), that "Sháh Beg advanced by daily marches towards Thatta, by way of the Lakhí pass, and encamped on the banks of the Khánwáh, from which Thatta lies three kos to the south. At that time the river generally flowed by Thatta; therefore he was in doubt how he should cross." Now this is not very plain, and we should even more correctly interpret the original, if we were to say that, "Thatta lies three kos to the north of the Khánwáh." We know that this could not have not been meant, but the statement, as it stands, is puzzling, and the author of the *Turkhán-náma*, in the endeavour to be exact, has complicated matters still further. The *Tuhfatu-l Kirám*, (p. 41) says that the subsequent action took place "on the stream called 'Aliján, which flows below Thatta," but does not mention whether this was the same stream near which Sháh Beg encamped, though from the context we may be allowed to presume that it was. The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* is more specific, and states (p. 48) that "he encamped on the bank of the Khánwáh, that is, the canal of water which Daryá Khán had dug, for the purpose of populating the Pargana of Sámkúrá and other lands at the foot of the hills, and the environs of the city."

It is evident, therefore, that Sháh Beg pitched his camp, not on the main stream, but on one of the canals, or little effluents, from the Indus. The Ghizri, or Ghara creek, is too far to the westward, though it is represented in some maps as running up as far as the Indus itself, and joining it above Thatta. Indeed, there still exist traces of its having been met by a stream from the river at no very remote period, and, during the inundations, the city is even now sometimes insulated from this cause. In the absence of any more precise identification, we may safely look to this deserted bed as corresponding with the ancient 'Aliján, and suiting best the position indicated.

Authorities differ about the date of Sháh Beg's crossing this river, and capturing Thatta, by which an end was put to the dynasty of the Jáms, or Sammas. The *Tárikh-i Sind* says it occurred in the month of Muharram, 926. The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* is silent. The *Turkhán-náma* says Muharram, 927 (corresponding with December, 1520); differing only in the day of the month from the *Tuhfatu-l*

*Kirám*, where the correctness of this latter date is established by an appropriate chronogram :—

“Kharábí Sind.—The Downfall of Sind.”

The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* (p. 51) refers this chronogram to the period when Sháh Husain plundered Thatta, on the ground of extravagant joy having been evinced by its inhabitants upon the death of his father, Sháh Beg; but this is evidently a mistake, and is adopted merely to accommodate his false chronology.

#### *The Death of Sháh Beg Arghún.*

Authorities differ greatly respecting the time and place of Sháh Beg's death. The *Tarkhán-náma* states that it occurred in Sha'bán, 926 H., not far from Chandúka, said in the *Tárikh-i Sind* (MS. p. 196) to be thirty kos west of Bhakkar, and that the accession of Mirzá Sháh Husain was celebrated where Sháh Beg died.

Firishta says he died in 930 H., but mentions no place.

Mir Ma'súm (MS. p. 154) says, he died after leaving Bhakkar, on his way to Guzerát,—in the same page Agham is the particular spot implied—and that the words *Shahr-Sha'bán* (“month of Sha'bán”) represent the date of his death, i.e., 928 H. (1522 A.D.). That very night, he adds, Sháh Husain was proclaimed his successor, and, three years afterwards, Sháh Beg's coffin was conveyed to Mecca, where a lofty tomb was erected over it. He mentions (MS. p. 171) that Sháh Husain's succession took place at Nasrpúr, though he has previously led us to suppose it was Agham.

The *Tárikh-i Táhirí* (MS. p. 49) says that his death took place in 924 H.—“some say it occurred in Multán, some in Kandahár.”

The *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* (MS. p. 42) states that he died at Agham on the 23rd of Sha'bán, 928 H. It is mentioned in that work also, that this month represents the date of his death. The author gives satisfactory reasons why the reports just quoted from the *Tárikh-i Táhirí* must necessarily be both incorrect.

Under these conflicting evidences, we may rest assured that the chronogram is correct, and that Sháh Beg Arghún, the conqueror of Sind, died at Agham, on the 23rd of the month Sha'bán, 928 A.H. (18th July, 1522 A.D.).

## NOTE (C).—ETHNOLOGICAL.

*Native Opinions on the Aborigines of Sind.*

The names, which are given in the *Beg-Lár-náma* (p. 292) as three:—"Bína, Ták, Nabúmiya," amount to four in the *Tuhfat-ul Kirám* (MS. p. 4)—"Banya, Tánk, Múmíd, and Mahmír." They are given from Sindian authorities by Lieut. Postans, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (No. cxi. 1841, p. 184), as "Nubeteh, Tak, and Moomeed;" and again, by the same author (No. civiii. 1845, p. 78), as "Nubuja, Jak, and Momíd."

It would be a matter of great interest to restore these tribes correctly, and ascertain the course of their migrations. I can trace the mention of them to no earlier authority than the *Beg-Lár-náma*. All their names, except one, defy positive identification, and we may put the list of the *Vishnu Purána* and the *Asiatic Researches* through all kinds of contortions, without meeting any race that will yield a sufficient resemblance for our adoption. That single exception is "Ták," about which there can be no doubt. "Bína" may possibly represent "Mína," the probable founders of the celebrated Minagara, and the present occupants of the upper Krávalí range. Or if "Baniya" be the correct reading, then the designation may have been applied to them, as being foresters. In "Múmíd" we may perhaps have the "Med" of the Arabs; and in the "Mahmír," we may chance to have the representatives of the "Mhairs," or "Mairs" of Rájputána, if, indeed, they differ from the Med. We can venture upon nothing beyond these dubious conjectures.

That we should find the "Ták" in Sind at an early period, is by no means improbable, and if the statement rested on somewhat better, or more ancient, authority than the *Beg-Lár-náma*, it might be assumed as an undoubted fact, with some degree of confidence.

Tod exalts the Táks to a high and important rank amongst the tribes which emigrated from Scythia to India, making them the same as the Takshak, Nágabansí, or serpent-race, who acted a conspicuous part in the legendary annals of ancient India. His speculations,

some of which are fanciful, and some probable, may be found in the passages noted below.<sup>1</sup> One thing is certain that the Tâks were progenitors of the Musulmán kings of Guzerát, before that province was absorbed into the empire of Akbar.

Tod observes, that with the apostacy of the Ták, when Wajúhu-l Mulk was converted, and became the founder of the Muhammadân dynasty of Guzerát, the name appears to have been obliterated from the tribes of Rájasthán, and that his search had not discovered one of that race now existing; but there are Tâks amongst the Bhangís, who, though of spurious descent, have evidently preserved the name. There are also Tánk Rájputís in the central Doáb and lower Rohilkhand, whose privileges of intermarriage show them to be of high lineage; and there is a tribe of nearly similar name existing near Jambú, not far from their ancient capital Taksha-sila, or Taxila; of which the position is most probably to be sought between Manikyála and the Suán River, notwithstanding some plausible and ingenious objections which have been raised against that opinion.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Buddhists in Sind.*

Biláduri calls the temple of the sun at Multán by the name of *budd*, and he informs us, that not only temples, but idols, were called by the same name. As the Buddhist religion was evidently the prevalent one in Sind when the Musalmáns first came in contact with Indian superstitions, it follows that to Buddha must be attributed the origin of this name, and not to the Persian *but*, "an idol," which is itself most probably derived from the same source.

<sup>1</sup> *Annals of Rájasthán*, Vol. I. pp. 53, 92, 95, 99, 103-6, 536, 673, 738, 739, 796, 800; and Vol. II. pp. 225, 227, 445, 678, 735. His ardent admirer, Mr. E. Poccoke, exalts them still higher, by mis-spelling their name:—"The Tág is a renowned Rajpoot tribe! The Toga of the Rámas was the dress worn by this tribe! The race was the Taga-des (Toga-tus), that is, Tagland. . . The Gena Tagata, or Gena Togata, that is, the Tág Race!"—*India in Greece*, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> On this interesting and much-vexed question, consult Mannert, *Geographie der Gr. und Römer*, Vol. V.; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 451; *Asiatic Res.*, Vol. VIII. pp. 316, 348; *Modern Traveller*, "India," Vol. I. p. 119; *Annals of Ráj.*, Vol. I. pp. 92, 104, 693; II. p. 227; *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Vol. V. p. 118; XI. 157; *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 64, 107; Lassen, *Indische Alterth.*, Vol. II. p. 145; M. Stan. Julien, *Hist. d'Hiouen Thsang*, p. 143; and, above all, J. Abbott, *Journal A. S. Bengal*, 1852 pp. 216-218, 254-263; in which work, Taxila has frequently formed the subject of discussion.—[*Journal R. A. S.*, Vol. XX. p. 221.].



With regard to the *budd* of Debal,<sup>1</sup> M. Reinaud has observed that the word not only is made applicable to a Buddhist temple, but seems also to indicate a Buddhist *stupa*,<sup>2</sup> or tower, which was frequently the companion of the temple; and he traces the word *budd* in the *feou-thau*, or rather *foth*, which we find mentioned in the Chinese relations, as serving at the same time to designate a Buddha, and the edifice which contains his image. "*Feou-thou*" says Klaproth, "is the name which they give to pyramids, or obelisks, containing the relics of Sákya, or other holy personages. Chapels, likewise, are so called, in which these images are placed."<sup>3</sup>

Although Chach, who usurped the throne about the beginning of the Hijri era, was a Bráhmaṇ, there is no reason to suppose that he attempted to interfere with the then popular religion of Buddhism. Bráhmaṇism is, indeed, so accommodating to anything that partakes of idol-worship, that Chach and Dáhir might have made their offerings in a Buddhist temple, without any greater sacrifice of consistency than a Roman was guilty of in worshipping Isis and Osiris, or than we witness every day in a Hindú presenting his butter and flowers at the shrine of Shaikh Saddú, Gházi Mián, Sháh Madár, or any other of the apotheosized Muhammadan impostors of Hindústán. There is even no incompatibility in supposing that Chach, though a Bráhmaṇ by birth, still continued a Buddhist in his persuasion;<sup>4</sup> for the divisions of castes were at that time secular, not religious,—the four classes existing, in former times, equally amongst the Buddhists and amongst the Hindús of continental India, as they do at this day amongst the Buddhists of Ceylon, and amongst the Jains of the Peninsula, where even Bráhmaṇ priests may be found officiating in their temples.

There are several indications of the Buddhist religion prevailing

<sup>1</sup> The temple of Debal is described as being one hundred and twenty feet high, surmounted by a dome also of equal height.—*Tuhfat-u-l Kirám*, MS. p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> The origin of our English "stupa." It is curious that, in Icelandic also, *stupa* signifies "a tower." See further, respecting this word, Hammer-Purgetall, in *Wien Jahrbucher*, No. cvii. p. 17; Burnouf, *Budd. Ind.*, Vol. I. p. 349; Fergusson, *Illustr. to Anc. Archit. of Hindústán*, p. 14. [*Journ. R. A. S.*, I. (N.S.) p. 481.]

<sup>3</sup> *Fragments Arabes*, pp. 193, 200; *Fou-koue-ki*, pp. 19, 41, 50, 91, 356; *Mémoires sur l'Inde*, pp. 90, 177, 290.

<sup>4</sup> There seems, indeed, reason to believe that his brother and successor, Chandar, was actually a Buddhist ascetic.—*V. sup.*, p. 153.

at that period in the valley of the Indus, not only from the specific announcement of the Chinese travellers, and the declaration of Ibn Khurdádiba to that effect, but from certain incidental allusions of the Arabic writers, made without any particular reference to the opposite factions of Bráhmans and Buddhists—between which the distinctions, especially of worship, oblations, mythology, and cosmography, were generally too nice to attract the observations, or excite the enquiries of such ignorant and supercilious foreigners. Thus, when priests are mentioned, they are usually called *Samaní*;<sup>1</sup> the state elephant is white, a very significant fact (*supra*, p. 170); the thousand Bráhmans, as they are styled, who wished to be allowed to retain the practices of their ancient faith, were ordered by Muhammad Kásim, with the permission of the Khalif, to carry in their hands a small vessel as mendicants, and beg their bread from door to door every morning—a prominent ceremony observed by the Buddhist priesthood (p. 186); and, finally, the sculpturing, or otherwise perpetuating, the personal representations of their conquerors (p. 124); all these indicate Buddhist rather than Bráhmanical habits. To this may be added the negative evidence afforded by the absence of any mention of priestcraft, or other pontifical assumption; of widow-burning, of sacerdotal threads, of burnt-sacrifices, of cow-worship, of ablutions, of penances, or of other observances and ceremonies peculiar to the tenets of the Bráhmanical faith.

The manifest confusion which prevailed amongst the Arabs regarding the respective objects of Bráhman and Buddhist worship, prepares us, therefore, to find, as remarked at the commencement of

<sup>1</sup> Vide. translations of the *Futúhu-l Buldan* (p. 121) and the *Chach-náma*, *passim*. These are the Sarmanes, Sarmanes, Garmanes, Samanai, and Semoi, of Clemens of Alexandria, Strabo, and other Greek writers. The name is derived from the Sanskrit, *Sramana*, "a religious mendicant, an ascetic, especially one of the Buddhist faith." More information can be had respecting the various disguises and applications of this word, by consulting Schwanbeck, *Megasthenis Fragmenta*, pp. 45-50; C. Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, Vol. II. pp. 455-7; Lassen, *Rhein. Mus.*, Vol. I. pp. 171-190; *Ind. Alterth.*; Gildemeister, *de reb. Ind.*, p. 114; Humboldt, *Cosmos*, Vol. II. pp. 59; Thirlwall, *Hist. Græcæ*, Vol. VII. p. 15; *Journal A. S. Bombay*, No. viii. p. 91; Dr. Wilson, *Antiq. of Western India*, p. 63; *Journal R. A. S.*, No. xii. 378-402; Burnouf, *Budd. Ind.*, Vol. I. p. 275; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 491; Bohlen, *das alte Indien*, Vol. I. pp. 319-322.

this Note, that the temple of the Sun at Multán is, by Biládurí, styled a *budd* (p. 123). Even in the time of Mas'údí, the kings of Kanauj, which he asserts to have then been under Multán, are all styled *Búdh*, *Búdah* or *Bauúra*, doubtless from the worship which the Arabs had heard to prevail in that capital (p. 22); and in this he is followed by Idrísí (p. 81), who wrote as late as the middle of the twelfth century: so that the use of *budd* is very indefinite; and whether applied to man, temple, or statue, it by no means determines the application to anything positively and necessarily connected with Buddhism, anymore than the absence of that word denotes the contrary, when incidental notices and negative testimonies, such as those mentioned in the preceding paragraph, can be adduced to support the probability of its prevalence.

#### *The Jats.*

[General Cunningham in his Archæological Report for 1863-4, says, "The traditions of the Hindu Játs of Biána and Bharatpur point to Kandahar as their parent country, while those of the Muhammadan Játs generally refer to Gajni or Garh-Gajni, which may be either the celebrated fort of Ghazni in Afghanistan or the old city of Gajnipur on the site of Rawul-Pindi. But if I am right in my identification of the Játs with the *Xanthii* of Strabo, and the *Iatii* of Pliny and Ptolemy, their parent country must have been on the banks of the Oxus, between Bactria, Hyrkania, and Khorasmia. Now in this very position there was a fertile district, irrigated from the Margus river, which Pliny calls *Zotale* or *Zothale*, and which, I believe to have been the original seat of the *Iatii* or Játs. Their course from the Oxus to the Indus may perhaps be dimly traced in the *Xuthi* of Dionysius of Samos, who are coupled with the *Arieni*, and in the *Zuthi* of Ptolemy who occupied the *Karmanian* desert on the frontier of Drangiana. As I can find no other traces of their name in the classical writers, I am inclined to believe, as before suggested, that they may have been best known in early times, by the general name of their horde, as *Abars*, instead of by their tribal name as *Játs*. According to this view, the main body of the *Iatii* would have occupied the district of *Abiria* and the towns of *Pardobathra* and *Bardaxema* in Sindh, or Southern Indo-Scythia, while

the Panjab or Northern Indo-Scythia was chiefly colonized by their brethren the *Meds*.

[When the Muhammadans first appeared in Sindh, towards the end of the seventh century, the *Zaths* and *Meds* were the chief population of the country. But as I have already shown that the original seat of the *Med* or *Medi* colony was in the Panjab proper, I conclude that the original seat of the *Jatts* or *Jât* colony, must have been in Sindh. \* \* \* \* At the present day the *Jâts* are found in every part of the Panjab, where they form about two-fifths of the population. They are chiefly Musulmans, and are divided into not less than a hundred different tribes. \* \* \* \* To the east of the Panjab, the Hindu *Jâts* are found in considerable numbers in the frontier states of Bikaner, Jesalmer, and Jodhpur, where, in Col. Tod's opinion, they are as numerous as all the Rajput races put together. They are found also in great numbers along the upper course of the Ganges and Jumna, as far eastward as Bareilly, Farakhabad, and Gwalior, where they are divided into two distinct clans. \* \* \* To the south of the Panjab, the Musulman *Jâts* are said by Pottinger to form the entire population of the fruitful district of Haraud-Dajel, on the right bank of the Indus, and the bulk of the population in the neighbouring district of Kach-Gandava. In Sindh, where they have intermarried largely with Buluchis and Musulmans of Hindu descent, it is no longer possible to estimate their numbers, although it is certain that a very large proportion of the population must be of *Jât* descent.]

#### *The Kerks.*

The pirates, whose insolence led to the final subjugation of Sind, are stated, by a very good authority, to be of the tribe of Kerk, Kruk, Kurk, Karak, or some name of nearly similar pronunciation. The reading is too clear to be discarded in favour of 'Kurd,' or 'Coorg,' as has been proposed; and M. Reinaud, while he suggests the latter reading, which has been shown to be highly improbable, on the ground of Coorg being not a maritime, but an inland hilly country — nevertheless informs us that, in the annals of the Arabs, the Kurk are more than once spoken of as desperate pirates, carrying their expeditions even as far as Jidda,

in the Red Sea.<sup>1</sup> We must, therefore, necessarily be content to consider them as of Sindian origin, otherwise Rái Dáhir would not have been called to account for their proceedings.

Though the name of Kork be now extinct, and declared to be entirely incapable of present identification, we must enquire whether we cannot find any trace of their having occupied the banks of the Indus at some remote period. And, first of all the resemblance of the name of Krokala, which has conspicuous mention in the voyage of Nearchus, is sufficiently striking to attract our observation. Dr. Vincent and Heeren consider Krokala to be the modern Karáchi. A later authority says Chalna, a small rocky island, about four miles from Cape Monze.<sup>2</sup> Neither of these authorities knew that there is at present a large insular tract, which bears the name of Kakrála, at the mouth of the Indus, answering exactly all the requirements of Arrian's description—"a sandy island, subject to the influence of the tides."<sup>3</sup> It is situated between the Wanyáni and Pittí mouths of the river; but modern travellers differ about its precise limits. Captain Postans places it further to the west, and makes it include Karáchi.<sup>4</sup> This is no shifting, or modern name. We can see from the *Ayn-i Akbari*, and from some of the works quoted in this volume, that it has been known, and similarly applied, for the last three centuries at least; and it may, without question, be regarded as the Krokala of Arrian. Its origin is easily accounted for, by conceiving it to mean the "abode of the Krok," or whatever their real designation may have been before its perversion by the Greeks. The only other vestige of the name is in Karaka, a place three miles below Haidarábád.

In pointing out another possible remnant of this ancient name, I am aware I shall be treading on dangerous and very disputable ground. Nevertheless, let us at once, without further preliminary, transfer ourselves to the north-eastern shores of the Euxine sea,

<sup>1</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*, Vol. I. p. 194; *Asiatic Nations*, Vol. II. p. 246; *Journal of the R. Geographical Society*, Vol. V. p. 264; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 479.

<sup>3</sup> Nearchi *Paropius*, p. 4; *Plin. Nat. Hist.*, vi. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Personal Obs. on Sindh*, p. 24; *McMurdo, Journ. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 212; *Burnes, Travels to Bokhara*, Vol. III. p. 12; *L'Univers Pittoresque*, "Inde," p. 68.

where we shall find, among other peoples and places recalling Indian associations, the tribe of Kerketæi or Kerketæ<sup>1</sup>—the bay of Kerketis<sup>2</sup>—the river of Korax<sup>3</sup>—the mountains of Korax<sup>4</sup>—the town of Korok-ondame<sup>5</sup>—the river and peninsula of Korok-ondame<sup>6</sup>—the sea, or lake, of Korok-ondamētis<sup>7</sup>—the tribe of Kerketiki<sup>8</sup>—the city of Karkinitis<sup>9</sup>—the city of Karkine<sup>10</sup>—the bay of Karkinitis<sup>11</sup>—the city of Kirkæum<sup>12</sup>—the river of Karkenites<sup>13</sup>—the region of Kerketos<sup>14</sup>—the tribe of Kōraxi<sup>15</sup>—the wall of Korax<sup>16</sup>—and other similar names,—all within so narrow a compass as to show, even allowing many to be identical, that they can have but one origin, derived from the same fundamental root—Kerk, Kurk, Karak, Korak, Kark—retaining immutably the same consonants, but admitting arbitrary transpositions, or perhaps unsettled pronunciations of unimportant vowels.

It may be asked what connection these names can possibly have with our Sindian stock. Let us, then, carry the enquiry a little further, and many more Indian resemblances may be traced:—for,

<sup>1</sup> Hellanicus, *Fragm.* 91; Scylax Caryand., *Periplus*; ed. Hudson, p. 31; Strabo, *Geograph.*, xi. 2; ed. Tauchnitz, Vol. II. pp. 399, 406; Dionys., *Perieg.* V. 682. Pallas and Reineggs consider that the Charkas, or Circassians, derive their name from the Kerketæ. They certainly occupy the same sites.

<sup>2</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, *ib.* and iii. 6; Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 9, 12; Pompon, *Mela, de situ Orbis*, i. 19; iii. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.* *ib.* p. 403; Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9; Stephanus Byzant., *Ethnica*, s.v.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.*, *ib.*; Pompon, *Mel.*, i. 19; Dionys., *Perieg.*, 550.

<sup>7</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.*, *ib.*; Steph. Byz., s.v.

<sup>8</sup> Pompon, *Mela*, i. 19; Priscian, *Perieg.*, 663.

<sup>9</sup> Steph. Byz., v. *Καρκινίτις*; Herod., iv. 99.

<sup>10</sup> Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, iv. 26; Ptol., *Geogr.* iii. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.*, vii. 3; *ib.* p. 90; Pompon, *Mel.*, ii. 1; Artemidori, *Fragm.* p. 87.

<sup>12</sup> Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 4; *Etymolog. Magnum*, v. *Κίρακος*; Apoll. Rhod., *Argon.*, ii. 400; iii. 200.

<sup>13</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, iii. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Eustathius, ad Dionys., *Perieg.*, 682.

<sup>15</sup> Hecataeus, *Fragm.*, 185; Scylax Cayand., *Periplus*, p. 31; Steph. Byz., s.v.

<sup>16</sup> Bayer, *de Muro Casu*; Reineggs, *Histor.-Topograph. Beschreibung d. Kaukasus*, Tom. I. p. 16; Steph. Byz., v. *Κόρακος*. The common names of Charax, and its compounds, Characene, Characoma, etc., in Syria, Asia Minor, and along the course of the Euphrates and Tigris, offer an inviting resemblance, but have no connection with these. The origin of these names is, curiously enough, both Hebrew and Greek; the Hebrew signifying a "wall," or "fortress;" *χάραξ*, a "fosse." The Kerak, or Karac, which we so often read of in the history of the Crusades, is derived from the former.

next to these wild Kerketiki, we are struck with finding the very Sindians themselves.

KERKETIKI*que, feroz ea gens, SINDI*que *superbi.*<sup>1</sup>

We have also a Sindikus portus<sup>2</sup>—a town of Sinda<sup>3</sup>—the tribe of Sindiani<sup>4</sup>—the town of Sindica<sup>5</sup>—the tract of Sindike<sup>6</sup>—the town of Sindis<sup>7</sup>—the tribe of Sindones<sup>8</sup>—the town of Sindos<sup>9</sup>—the tribe of Sinti<sup>10</sup> Here, again, it may be admitted, that some of these may be different names for the same tribes and the same places.

The old reading of the passage in Herodotus, where the Sindi are mentioned (iv. 28), was originally Indi, but commentators were so struck with the anomaly of finding Indians on the frontiers of Europe, and they considered it so necessary to reconcile the historian with geographers, that they have now unanimously agreed to read Sindi, though the reading is not authorized by any ancient manuscripts. It is impossible to say what is gained by the substitution; for Sindi must be themselves Indians, and the difficulty is in no way removed by this arbitrary conversion. Hesychius, moreover,—no mean authority—says that the Sindi of the Euxine were, in reality, Indians; nay, more, though writing two centuries before our Kerks are even named or alluded to, he expressly calls the Kerketæ also “an Indian nation.”<sup>11</sup>

It has been remarked, that even if no such direct testimony had been given, the hints that remain to us concerning the character and manners of these Sindi, the peculiar object of their worship, and their dissolute religious rites and sorceries, would leave no doubt as to the country from which they were derived.

It is from this region that the Indian merchants must have sailed

<sup>1</sup> Orphei *Argonautica*, Cribelli versio, v. 1049; see also Herod., iv. 28; Apollon. Rhod., *Argonaut.*, iv. 322; Strabo, *Geogr.*, xi. 2; *ib.* p. 403; Val. Flacc., *Argon.*, vi. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Scylax Caryand., *Periplus*, p. 31; Strabo, *Geog.*, *ib.*, p. 406; Ptol., *Geogr.* v. 9; Steph. Byz., v. *Σίνδικος*. This is still called Sindjak, a haven near Anapa. Rennell's map makes it correspond with Anapa itself.

<sup>3</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Lucian, *Toxaris*, c. 55.

<sup>5</sup> Herod., iv. 86.—Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo, *ib.*, pp. 399, 403, 404.

<sup>7</sup> Hesychius, *Lex.*, s. v.

<sup>8</sup> Pompon. Mela, i. 19.

<sup>9</sup> Pompon. Mela, i. 19.

<sup>10</sup> Scylax Car., *Periplus*, *ib.*—Hesychius, *Lex.*, s. v.—Polyænus, *Stratagem.*, viii. 55.

<sup>11</sup> *Σίνδικος*, ἴθνος Ἰνδικόν. *Κερκετῆς*, ἴθνος Ἰνδικόν. *Conf. Interpret.* Hesych., Vol. II. p. 234.

who were shipwrecked in the Baltic and presented by the king of the Suevi, or of the Batavi, to L. Metellus Celer, the pro-consul of Gaul; for they could not have been carried round from the continent of India to the north of Europe by the ocean. Various solutions of this difficulty have been attempted. It has been surmised that they might have been Greenlanders, or mariners from North America, or even painted Britons: but the fact cannot be disputed, that they are called plainly "Indians," by all the authors who have recorded the fact, however improbable their appearance in those regions might have been.<sup>1</sup>

Their nautical habits were no doubt acquired originally in the Indian Ocean, and were inherited by generations of descendants. It is even highly probable that their inveterate addiction to piracies, which led to the Muhammadan conquest, and has only now been eradicated by the power of the British, may have been the cause of this national dislocation, which no sophistry, no contortion of reading, no difficulty of solution, can legitimately invalidate. The very term of *ignobiles*, applied to them by Ammianus Marcellinus (xxii. 8), and the curious expressions used by Valerius Flaccus (vi. 86),—

*Degeneresque ruunt Sindi, glomerantque, paterno  
Crimine nunc etiam metuentes verbera, turmas,—*

imply a punishment and degradation, which are by no means sufficiently explained by reference to the anecdotes related by Herodotus (iv. 1-4), and Justin (ii. 5).<sup>2</sup>

Whether this degradation adheres to any of their descendants at the present time will form the subject of a future essay; but before closing the subject of these early Indian piracies, we should not omit to notice the evident alarm with which they always inspired the Persian monarchy, even in the days of its most absolute power. Strabo and Arrian inform us, that in order to protect their cities

<sup>1</sup> Qui ex India commercii causa navigantes, tempestate essent in Germania abrupti, —Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, ii. 67. Compare Pompon. Mel., *de sit. Orb.*, iii. 6. The original authority is Cornelius Nepos, *Fragmenta*, p. 731; ed. A. van Staveren, Lugd. Bat., 1734, where the Notes should be consulted. See also Ramusio, *Navigat. et Viaggi*, Tom. I. p. 373 D.

<sup>2</sup> Ukert, *alte Geographie*, Vol. III. pt. ii. pp. 494-496, 510; W. D. Cooley, *Maritime and Inland Discovery*, Vol. I. pp. 82-87; *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.*, Tom. VI. p. 263; XLVI. p. 403; M. Viv. de St. Martin, *Etudes de Géographie ancienne*, Tom. I. p. 273.



against piratical attacks, the Persians made the Tigris entirely inaccessible for navigation. The course of the stream was obstructed by masses of stone, which Alexander, on his return from India, caused to be removed for the furtherance of commercial intercourse. Inspired by the same dread, and not from religious motives, (as has been supposed), the Persians built no city of any note upon the sea-coast.<sup>1</sup>

We may here make a passing allusion to another memorial of Indian connexion with these parts. The southern neighbours of these Euxine Sindi were the Kolchians. C. Ritter, in his *Vorhalle*, quoted at the end of this Note, asserts that they came originally from the west of India. Pindar<sup>2</sup> and Herodotus<sup>3</sup> both remark upon the darkness of their complexion. The latter also mentions that they were curly-headed. He states that he had satisfied himself, not only from the accounts of others, but from personal examination, that they were Egyptians, descended from a portion of the invading army of Sesostris, which had either been detached by that conqueror, or, being wearied with his wandering expedition, had remained, of their own accord, near the river Phasis. He also mentions the practice of circumcision, the fabrication of fine linen, the mode of living, and resemblance of language, as confirmatory of his view of an affinity between these nations. He has been followed by Diodorus and other ancient writers, as well as many modern scholars, who have endeavoured to account for this presumed connection.<sup>4</sup> I will not lengthen this Note by pursuing the enquiry; but will merely remark that this Egyptian relationship probably arises from some confusion (observable in several other passages of Herodotus), respecting the connection between the continents of India and Ethiopia,—which pervaded the minds of poets and geographers

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, *Geograph.*, xvii. 1; *ib.*, Vol. iii. p. 338; Arrian, *Expedit. Alex.*, vii. 7. Amm. Marcellinus, xxiii. 6; Robertson, *Ancient India*, Note x.; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. x. pp. 24-32; *Ind. Alterthum*, ii. 601. Heeren and others have questioned whether these dykes were not rather maintained for the purposes of irrigation.

<sup>2</sup> Κελευσώεσσι Κόλχοισιν.—*Pyth.*, iv. 378. The Scholiast dwells on the subject.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist.*, II. 104. See also Eustathius ad Dionys., *Perieg.*, 689.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* *Hist.*, i. 24. 65; Apollon. Rhod., *Argon.*, iv. 259-271; Strabo, *Geogr.*, xi. 2, *ib.*, p. 409; Val Flacc., *Argon.*, v. 421; Fest Avien., *Deser. Orbis*, 871; Amm. Marc., xvii. 8; Ukert, *alt's Geogr.*, Vol. III. pt. ii. p. 509; St. Martin, *loc. cit.*, pp. 255-270.

from Homer<sup>1</sup> down to Ptolemy,<sup>2</sup>—or rather down to Idrisi and Marino Sanuto;<sup>3</sup> and which induced even Alexander, when he saw crocodiles in the Indus, although their existence therein had already been remarked by Herodotus, to conceive that that river was connected with the Nile, and that its navigation downwards would conduct into Egypt.<sup>4</sup>

It is admitted that grave objections may be raised, and have been urged with some force, against carrying these presumed analogies too far; and sceptics are ready to exclaim with Fluellen, "there is a river in Macedon, and there is also, moreover, a river at Monmouth  
• • • there is salmons in both." But, while some have endeavoured to trace the indications of a direct Indian connection between the inhabitants of the Euxine shores and India, on the ground of such names as Acesines,<sup>5</sup> Hypanis,<sup>6</sup> Kophes, or Kobus,<sup>7</sup> Typhaonia,<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Il.*, xxiii. 205; *Odyss.*, i. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Geograph.*, vii. 3, 5. There had been a decided retrogression in the system of Ptolemy; for Herodotus, Strabo, and some others had a far correcter knowledge of the Southern Ocean.

<sup>3</sup> Vincent, *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, pp. 668, 664-8; M. Jaubert, *Geog. & Edrisi; Gesta Dei per Francos*, Vol. II. p.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, *Geograph.*, xv. 1, Vol. III. p. 266; Arrian, *Expedit. Alex.*, vi. 1; Geier, *Alex. M. Historiarum Scriptores*, p. 118.

It is fair to remark, that such ignorance is not reconcilable, either with the general arrangement of Alexander's plans, or with the real geographical knowledge which his inquisitive mind must have imbibed. Respecting the supposed geographical connection of these two countries; see Schaufelberger, *Corpus Script. Vet. qui de India scripserunt*, 1845, l. 12; Sir J. Stoddart, *Introd. to the Study of Un. Hist.*, pp. 112, 218; Schwanbeck, *Megasthenis Fragmenta*, pp. 1-5, 64; Dr. Smith's *Dict. of Geogr.*, v. "Arabicus Sinaus" and "Asia;" Gildemeister, *Script. Arab. de rebus Indicis*, pp. 27, 145; Humboldt, *Cosmos* (Sabine), Vol. II. Note 419; D'Anville, *Antiq. de l'Inde*, p. 187; Cooley, *Mar. and Inland Discov.*, Vol. I., pp. 113, 128, 150; Valentyn, *Beschryving van Oost Ind.*, Vol. I. p. 62; Robertson's *India*, Note xxxii; *Clesias Operum Reliquia*, ed. Baehr, pp. 309, 454. These quotations do not refer to the large and interesting question of their civil, religious, and ethnographical affinities, which Heeren, Bohnen, and others have treated of in learned disquisitions.

<sup>5</sup> A river of Sicily.—Thucyd., *Bell. Pelop.*, iv. 25.

<sup>6</sup> A western tributary of the Dnieper, according to Herodotus. Also, the name of another river which fell into the Pontus Euxinus. Herod., iv. 17, 52; Ovid., *Pont.*, iv. 10, 47; *Metamorph.*, xv. 285.

<sup>7</sup> A river on the eastern shore of the Euxine.—Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 4; Arrian, *Perrip.*, p. 10.

<sup>8</sup> Rocky mountains in the Caucasus and India.—*Etymol. Magn.*, s.v. *Topadua*.

Phasis,<sup>1</sup> Caucasus, and such like, being found in both one country and the other; and while the resemblance between the worship of Odin and Buddha has been strongly urged by similar advocates;<sup>2</sup> it may, on the other hand, and with great reason, be asserted that these names are not local in India, and that they have generally been grafted on some Indian stock, offering a mere partial likeness, either through the ignorance of the Greeks, or with the view of flattering the vanity of Alexander, by shifting further to the eastward the names and attributes of distant places, already removed almost beyond mortal ken and approach, and lying far away—

“Extra flammantia mœnia mundi.”<sup>3</sup>

In the grossness of their indiscriminate adulation, they were at all times ready to ascribe to that conqueror the obscure achievements of mythical heroes, whose glory was inseparably connected with certain streams and mountains, which even they, in the plenitude of their power, had found it no easy matter to traverse and surmount. Strabo, indeed, informs us that the Argonautic monuments were industriously destroyed by Alexander's generals, from a ridiculous alarm lest the fame of Jason might surpass that of their master. Parmenio is especially mentioned both by him and Justin, as one whose jealousy was prompted to destroy several temples erected in honour of Jason, “in order that no man's name in the east might be more venerable than that of Alexander.”<sup>4</sup>

Hence, it has been justly remarked, even by early writers, open to the influence of reason and philosophy, and guided by the results

<sup>1</sup> A river of Scythia, as well as of Colchis and of Taprobane.—Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, i. 48; Val. Flac., *Argon.*, ii. 696; Pausan., iv. 44; Steph. Byz., v. *Ἰνδία*. Respecting the Colchis of Southern India, see Dr. Smith's *Dict. of Geography*, v. “Colchis” and “Colchi Indiae.”

<sup>2</sup> This Odin-Buddha-Hypothesis, as the Germans call it, has been, perhaps, somewhat too readily condemned by Kemist, Elaproth, A. W. Schlegel, Ukert, and others. Compare *Asiatic Researches; Fundgruben des Or.*, Vol. IV., p. 201; *Asia Polynotta*, p. 144; *Introd. to Univ. Hist.*, ut sup., pp. 275-8; Finn Magnusea, *Myst. Religionen* (Lericon, Copenhagen, 1848).

<sup>3</sup> Compare on this subject, Strabo, *Geogr.*, vii. 35, xi. 2, Vol. II. p. 77, 408; the Scholiast upon Apollon. Rhod., *Argon.*, ii. 397, 417; Ukert, *alt. Geographie*, Vol. III. pt. 2, pp. 205, 305.

<sup>4</sup> Justin, *Hist. Phil.*, xlii. 3; Strabo, *Geogr.*, xi. 5, Vol. II. p. 421, xi. 11, p. 441, xi. 14, p. 456, xv. 1, Vol. III. p. 253, xvi. 4, p. 412; Arrian, *Indica*, ii; *Exped. Alex.*, v. 3.

of an extended observation, that the Greeks have transposed these localities upon very slender foundations, and that many of the barbaric names have been *Hellenised*."<sup>1</sup>

We find frequent instances of the same tendency to corruption in our own Oriental nomenclature, but with even greater perversions. Thus, we have heard our ignorant European soldiery convert Shek-awaci into 'sherry and water;' Siraju-d Daula into a belted knight, 'Sir Roger Dowler;' Dalip into 'Talip;' Sháh Shujá'u-l Mulk into 'Chá sugar and milk,' and other similar absurdities; under which, in like manner, "many of the barbaric names have been *Anglicised*,"

But when we apply the same argument to the cases under consideration, we shall see it has no force; for here there has been no room for the corruptions and flatteries to which allusions have been made; nor did it ever occur to the Greeks to enter upon the same comparisons which are engaging our attention. When we carry these identifications yet further, we shall find names with which the Greeks were not even acquainted; and it is not between streams, towns, and mountains, that the similitudes exist, but between peoples in the one country and places in the other.—the latter known, the former unknown, to ancient historians and geographers,—who have, therefore, left the field open for moderns alone to speculate in.

Now, it is not merely in the two instances already adduced that these striking monuments of connection attract our observation; but when we also find the Majidi next to the Sindi and Kerkete,<sup>2</sup> a tribe

<sup>1</sup> Nikanor, in Steph. Byz., *Ethnica*, v. *Távas*. Compare Hecyeb, *Lex. v. Σαρδαποπύδος*; Schlegel, *Ind. Bibliothek*, Vol. II. p. 297; Droysen, *Geschichte A. G.*, p. 405; Wesseling, ad Diod. Sic., xvii. 83; Bernhardt, ad Dionys. *Perieg.* 714.

<sup>2</sup> (Pseudo-) Arist., *de Mirabil. Auscultat.*, c. 123. The Sindi were by some authors considered to be a remnant of the Maistas; Steph. Byz., v. *Σινδοί*; Strabo, *Geogr.*, xi. 2, §. Vol. II. p. 404. This extraordinary juxtaposition of Sindi and Majidi again occurs in Thrace; See Thucyd., *Bell. Pelop.*, ii. 93. Respecting the Sindi, Sindos, Sintica, and similar names in Thrace and Macedonia, see Herod., vii. 123; Cæsar, *Bell. Civ.*, iii. 79; Liv., *Hist. Rom.*, xvi. 25, xl. 22, xlv. 43, xlv. 29; Polybius, *Excerpt.*, x. 37; Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, iv. 10; Steph. Byz., v. *Σινδοί*; *Λεξ. Μετροπ.* v. "Thrace." Homer tells us also of Sintians on Lemnos, who 'spoke a strange language;' *Il.* i. 694; *Od.* viii. 294; and they had before his time been noticed by Hellanicus of Lesbos; *Fragmenta*, 118. 113. From thence, the Sindhast on Thucydidēs says, that the Thracian Sindians were derived. More Indian families might be mentioned in Lycia and other eastern countries, but enough has been adduced on the subject to suit our present design.

of Arii or Archi,<sup>1</sup> an island of Aria or Aretias,<sup>2</sup> a river Arius,<sup>3</sup> a tribe of Maetes or Maotai,<sup>4</sup> a town of Madia,<sup>5</sup> a town of Matium,<sup>6</sup> a tribe of Matiani,<sup>7</sup> a town of Mateta,<sup>8</sup> a tribe of Kottæ,<sup>9</sup> a country of Kutaïs,<sup>10</sup> a city of Kuta,<sup>11</sup> a city of Kutaia,<sup>12</sup> a tribe of Kolchi,<sup>13</sup> a district of Kolchis,<sup>14</sup> a Kolchian sea,<sup>15</sup> a tribe of Koli,<sup>16</sup> the mountains of Koli,<sup>17</sup> a district of Koli,<sup>18</sup> a province of Iberia,<sup>19</sup> a tribe of Iberes,<sup>20</sup> a tribe of Bounomai,<sup>21</sup> a district of Minyas,<sup>22</sup> a city of Male,<sup>23</sup> a tribe of Baternæ,<sup>24</sup> a river of Bathys,<sup>25</sup> a port and town of Bata;<sup>26</sup> when we find all these names in close juxtaposition, reminding us in their various forms of our own Meds, Káthis, Koles, Abhfrs, Minas, Mallinas, and Bhatís, tribes familiar to us as being, at one time, in and near the valley of the Indus; and when we consider, moreover, that all these different names, including the Sindi and Kerketæ, were congregated about the western region of the Caucasus, within a

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, *Geogr. ibid.*; Steph. Byz. v. *Ἀρχηελ*; Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Apollon. Rhod., *Argon.*, ii. 103; Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, v. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Scyl. Caryand., p. 32. The connection of the Arii and Maidi will be developed in the following Note.

<sup>4</sup> Scymnus Chius, 870; Strabo, ii. 5, xi. 2; Frisician, *Forseg.*, 644. As for the Lake Maotis being so called, as Herodotus (iv. 86) says, because it is the *mother* of the Pontus, it is surprising that so frivolous a reason has met favour with modern geographers. See, on this name, Zeuss, *die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, p. 296.

<sup>5</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Pompon. Mel., *de sit Orb.*, i. 2. <sup>8</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 8. <sup>9</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, vi. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Orpuei *Argonaut.*, 824, 1009; Apollon. Rhod., *Argonaut.*, ii. 399, 403, iv. 511.

<sup>11</sup> Lycophron, *Cassandra*, 174; Steph. Byz., v. *Κίρα*; Eustath., ad *Il.*, iv. 103.

<sup>12</sup> Val. Flaccus, *Argon.*, vi. 428, 693; *Etymol. Mag.*, p. 77.

<sup>13</sup> Herod., ii. 104; Diod. Sic., i. 28; Pindar, *Pyth.*, iv. 378.

<sup>14</sup> Strabo, xi. 2, §. p. 408; Ptol., v. 10; Pomp. Mela, i. 19.

<sup>15</sup> Strabo, *ib.*, p. 399. <sup>16</sup> Scyl. Car., *Periplus*, p. 31; Steph. Byz., v. *Κόλοι*.

<sup>17</sup> A portion of the Caucasus, Hecateus, *Fragm.*, 161, 186; Steph. Byz., *ib.*

<sup>18</sup> Steph. Byz., *ib.*; Ptol., *Geogr.*, vi. 5.

<sup>19</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9; Val. Flacc., *Argon.*, vi. 120; Pliny, Plutarch, Pomponius Mela, etc.

<sup>20</sup> Strabo, *Geog.*, xi. 2, p. 406; 3, p. 412; Appian, *Mithridates*, 101, 116.

<sup>21</sup> Orphei, *Argonautica*, v. 1636. Their relation to the buccolic Abhira, or Abhrs as we now call them, will be obvious to any one who has resided in India. *Ind. Athenion.* II. 647, 953, 958. <sup>22</sup> Servius ad Virg., *Eclog.*, iv. 84.

<sup>23</sup> Scylax Caryand., *Periplus*, p. 32, and the note of Vossius, p. 42.

<sup>24</sup> Valer. Flacc., *Argon.*, vi. 70.

<sup>25</sup> Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 4; Postinger, *Tab.*, *Segm.* vii. This may be derived, as is usually supposed, from *Basis* 'deep'; Dr. Falconer's translation of the *Periplus* of the *Euxine Sea*, p. 44.

<sup>26</sup> Scyl. Caryand., *Peripl.*, p. 31; Strabo, *Geogr.*, *ib.*, p. 406; Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9.

space scarcely larger than the province of lower Sind, and when again we reflect upon the curious coincidence, that Pliny<sup>1</sup> calls the former province "Scythia Sendica," while Ptolemy<sup>2</sup> calls the latter "Indo-Scythia;" that even as late as the fifth century, the judicious ecclesiastical historian, Socrates,<sup>3</sup> as well as the accurate geographer, Stephanus,<sup>4</sup> continued to call the former by the name of "India," it is very difficult to resist the conviction, that these cumulative instances of combinations and affinities cannot be altogether accidental, or the mere result of diligent and ingenious exploration.

But, even allowing that all these miscellaneous instances of resemblance, brought forward in the preceding paragraph, are indeed purely fortuitous,—and it is willingly acknowledged that there is "ample room and verge enough" for a sharp eye, a nice ear, and a playful fancy, in the selection of such alliterative illustrations,—even if we reject them altogether as the products of a wild and dreamy imagination, and since they add little to the cogency of our argument, they may be resigned as such without a murmur, still it is impossible to yield the Sindi, the Kerketae, or even the Maldi, to the cavils of such an illiberal and hostile spirit of criticism, for, with respect to them, it must be confessed by all but the most obstinately sceptical, that they, at least, stand boldly and prominently forth, as undoubted evidences of actual Indian occupancy on the shores of the Euxine.

It is not the purport of this Note to show how these coincidences could possibly have arisen; how nations, separated by so many mountains, seas, forests, and wastes, could have preserved any signs whatever of original identity, much less of such close approximation in names, as has been here adduced. Ukert, the strongest opponent of this supposed connection between the Caucasus and India, mentions that the ancients are express in asserting that the Indians

<sup>1</sup> *Plin., Nat. Hist.*, iv. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Geogr.*, vii.; Eustathius ad Dionys., *Perieg.*, 1088; Mannert, *Geog. der Griechen und Römer*, Vol. V. p. 220; Ersch and Gruber, *Encycl. der Wissenschaften*, s.v. "Indo-scythia;" *Nouv. Journ. Asiatique*, 3rd series, Tom. VIII. p. 264.

<sup>3</sup> *Eccles. Hist.*, i. 15. See also the note by Isaac Vossius to Seylax Caryand., p. 40, ap. Hudson, *Geog. Gr. Min.*, Vol. I.; and Fréret, *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, Tom. IV. p. 603.

<sup>4</sup> *Ethnica*, vv. Γοργιωνος et Σινθικος. See also Is. Tzetzes ad Lycophron, *Cassand. a.*, 174, where he calls the Kolchians Ἰνδοὶ Σινδοί.

never sent out of their country any armies or colonies;<sup>1</sup> but migrations might easily have arisen from other causes, and a hint has been thrown out above, that in this particular instance, the expatriation might perhaps not have been altogether voluntary.

In another part of this work I have traced, step by step, the progress of one Indian family from the banks of the Indus to the remotest shores of Europe; and in the following Note upon the Meds, I have shown several instances of compulsory transportations to countries nearly as remote; so that this branch of the enquiry need not engage our attention further in this place, the object of showing the probable existence of a tribe of Kerks, both on the Indus and Euxine, having, it is hoped, already been sufficiently proved to the satisfaction of every candid and unprejudiced mind.<sup>2</sup>

#### *The Meds.*

We find the Meds frequently mentioned by the Arab authors on Sind, and, together with their rivals the Jats, they may be considered the oldest occupants of that province, who, in their names as well as persons, have survived to our own times.

The first account we have of them is in the *Mujmalu-t Tawarikh*. That work mentions that the Jats and the Meds are reputed to be descendants of Ham, the son of Noah, and that they occupied the banks of the Indus, in the province of Sind. The Meds, who devoted themselves to a pastoral life, used to invade the territories of the Jats, putting them to great distress, and compelling them to take up their abode on the opposite side of the river; but, subsequently, the Jats, being accustomed to the use of boats, crossed over and defeated the Meds, taking several prisoners and plundering their country.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.*, xv. 1; *ib.* Vol. III. p. 251; Diod. Sic., *Biblioth. Histor.*, ii. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Compare also Wahl, *Asien*, Vol. I. pp. 793, *et seq.*; Malte Brun, *Universal Geography*, Vol. II. pp. 27-52; Lünemann, *Descriptio Caucasi*, Gotting., 1803; Rommel, *Caucasus regionum et gentium Straboniana deser.*, Lips. 1804; Ritter, *Asien*, Vol. II. p. 622; and *die Vorhalle der Europäischen Völker-geschichten*, pp. 51, 75, 300; Eichwald, *Geogr. d. Kasp. Meeres*, p. 303, *et seq.*; Boeckh, *Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vol. II. pp. 100-110; M. V. de St. Martin, *Mém. histor. sur la Géog. anc. du Caucase*, Sect. ii, iii, in *Etudes de Géog.*, Vol. I; Ukert, *Atlas Geographiq.*, Vol. III. pt. ii. pp. 282-286; Christoph. Cellarius, *Notitiæ orbis antiqui*, Vol. II. pp. 356-367.

At last these two tribes, seeing the inutility of protracting their contests any longer, agreed to send a deputation to Duryodhana, the king of Hastinapur, begging him to nominate a king to rule over them. Duryodhana accordingly nominated his sister Dussal (Duh-sála), the wife of Jayadratha, who exercised the functions of government with great wisdom and moderation. The families and adherents of 30,000 Bráhmans, who were collected from all parts of Hindústán, were sent by Duryodhana to her court, and from that time Sind became flourishing and populous, and many cities were founded. The Jats and the Meds had separate tracts of land assigned to them, and were governed by chiefs of their own election.

The queen and Jayadratha made the city of 'Askaland their capital; the same place, apparently, which is called in a subsequent passage 'Askaland-úsa, perhaps the Uchh of later times, as has been shown in another Note of this Appendix (p. 365).

Jayadratha was killed in the fatal field of Thanesar, and his faithful wife ascended the funeral pile, after their reign had continued for more than twenty years. On the same field was extinguished the dynasty called after the name of Bharata, he being the most celebrated ancestor of Dhritaráshttra, the father of Duryodhana and the Kurus. On the transfer of the empire to the Pándavas, Yudhishthira conferred Sind upon Sanjwára, the son of Jayadratha and Dussal (Duh-sála), and from him Há was descended (*supra*, p. 103). As the Great War, in which these heroes enacted a conspicuous part, has been supposed, on astronomical grounds, to have taken place during the twelfth century B.C.,<sup>1</sup> we must assign an equal antiquity to their contemporaries the Meds of Sind, if we put faith in this narrative; but as this early settlement is not, in Lassen's opinion, opposed to probability in the case of the Jats, we need not withhold our faith in its correctness with respect to the Meds. Indeed, admitting that the 'Jartikas' of the *Mahá-bhárata* and the *Puránas* represent the Jats, we cannot but consider the 'Madras' as repre-

<sup>1</sup> Sir W. Jones, *Works*, Vol. III. p. 213; VII. 77. Some fix it earlier. See Prichard, *Researches into the Phys. Hist. of Mankind*, Vol. IV. p. 101, *et seq.*; Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. I. p. 499, *et seq.*; Prof. Wilson, *J. A. S. Bengal*, Vol. XIII. p. 81.



senting the Meds—confirming thereby the antiquity and synchronism of these two races on the banks of the Indus.<sup>1</sup>

During the period of Arab occupation, Muhammad Kásim is represented as making peace with the Meds of Suráshtra, “seafarers and pirates, with whom the men of Basra were then at war.” This gives a great extent to their dominion at that period towards the south-east.

In the time of Mu'tasim Bi-llah, 'Amrán, the Barnekide, governor of Sind, directed an expedition against the Meds, in which he killed three thousand of them, and constructed an embankment, which he called the Meds' embankment, probably for the purpose of depriving them of the means of irrigation, as was done so effectually in 1762 and 1802 at Mora and Ali Bandar, when the Sindians ruined the prosperity of north-western Kachh. The word *Sakar*, embankment,<sup>2</sup> is preserved in the town of that name opposite to Rori, where, however, the mound is a natural limestone formation of about one hundred feet high, and not an artificial causeway.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, we might, if we could be sure that any Meds were then on the western side of the Indus, pronounce this to be the identical locality; for certainly, in Biládurí (*supra* p. 128), the whole transaction seems to be closely connected with 'Amrán's proceedings against Kandábel and the Jats on the Aral river, not far from Sakar, insomuch that, immediately after settling affairs with them he returns to attack the Meds, having the chief of the Jats in his company. But, as on the occasion of this second attack, he dug a canal from the sea to their lake, rendering their water salt and nauseous, there can be no question of this scene, at least, being in the south-eastern portion of the province, where they were settled in the greatest numbers; and here, therefore, we must also look for the embankment raised in the first incursion. They are said to have been attacked by 'Amrán from several different directions, and were thus doubtless reduced to great extremities.

<sup>1</sup> Lassen, *de Pentapotamid Ind.*, p. 20, and *Indische Alterth.* Vol. I. pp. 97, 397, 821; Wilson, *Vishnu Purána*, Index; *As. Researches*, Vol. VIII. p. 346; M. Vivien de St. Martin, *Études de Géographie ancienne*, Tom. i. p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> Sakar, or Sakhar, as it is now pronounced, is better known to the natives as “Clipribandar,” which would imply that it was, in part at least, artificial.

During the reign of the same Khalif, we find an Arab chieftain, Muhammad bin Fazl, who had taken possession of Sindán, in the Abrása district of Kachh, attacking the Meds with a squadron of seventy vessels;<sup>1</sup> on which occasion he took Máli, of which the position may be identified with Mália on the Machú. This powerful armament seems to have been directed against the sea-board of the tract invaded by 'Amrán, now occupied by the Ran of Kachh; where Vigogad, Vingar, and Ballyári, on the northern, and Phang-warri, Nerona, Bitáro, etc., on the southern shore, are all known, both by concurrent native tradition, as well as by independent European observation, to have been once washed by the sea.

All these various expeditions, however, had but little permanent effect in reducing the power of the Meds, for Mas'údi informs us that, when he visited Sind, the inhabitants of Mansúra were obliged continually to protect themselves against their aggressions.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn Haukal notices them under the name of Mand (p. 38), and though, without the diacritical point, the word might be read Med, yet as all the MSS., few as they are, concur in this reading, it must be retained. He describes them as dwelling on the bank of the Indus from the borders of Multán to the sea, and in the desert between that river and Fámhal, the frontier town of Hind. They had many stations which they occupied as pasture grounds, and formed a very large population, unconverted to the faith. What Abú-l Fidá says of them is taken from this passage, and we do not read of them in any subsequent author.<sup>3</sup>

Hence we might suppose that the tribe is entirely extinct, and have left no memorial of their existence, except the passages above quoted. M. Reinaud, indeed, observes that he finds it impossible to apply the name of Med or Mand, to any known population, and therefore conceives that the denomination is disfigured. But he is mistaken in this supposition, for the tribe of Med still exists, both to the east and the west of the Indus;<sup>4</sup> and those on the coast, being

<sup>1</sup> *Bárijá* in the original. *Supra*, p. 124, 123. See Note on the word "Bargu."

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 43, 50, 188, 215, 234.

<sup>3</sup> *Gildemeister, Script. Arab. de rebus Indicis*, p. 172.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Ajín-i Akbari* also we have a tract called after their name within the Sirkár of Háji Khán.

unable now to practice piracy after the mode of their ancestors, devote themselves to the more tranquil pursuit of fishing. To the east, we find them roving on the borders of Sind and Jodhpúr, the site of their occupation during the Arab period; and to the west, they are found in the little ports of Makrán, from Súmmayní to Charbar, divided into the clans of Gazbúr, Hormári, Jellar-záf, and Chelmar-záf.

It is possible that the Meds, or some offshoot of that stock, may have been designated as Mand, for that syllable enters into the name of several native tribes and places existing to this day: as the Mand-ar, the Mand-hor, the Mind-lro, besides the Bulúch tribe of Moud-rání, as well as the ancient towns of Mand-rá and Mand-ropat, in Cháchagám, to the east of the Gúnt, Mand-rása to the north of the Makalí hills, and Mund-ra and other similar names in Kachh.

That the Mers of the Arávalí mountains and Káthiwár are descendants of the same family, is also not beyond the bounds of probability. The native pronunciation, especially in the western and north-western provinces of Hindústán, tends so much to an intermixture of the cerebral letters *r* and *d*,—the written character, indeed, being the same in both, and the diacritical marks being a mere modern innovation—that Mer and Med may be identical: and the addition of the aspirate, which sometimes makes the former into Mher, or, as we commonly write it Mhair, offers still no argument against identity, for that also is an optional excrescence, especially in the names of peoples and families. For the same reason, the connection of the Mahr of Ubáro, and other tracts in the Upper Sind, where they are reckoned by their neighbours as the aboriginal inhabitants of the country between Bhakkar and Baháwalpúr, is equally plausible.<sup>1</sup>

Tod pronounces the Mers to be of Bhattí origin, and derives their name from *Meru*, “a mountain.” But at the same time that he pronounces them to be Bhattis, he says they are a branch of the Mína, or Maina, one of the aboriginal races of India. These statements are obviously incompatible, and the Bhattí hypothesis must be rejected.

<sup>1</sup> To them may perhaps be ascribed the distinction of giving name to the Mihrán, or Indus.

The old town of Mhar in Kachh, where there is a temple of great antiquity and celebrity, dedicated to the goddess Asapára, may probably trace its origin to a similar source.

During the whole period of their known history, they have been conspicuous for their lawless and predatory habits, from the time when four thousand Mör archers defended their passes against Pirthi-Ráj,<sup>1</sup> down to A.D. 1821, when their excesses compelled the British government to attack them in their fastnesses, and reduce them to complete obedience. Since which period, it is gratifying to observe that they have emerged from their barbarism, and, under the judicious management of European officers, have learnt to cultivate the arts of peace, and set a notable example of industry to the surrounding tribes.

Taking into consideration, therefore, the fact that the Mers of the Arávali are but little advanced beyond the tract where the Meds are known, a thousand years ago, to have formed a numerous and thriving population; that their brethren, the Minas, can themselves be traced in their original seats to the banks of the Indus; that Káthiwár, or the Saurashtran peninsula, was the very nursery of the piractical expeditions for which the Meds were about the same period celebrated and feared, and where Mers still reside, we may conclude that to declare them identical, is doing no great force to reason and probability.<sup>2</sup>

The simple permutation of a letter—not unnaturally forced, but based upon a law of common observance—introduces us to a new connexion of considerable interest; for we may make bold to claim, as an ancient representative of this race, Meris, or Moeris, the king of Pattala, who, on the approach of Alexander, deserted his capital, and fled to the mountains. The site of this town, at the head of the Delta of the Indus, answers well to the position which we may presume the chief of the Meds to have occupied at that period; and, that the name was not personal, but derived from his tribe, we may be satisfied, from the common practice of Alexander's historians, as

<sup>1</sup> With reference to the concluding paragraphs of this Note, the celebrity of Median archery—the *Medi pharetrá accori*—should be borne in mind. Horat., Carm. ii. Od. 16; Propert., Lib. iii. Eleg. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Chr. Lassen, *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1840, Tom. iii. p. 139, and *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. I. p. 369; Tod, *Annals of Rajasthan* Vol. I. pp. 630-686; II. 323; Renouard, *Encyclop. Métrop.*, Vol. XX. pp. 40-42; Col. Dixon, *Report on Mhairwára*; M. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Études de Géographie ancienne*, Tom. I. p. 339.

exemplified in the instances of Abisares, Porus, Sambus, Musicanus, Assacanus, and Taxiles, who have these names severally attributed to them from the nations, countries, or towns over which they ruled. Dr. Vincent, in admitting, as the etymon of Moeris, the Arabic words *Mir Rais*, "the ruling chief," has suffered his too easy credulity to be played upon by an ambitious young orientalist. Bohlen has attempted to trace in the name of Moeris a corruption of *Mahárjá*, "the great king," in which he is followed by Ritter; but, independent of the fact that his kingdom was circumscribed within very narrow limits, he is expressly noticed by Arrian, under the humble title of *ὑπαρχος*, which invariably implies subordination, and not supremacy.<sup>1</sup> A more probable, but still unlikely, origin has been suggested, from the tribe of *Maurya*;<sup>2</sup> but they were far away in the east, remote from Sind, so that altogether locality and verbal resemblance are most favourable to the present hypothesis, that Meris is a Grecised form for the "chief of the Mers."

We may even extend our views to a still more remote period, and indulge in speculations whether this tribe may not originally have been a colony of Medes. There is nothing in the distance of the migration which would militate against this supposition, for Herodotus mentions the Sigynnæ, as a colony of the Medes settled beyond the Danube:—"How they can have been a colony of the Medes," he observes, "I cannot comprehend; but anything may happen in course of time."<sup>3</sup> The Medians are also said to have accompanied the expedition of Hercules, when he crossed over from Spain into Africa.<sup>4</sup> The Sauromatæ were Median colonists beyond the Tanais, or Don.<sup>5</sup> The Matienoi, or Matienes,<sup>6</sup> the Kharimatai,<sup>7</sup> and possibly the Mares,<sup>8</sup> were Caucasian colonists from Media, preserving in their names the national appellation of Mata or Madia.

<sup>1</sup> Q. Curt. Ruf., *De gestis Alex. Mag.*, Lib. ix. ch. 34; Arrian, *Anab.*, Lib. vi. ch. 17; Ritter, *Die Eräkunde von As.*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 474; Bohlen, *das Alte Indien*, Vol. I. p. 91; Vincent, *Comm. and Nov. of the Ancients*, Vol. I. p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. Bunkfy, *Indien*; M. F. Baudry, *Encyclopédie Moderne*, Tom. xviii. coll. 140, 144. <sup>3</sup> Herodotus, v. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Sallust, *Jugurtha*, 14; *Nouv. Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, Tom. xii. p. 181, *et seq.*

<sup>5</sup> Diod. Sic., *Bibl. Hist.*, ii. 43; Plin., *Hist. Nat.*, vi. 7. See on this subject, Zeuss, *die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, p. 293.

<sup>6</sup> Dionysii. *Perieg.*, 10c2; Herod., i. 189; iii. 94; v. 49, 52.

<sup>7</sup> Stephan. Byzant., s.v. *Χαριδάται*.

<sup>8</sup> Herod., iii. 94; vii. 97; Steph. Byzant., s.v.

They may either have been transplanted to the banks of the Indus when the Medo-Persian empire extended so far to the eastward; or they may have migrated thither at some indefinitely early period; or they may have sought an asylum there upon the occupation of their country by the Scythians; or during the persecution of the Magi, who constituted one of the six tribes of Medes, just as the Pársis did in Guzerát, at a later period and on similar occasion. It is worthy of remark that Ibn Haukal places the Budhas, or Budhyas, in the same category with the Mand, representing them as comprising several tribes to the west of the Indus. Now, the Dudií were also one of the six Median tribes, and the juxtaposition of these two names in the province of Sind should not escape notice, for they also may have formed a body of similar emigrants.<sup>1</sup>

All arguments against the probability of such dispersions stand self-confuted, when we consider that Sindians were on the Euxine;<sup>2</sup> and that, besides the familiar instances of Samaritans and Jews under the Assyrians, we read over and over again in Persian history, of the deportations of entire tribes, expressly termed *'ανασπάστοι* by Herodotus.<sup>3</sup> Thus we have the removal of Pæonians to Phrygia,<sup>4</sup> of Barcæans from Africa to Bactria,<sup>5</sup> of Milesians to Ampe, near the Tigris,<sup>6</sup> of Egyptians to Susa,<sup>7</sup> of Eretrians from Eubœa to Ardericca,<sup>8</sup> and to Gordyene,<sup>9</sup> of Antiochians to Mahúza,<sup>10</sup> and others which it would be tedious to specify.

There is another curious coincidence worthy of notice. It is well known, that from below the junction of the Panjáb rivers down to Sihwán, the Indus takes the name of *Sar*, *Siro*, or *Sira*, and from below Haidarábád to the sea, that of *Lár*. It is more correct, but unusual, to add an intermediate division, called *Wicholo*, "central," representing the district lying immediately around Haidarábád. just

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, i. 101; Gildemeister, *de rebus Indicia*, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> I have entered on this subject in another Note; and will here merely again remark upon the singular fact of Sindi and Maidi occupying the same tract on the Euxine, and again, the Sinti and Maidi being found in close proximity with each other, even in Thrace.

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, iv. 204.

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus, v. 98; vii. 80.

<sup>5</sup> Herodotus, iv. 204.

<sup>6</sup> Herodotus, vi. 20.

<sup>7</sup> Ctesias, *Persica*, c. 9.

<sup>8</sup> Herodotus, vi. 119; Philostrati, *Vita Apollon.*, i. 24-30.

<sup>9</sup> Strabo, *Geogr.*, xvi. 1; ed. Tauchnitz, Vol. III. p. 351.

<sup>10</sup> *Ancient Universal History*, Vol. IX. p. 305.

as on the Nile, the Wustánf, "midlands," of the Arabs represented the tract between Upper and Lower Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Sir A. Burnes says that *Sir* and *Lár* are two Bulúch words for "north" and "south." But the first is a Slavonic word also, which Gatterer and Niebuhr tell us is retained in *Sauro-matæ*, signifying "northern" Medes. There were also a province of Siracene, and a tribe of Siraceni, and other similar names north of the Caucasus.<sup>2</sup> The Slavonic and Persian show a great similarity: thus, *spaco* signifies "a bitch" in both, and the same with the first syllable of *Sauromatæ*, or *Sár-matæ*.<sup>3</sup> Hence *Sar* for the "northern" Indus, was more probably a remnant of Median than Bulúch emigration, though the Persian element could be accounted for, even on the latter supposition, seeing what a strong tincture the Bulúchí language retains of its original Iránian connection.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, amongst the several tribes of Kshatriyas, who, having neglected to observe the holy customs, and to visit the Bráhmans, became so degenerate that they were expelled their caste, and regarded as "Dasyus," or robber tribes, Manu enumerates the "Pahlavas."<sup>5</sup> "They are," continues the holy legislator, "Dasyus, whether they speak the language of Mlechchhas, or that of Aryas." *Arya* in Sanskrit, *airya* in Zend, means "noble," "sacred," "venerable;" hence a portion of Upper India is called *Aryavarta*, "the holy land," or "country of the Aryas." The Medes being also of the same original stock, were universally called *Arii*. The *Aryas* of Manu, therefore, are not necessarily, as some interpret, only degenerate natives, but may likewise have been Medes occupying the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Eadie, *Early Or. History*, p. 13; Lt. Burton, *Sindh*, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, iv. 26; Strabo, *Geogr.*, xi. 2, 5; ed. Tauchnitz, Vol. II. pp. 399, 419, 422; Tacitus, *Annal.*, xiii. 15; Ptol., *Geogr.*, v. 9; Boeckh, *Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vol. II. p. 1009.

<sup>3</sup> Vuller's *Institut*, p. 32.

<sup>4</sup> Sir A. Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara*, Vol. III. pp. 64, 268; Dr. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Sind*, pp. xiv. 107; *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 224; *Journ. R. Geogr. Soc.*, Vol. III. 128, 130; Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, Vol. I. 96; Herodotus, i. 110; *Report of British Association*, 1851, p. 145; *Tuhfat-ul Kirán*, M.S. p. 168; Gatterer, *Comment. Soc. Scient. Gott.*, Vol. xii. pp. 160, 161.

The name of *Sar* is probably at least as old as the "Sorani" of Stephanus, a tribe which must have been ea, or near, the Indus, because an Alexandria, enumerated by him as the fourteenth, was built within their territory. If the people of *Sar* are not meant, allusion is perhaps made to the *Sodhas*, who once occupied that country.—*See Ethnica*, v. Ἀσσοδῆσαι.

<sup>5</sup> [Cf. Pehlavi].

valley of the Indus. It is probable that a still earlier, and more degenerate branch of the same family may be spoken of under the name of "Meda," in the code of Manu, "who must live without the town, and maintain themselves by slaying beasts of the forest." Allusion seems here to be made to the Mers of the *Arávali*.<sup>1</sup>

These indications need not be enlarged on further in this place. Many will, of course, look upon them as fanciful and extravagant. Others, who feel so disposed, must pursue the investigation for themselves; for it is foreign to the main design of this Note, which has merely been to show that we have the Meds of the Arabs retaining their own name to this day, as well as probably under a slightly varied form, in and around the original seats of their occupation. That object has, it is hoped, been accomplished satisfactorily, and with regard to all extraneous matter, to use the words of Cicero, *sequimur probabilia, nec ultra quam id, quod verisimile occurrerit, progredi possumus, et refellere sine pertinaciâ et refelli sine iracundiâ parati sumus*.<sup>2</sup>

[General Cunningham, in his Report for 1863-64, says:—"The *Meds* or *Mands* are almost certainly the representatives of the *Mandrueni*, who lived on the *Mandrus* river, to the south of the *Oxus*; and as their name is found in the *Panjâb* from the beginning of the Christian era downwards, and in none before that time, I conclude that they must have accompanied their neighbours, the *Iatii*, or *Jâts*, on their forced migrations to *Ariana* and *India*. In the classical writers, the name is found as *Medi* and *Manduens*, and in the Muhammadan writers, as *Med* and *Mand*." To show that these

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, vii. 62; *Instituta of Manu*, ii. 22, 36, 45, 48; Heeren, *Historical Researches*; *Asiatic Nations*, Talboys, Vol. III. p. 322; Lassen, *Ind. Alterthum.*, Vol. I. pp. 516, et seq.; *Ind. Bibliothek*, Vol. III. p. 71; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyclopædie*, xv. "Indo-Germanischer Sprachstamm," p. 1, 46, and "Indien," pp. 4, 15, et seq.; *Abhandlungen der Koenig. Bayer. Acad. der Wissenschaften*, 1829, p. 146; Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua*, pp. 119-124; Pott, *Etym. Forschungen*, pp. lxxii.; Burnouf, *Comm. sur le Yaçna*, Note p. cv.; M. F. Baudry, *Encycl. Moderne*, Tom. XVIII. col. 122-130.

<sup>2</sup> Besides the special references given above, compare M. Vivien de Saint Martin, *Mém. Hist. sur la Geogr. anc. du Caucase*, pp. 242, 248, in *Études de Géographie*, Vol. I.; and *Hist. de l'Asie Min. Ancienne*, p. 218; Boeckh, *Corpus Inscript.*, Vol. II. p. 83; Schafarik, *Slawische Alterthümer*, Vol. I. pp. 302, 333, et seq.; Ukert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, Vol. III. Abth. ii. pp. 119, 269, 273, 279, 284, 333, 337, 346.



APPENDIX.

two spellings are but natural modes of pronunciation of the same name, the General notices the various ways in which the name of a village on the Jhelam is spelt in different maps and books—*Meriala, Mandiali, Mámriála, Mandyála, Mariála, and Merali.*]

[The earliest notice of the *Meds* is by Virgil, who calls the Jhelam *Medus Hydaspes*. The epithet is explained by the statement of Vibius Sequester, which makes the Hydaspes flow “past the city of Media.” Now this is clearly the same place as Ptolemy’s *Euthymedia*, or *Sagala*, which was either on or near the same river, and above Bukephala. Lastly, in the Peutingerian Tables, the country on the Hydaspes, for some distance below Alexandria Bucefalos, is called *Media*. Here then we have evidence that the *Medi*, or *Meds*, were in the Panjáb as early at least as the time of Virgil, in B.C. 40 to 30, and as we know that they were not one of the five tribes of *Tuchi*, or *Tochari*, whose names are given by the Chinese writers, it may be inferred, with tolerable certainty, that they must have belonged to the great horde of *Sus*, or *Abars*, who entered India about B.C. 126, and gave their name to the province of Indo-Scythia.]

[As the date of the Peutingerian Table is not later than A.D. 250, we have a break of upwards of four centuries before we reach the earliest notices of the Muhammadan writers. In these we find the *Meds* or *Mands* firmly established in Sindh, along with their ancient rivals the *Játs*, both of whom are said to be the descendants of Ham, the son of Noah. Rashid-ud din further states that they were in Sindh at the time of the Mahá-bhárata, but this is amply refuted by the native histories of the province, which omit both names from the list of aborigines of Sindh. Ibn Haukal describes the Mands of his time (about A.D. 977), as occupying the banks of the Indus from Multan to the sea, and to the desert between Makrán and Famlal. Masudi, who visited India in A.D. 915–16, calls them *Mind*, and states that they were a race of Sindh, who were at constant war with the people of Mansura. These notices are sufficient to show, that at some time previous to the first appearance of the Muhammadans, the *Meds* must have been forced to migrate from the Upper Panjáb to Sindh. There they have since remained, as there can be no doubt that they are now represented by the *Mers* of the Arávalí Range to the east of the Indus, of Káthiáwar to the south, and of Biluchistán to the west.]

[“The name of *Mer*, or *Mand*, is still found in many parts of the Panjáb, as in *Meror* of the Bari and Rechna Doabs, in *Mera*, *Mandra*, and *Mandanpur* of the Sind Ságar Doab, and in *Mandali*, of Multan. *Mera*, which is ten miles to the west of Kalar Kahár, is certainly as old as the beginning of the Christian era, as it possesses an Arian Pali inscription, fixed in the side of a square well. The *Mers* would seem also to have occupied Lahore, as Abú Rihán states that the capital of Loháwar was named *Medhukur* or *Mandhukur*.<sup>1</sup> This place is said to have been on the east bank of the Ravi, and, if so, it was most probably Lahore itself, under a new name. There is an old place called *Mandhyawála*, on the west bank of the Ravi, and only twelve miles to the south-west of Lahore, which may possibly be the *Mandhukur* of Abu Rihán. But the old mound of *Mirathira*, in the Gugera district, in which figures of Buddha and moulded bricks have been discovered by the railway cuttings, is a more likely place. This frequent occurrence of the name in so many parts of the Panjáb, and always attached to old places, as in *Mera*, *Mandra*, and *Meriali*, of the Sindh Ságar Doab, and in *Medhukur* or *Mandhukur*, the capital of Loháwar, offers the strongest confirmation of the conclusion which I have already derived from the notices of the classical authors, that the *Meds* or *Mers* were once the dominant race in the Panjáb. The special location of the *Medi* on the Hydaspes by classical writers of the first century of the Christian era, the evident antiquity of *Mera*, *Meriali*, and other places which still bear the name, and the admitted foreign origin of their modern representatives, the *Mers*, all point to the same conclusion, that the *Medi*, or *Meds*, were the first Indo-Scythian conquerors of the Panjáb.”

[• • • • “About this time (30 to 20 B.C.) the *Meds* may be supposed to have retired towards the south, until they finally established themselves in Upper Sindh, and gave their name to their new capital of *Minnagara*. As this could scarcely have been effected with the consent of the former occupants of Upper Sindh, whom I suppose to have been the *Iatii*, or *Jats*, I would refer to this period as the beginning of that continued rivalry, which the historian Rashídu-d din attributes to the *Jats* and *Meds*.<sup>2</sup> To this same

<sup>1</sup> [See *supra*, p. 62.]

<sup>2</sup> [See the *Mujmalu-t Tawárikh*, *supra*, p. 103.]

cause I would also refer the statement of the Erythrean Periplus, that about A.D. 100, the rulers of Minnagara were rival Parthians, who were mutually expelling each other." ]

*The Wairsi and Sodha Tribes.*

Wairsi, we are told in the *Beg-Lar-nāma* (MS. p. 55), was a chief among the Sodhas. It would have been more correct to say that Wairsi was the chief clan among the Sodhas; for Wairsi was not a personal designation, as is evident from many passages of that work. It is written indiscriminately Wairsi and Wairsa, and a cognate, but then hostile, clan bore the closely similar name of Waisa (MS. pp. 190, 191). The Sameja tribe, often mentioned in the same work, is also a branch of the Sodhas.

An exact translation of the text to which this note refers would represent Rājia as the daughter of the Rānā (which, by the way, is spelt throughout in the original as Ra'nā); but at p. 61 we learn that she was his sister's son, and so she is also styled in the *Tuhfatu-l Kirdm* (MS. p. 73). Indeed, had she been his own daughter, we should not have found Abū-l Kāsim Khān-i Zamān, who was the issue of the marriage with Mīr Kāsim Beg-Lār, passing his childhood among the Bhattis of Jesalmīr after his father's death, but rather among the Sodhas of 'Umarkot.

The Soda or Sodha tribe (spelt Soda by Col. Tod, and Sodā by the Rev. Mr. Renouard) is an offshoot of the Pramāra, and has been for many centuries an occupant of the desert tracts of Western India, into which they have receded, like their predecessors, when driven forward by more powerful neighbours from the banks of the Indus. Col. Tod contends that they are the descendants of the Sogdi of Alexander's time, in which there is greater probability than in most of his speculations. Sogdi may be a corruption, derived from the greater familiarity of historians with the northern nation of that name. The Sodra of Diodorus offers an equal resemblance of name and position. It is not plain which bank of the river the Sodra or Sogdi then occupied. They are not mentioned by Q. Curtius, and Arrian's use of "right" and "left," as applied to the banks of the Indus, is so opposed to the modern practice of tracing a river from its source downwards, that it adds to the confusion.

The transaction mentioned in the text shows the early period at which the Hindús began to disgrace themselves by their inter-marriages with Muhammadans; and the high repute of the beauty of the Sodha women has served to maintain that practice in full vigour to the present time.

At the period treated of, we find the Sodhas in possession of 'Umárokot, of which the name and consequence have been subsequently much increased, independant of its importance as a border fortress, by being the birth place of the renowned Akbar.

The Ráná of the Sodhas was expelled from 'Umárokot by the Tálpúrs of Sínd; and the present representative of the family, who still retains his title of Ráná, resides at Chor, a few miles north-east of his former capital, shorn of all power, and hard pressed for the means of subsistence.<sup>1</sup>

---

NOTE (D).—MISCELLANEOUS.

*The Terrors of the Moghal Helmet.*

(PAGE 276).

The reader of the history of the Crusades will recognize a similar anecdote, relating to a hero more familiar to him than Daryá Khán. The chivalrous Sire de Joinville tells us, that Richard's name acted as a powerful sedative upon the children of the Saracens, and that even their very horses were presumed to start at his shadow:—

“Le roy Richard fist tant d'armes outremer a celle foys que il y fu, que quant les chevaus aus Sarrasins avoient pouour d'aucun bisson, leur mestres leur disoient:—‘*Cuides tu,*’ fesoient ils à leurs chevaus, ‘*que se soit le roy Richart d'Angleterre?*’ Et quant les

<sup>1</sup> Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, Vol. V.; Ritter, *Die Bräukunde von As.*, Vol. IV. pt. i. p. 471; Tod, *Annals of Rájasthán*, Vol. I. p. 93; II. p. 310-319; *Encyc. Metrop.*, Vol. XXIII. p. 781; *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. I. p. 33; Mitford, *Hist. of Greece*, Vol. X. pp. 231, 232, notes 15 to 17; Dr. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Sínd*, p. 105; *Journ. R. Geog. Soc.*, Vol. IV. p. 93; Vincent, *Comm. and Nav. of the Ancients*, Vol. I. pp. 137-145; Arrian, *Anab.*, vi. 16; Diod. Sic., *Biblioth. Hist.*, xvii. 102; Mrs. Postans, *Cutch*, pp. 52, 136.

enfans aus Sarrasins bréoiert, elles leur disoient:—‘*Tay-toy! tay-toy! ou je irai querre le roy Richart qui te tuera.*’”<sup>1</sup>

It is curious that we should learn this from a Frenchman only. Our English chroniclers, who exhaust the language of panegyric in speaking of Richard, omit this anecdote, which appears to be derived from a mere eastern mode of expressing terror.

In the passage taken from the *Tárikh-i Túhírí* we have not only children taking fright, but women even bringing forth prematurely, at the name of Daryá Khán. The same effect is ascribed in that work (pp. 48, 52) to the Moghal cap:—“Such fear of the Moghals fell upon both men and women, that the men lost all courage, and the women miscarried at the very sight of the Moghals with their terrific head-pieces.” But the shape and feature of this alarming helmet, or *Táki*, are not described. The *Tuhfatu-l Kírám* (p. 42) tells us that even horses started at it, as those of the Saracens at Richard of England.

We might, from the expressions used, conceive that their helmets, like those of Ulysses and some of the barbarous nations of antiquity, were covered with alarming devices of open jaws and fiery dragons. and that the Moghals in-Sind stalked about,—

—— tegmen torquens immane leonis,  
Terribili impexum setâ, cum dentibus albis,  
Indatus.<sup>2</sup>

but had this been the case, we should have most probably had more frequent mention of the circumstance, especially by Khusrú, who was their prisoner, and delighted to record their hideous faces and fashions.

But neither in Khusrú, nor in any other author, do we find notice of such an helmet, or *chápelle de fer*, as would give rise to the fears here depicted. A good European observer of their manners merely remarks that the upper part of their casque was of iron or steel.<sup>3</sup> The tail of hair, if it was worn according to its present dimensions,

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. du roy St. Loys*, ix. p. 116; see also *Matt. Westm.*, p. 304.

<sup>2</sup> *Virg. Æn.*, vii. 666

<sup>3</sup> *Galea autem est superius ferrea vel de chalybe, sed ille quod protegit in circuitu collum et gulam de corio est.*—*J. de Plano-Carpini, in Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires*, Tom. IV. p. 687.

might, notwithstanding its being honoured as a royalty,<sup>1</sup> have excited surprise, and perhaps ridicule, but no alarm. From an early period, ever since the Moghal tribes were known to Europe, this appendage has naturally excited observation, just as it does now, where they border on European nations.<sup>2</sup> Procopius<sup>3</sup> and Priscus<sup>4</sup> remark upon it as a peculiarity of the Huns.

It is probable that these Moghals in Sind may, in their day, have worn a head-dress, such as Rubruquis, more than two centuries before, had attributed to their women. Even at present, the Turkman female cap is no pigmy, being higher than a military chako, over which a scarf is thrown, reaching down to the waist. But this is nothing to what it was in the time of our adventurous traveller. That was indeed calculated to inspire terror, and produce the results attributed to the *Tâki*. It must have been more formidable than European courts ever produced, even in the horned and steeple coiffure of the fifteenth century.

“Their women have an ornament for their heads, which they call *Botta*, being made of the barks of a tree. \* \* \* It hath a square sharp spire rising from the toppe thereof, being more than a cubite in length, and fashioned like unto a pinnacle. \* \* \* Upon the midst of the sayd spire, or square toppe, they put a bunch of quills or of slender canes, another cubite long, or more. \* \* \* Hereupon, when such gentlewomen ride together, and are beheld afar off, they seem to be souldiers with helmets on their heads, carrying their lances upright; for the sayd *Botta* appeareth like a helmet with a lance over it.”<sup>5</sup>

This is like the fantastic *fontange* of Europe, raised an ell above the head, and pointed like steeples, which caused our pious preachers

<sup>1</sup> “A Mongol is amenable to punishment if he pluck another by his tuft of hair, not on account of the assault, but because the tuft is declared to be the property of the Emperor.”—Pallas, *Mongolischen Völker*, Vol. I. p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> M. J. de Klaproth, *Voyage au Caucase*, Tom. I. p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Historia Arcana*, p. 31, Lugd. 1623. He says the Massagetæ adopt the same custom.

<sup>4</sup> *Excerpta de Legationibus*, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Rubruquis, esp. 8, ap. Hakluyt, *Voyages and Discoveries*, Vol. I. p. 108. The original Latin is given at p. 232, and a similar description by Jean de Plan-Carpin, at p. 615 of the *Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires*, above quoted. Quatremere, *Hist. Mong.*, p. 102, note 30.

infinite trouble, as well as missionary perambulations, for its suppression. So like, indeed, that it would really seem to be derived direct from the eastern model, but that these comical fashions are the product of no particular age or country; for even before the decline of the Empire, the Roman lady--

"Tot premit ordinibus, tot adhuc compagibus altum  
Ædificat caput; Audromachen a fronte videbis."<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, when we consider that, about the time of the capture of Constantinople, Turkish turbans were all the rage in Western Europe, we may perhaps admit, that, had we not become acquainted with Tartar costume, the marvellous absurdity of the steeple-cap never could have been introduced amongst us. Paradin describes it as—"Made of certain rolls of linen pointed like steeples, about an ell in height. These were called by some, great butterflies, from having two large wings on each side, resembling those of that insect. The high cap was covered with a fine piece of lawn, hanging down to the ground, the greater part of which was tucked under the arm."<sup>2</sup>

This must evidently be the same as the Tartar *Botta*, and the illuminations of that period make the dimensions still more portentous, and the resemblance to the eastern original still more striking. The *paysannes* of Normandy have to this day preserved this monstrous extravagance for the gratification of modern eyes.<sup>3</sup>

If this was not the Alpine chapeau which spread such dismay in Sind, it may have been the lofty dark sheepskin *Tilpak*,<sup>4</sup> which the Turkmans now wear, about a foot high. An exaggerated form of this would have been alarming enough to produce the effect described.

#### *Dismounting for Combat.*

We find that the practice of dismounting, previous to coming to close combat, is frequently alluded to in these local histories, as being of common observance among many of the border tribes between Sind and Rájputána.

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal, *Sat.*, vi. 501. Rupert's note gives other instances.

<sup>2</sup> Paradin, *Annales de Bourgogne*, p. 700.

<sup>3</sup> Wright, *Archæological Journal*, No. i.; Addison, *Spectator*, No. 98; Planché, *Hist. of British Costume*, pp. 146-149, 236-263; Argentre, *Hist. de Bretagne*, livr., x. ch. 42; Bayle, *Dict. Histor.*, v. "Andromaque," rem. G. and v. "Conceit."

<sup>4</sup> I presume this is the same as the *Kalpak*, on which see *L'Univers. Pitt.*, vi. 67.

Here in the Extract from the *Beg-Lar-náma*, at p. 293, it is the Sodhas and Ráthors who adopt it. A few pages before, we find the Jhárejas of Guzerát, who accompanied Jám Firoz against Mirza Sháh Husain, appealing to that custom, as established among themselves; declaring that they always fought with the enemy on foot.

We have seen above (p. 411) that Rái Chach and Mahrat of Chitor contend against each other on foot; the former representing that, being a Brahman, he was unable to fight on horseback; then again mounting his horse unexpectedly, he slays his antagonist with the most deliberate treachery.

It is probable that the Ráná of Chitor would not have so readily been deceived by this insidious challenge, had it been at all opposed to the military practice of those times. Indeed, to the present day, we find Sindians, unlike most Asiatic nations, still somewhat repugnant to fighting on horseback, and priding themselves more on being foot soldiers than cavalry.

I allude in a subsequent note to the dismounting being followed by binding those fighting on the same side, one to the other, by their waistbands: but this seems to have been resorted to only in desperate circumstances, when there was no chance, or intention, of escape. The mere dismounting appears not to have been attended with any vow of self-sacrifice.

In Persian history we meet with similar instances of this dismounting to engage in single combat. Thus, after the fatal battle of Kádisiya, the Persian general, Takharján, dismounts to fight with the Arab champion, Zahír.

The practice was very common in the Middle Ages in Europe, being introduced chiefly for the purpose of obviating the inconvenience of the cumbersome armour of that period. The cavalry dismounted, leaving their horses at some distance, and combated with their lances on foot. William of Tyre (xvii. 4) says of the Emperor Conrad's cavalry, in the second Crusade:—"De equis descendentes, et facti pedites; sicut mos est Teutonicis in summis necessitatibus bellica tractare negotia." The English did the same in their engagement with the Scotch, in 1138, near North Allerton, commonly called the Battle of the Standard. Comines also (i. 3) observes upon it as a Burgundian fashion: "Entre les Bourgig-



nons, lors estoient les plus honorez ceux que descendoient avec les archers."

In the wars of Edward III. dismounting was not uncommon; and Sir John Hawkwood, one of his knights, the famous partizan leader, disguised by contemporary writers under the name of Aucud or Agutus, introduced it into Italy. And it was, as we learn from Monstrelet (ii. 10, 20), practised by the English in their second wars with France, especially at the battles of Crevant and Verneuil.<sup>1</sup>

### *Colligation in Fighting.*

The extraordinary custom alluded to in the *Beg Lár-náma*, of a devoted band tying themselves together by their waistbands, before fighting *à tout ou trance*, is mentioned in the same terms in the *Tárikh-i Sind* (MS. p. 173).

"When they saw the army of the Moghals, they *dismounted from their horses, took their turbans from off their heads, and binding the corners of their mantles, or outer garments, to one another, they engaged in battle; for it is the custom of the people of Hind and Sind, whenever they devote themselves to death, to descend from their horses, to make bare their heads and feet, and to bind themselves to each other by their mantles and waistbands.*"

These people appear most of them to have been Sammas; and it is among their descendants in Kachh that we find this curious custom again alluded to (*Tárikh-i Sind*, MS. p. 194), when Mirzá Sháh Husain attacked Rái Khangár. Here we have a new feature added, of serrying shields together like a compact phalanx.

"The men under Khangár, having set themselves in battle array, *dismounted from their horses, locked their shields together, seized their spears in their hands, and bound the corners of their waistbands.*"

The *Tarkhán-náma* omits all mention of the proceedings between Rái Khangár<sup>2</sup> and Mirzá Sháh Husain, but they are noticed in the *Tuhfatul Kírám* (MS. p. 194); and the observance of this strange practice is also there alluded to, in words similar to those quoted from the *Tárikh-i Sind*.

<sup>1</sup> Hallam's *Europe in the Middle Ages*, Vol. I. p. 508.

<sup>2</sup> According to a stanza familiarly quoted in Guzerát, there have been no less than seven Jhárcja chieftains of this name. We need not here show which was the opponent of Mirzá Sháh Husain.

The dismounting from horseback, prior to actual contact in the field of battle, is mentioned in a previous note of this Appendix, and appears to have been a more common occurrence; but the collision evidently implies desperation, even unto death.

Some barbarous nations of antiquity seem to have adopted the same practice, but more with the object, apparently, of keeping their ranks unbroken, than symbolizing any vow of self-destruction. So, at the battle of Campi Raudii, we read of the Cimbri binding themselves together by long chains run through their belts, avowedly for the purpose of maintaining an unbroken line.<sup>1</sup> There is good reason to suppose that the Soldurii of Gaul and the Comites of Germany showed their devotion occasionally in a similar fashion.<sup>2</sup>

Even as late as the days of chivalry, we find a resort to the same singular mode of showing a desperate resolve to die in the field. See what the heroic king of Bohemia, together with his faithful and devoted companions did at the glorious battle of Crécy:—

“The valyant kynge of Behaygne (Bohemia), called Charles of Luzenbourge, sonne to the noble Emperour Henry of Luzenbourge, for all that he was nyghe blynde, whan he vnderstode the order of the batayle, he sayde to them about hym, “Where is the lorde Charles, my sonne.” His men sayde, “Sir; we can nat tell; we thynke he be fightynge.” Than he sayde, “Sirs, ye ar my men, my companyons, and frendes in this iourney; I requyre you bring me so farre forward, that I may stryke one stroke with my swerde.” They sayde they wolde do his commaundement; and to the intent that they shulde not lese hym in the prease, *they tyed all their raynes of their bridelles eche to other*, and sette the kynge before to accomplysshe his desyre, and so they went on their ennemyes. The lord Charles of Behaygne, his sonne, who wrote hymselfe Kynge of Behaygne, and bare the arnes, he cam in good order to the batayle; but whan he sawe that the matter went awrie on their partie, he departed, I can nat tell you whiche waye. The kynge, his father, was so farre forewarde, that he strake a stroke with his swerde, ye and mo than foure, and fought valyantly, and so dyde his company; and

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Marius*, cap. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, Lib. iii. Cap. 22. vii. 40; Tacitus, *Germania*, Cap. 14; J. Schiller, *Thesaur. Antiq. Teutonicarum*, iii. pp. 33, 749.

they adventured themselves so forward, that they were there all slain; and the next day they were found in the place about the kynge, and all their horses tyed eche to other."<sup>1</sup>

A curious instance occurred even lately, when Muhammad 'Ali gained his victory over the Wahábis at Bissel. Several bodies of the Azir Arabs, who had sworn by the oath of divorce, not to turn their backs on the Turks, were found by the victors tied together by the legs, with the intent of preventing each other from running away, and in that unbroken and desperate line of battle were literally cut to pieces.<sup>2</sup>

*Barge, an Arabic word.*

The term used by Biláduri to represent a vessel of war is *Bárija*. He uses the same word, in the plural, in speaking of the vessels which were captured by the Meds, on their voyage from Ceylon to the Persian Gulf, an act of piracy which led to the Arab conquest of Sind (*supra*, p. 118).

Birúni says also, a century later, that the *Bawárij* are established at Kachh and Somnát, and are so called because they devote themselves to the pursuit of piracy, in ships which are called *Bera* (*supra*, p. 65).<sup>3</sup> This is a native word still in use for a boat, but the origin of the term *Bawárij* must be sought, not in the Indian *Bera*, but rather in the Arabic *Bárija*, which Golius, on the authority of the *Kámús*, tells us to mean a large vessel of war.<sup>4</sup>

From the same source our English *Barge* seems to be derived, which, though at first view it may appear rather a startling assertion, will perhaps be admitted, when we see how our best etymologists have failed in their endeavours to trace its real origin. Johnson (Todd) says it is derived from old French *Barje*, or *Barge*, and Low-Latin *Barga*. He should have ascertained whence the French *Barje* is itself derived. Tooke says, *Barge* is a strong boat, and *Dark* is a stout vessel, derived from the past participle of

<sup>1</sup> Froissart's *Chronicles*, translated by Lord Berners, Cap. 30, Vol. I. p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Sir H. Brydges, *History of the Wahabys*, p. 91; Dr. Crichton, *History of Arabia*, p. 602.

<sup>3</sup> See also Giliemeister, *de reb. Ind.*, p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> *Navis magna bellica.*—*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, s. v.

*beorgan*, "to protect," "to strengthen." Crabb says from *Barca*.<sup>1</sup> Richardson, from the Gothic *baorgan*, "to fortify." Webster, from Dutch *Bargie*. Palgrave tells us that the piratical boats of the Danes were called *Barga* and *Barka*;<sup>2</sup> and *Barca* is used by the Monk Abbo, in his unpolished poem (A.D. 891) on the siege of Paris by the Normans.

*Barcas per flumina raptant.*<sup>3</sup>

But we have no occasion to look for any connection between our words *Bark* and *Barge*. The former is confessedly an old word, the latter comparatively modern. The former is, indeed, much older than even the Danish or Norman piracies. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, who died A.D. 431, applies it thus:—

Ut mea siliubi *Barca* perfugio foret  
Puppis superstes obruta.<sup>4</sup>

In consequence of its use by Byzantine authors, altered into *Balaca* by Nicetas,<sup>5</sup> Salmasius and J. C. Scaliger have sought for a Grecian origin of the word, and the latter finds it in *Bápos*, quasi, "a ship of burden."<sup>6</sup> Others, again, say from "*Barca*, a city of Africa;" and Roderic of Toledo, from "*Barco*, a city of Spain."<sup>7</sup>

Our more immediate concern, however, is with *Barge*, respecting which it is obvious to remark, that, though its present use is confined to fluviate transits and pageantries—whether for the conveyance of coals or cockneys, merchandize or Lord Mayors—it was, on its first introduction, designed for higher purposes. Our oldest writers apply it solely to sea-going craft. Thus Chaucer:—

He knew wel alle the havens, as they were,  
Fro' Gotland to the Cape de Finistere,  
And every creke in Bretagne and in Spaine:  
His *barge* ycleped was the Mag-lelaine.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Discussions of Purley*, Vol. II. p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Technological Dictionary*, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> Quoting Hincmar—"quas nostrates *Bargas* vocant."—*History of Normandy and England*, Vol. I. p. 510.

<sup>4</sup> *De bello Paris*, Lib. II. This poem was published in Latin and French, with notes, by M. Taranne, in 1834.

<sup>5</sup> *Pœmata*, 13.

<sup>6</sup> *Alex.*, Lib. I. Num. 7.

<sup>7</sup> *Exercit.*, 71.

<sup>8</sup> *De rebus Hispan.*, Lib. I. Cap. 5. These quotations are from Hofmann, *Lexicon Universale*, Vol. I. p. 476. See also Ducange, *Glossar. Med. et Inf. Latinitatis*, vv.

<sup>9</sup> Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, v. 412.

Even as late as the fifteenth century, the great Swedish ship of 1000 tons burden was called the King's *barge*;<sup>1</sup> and the largest vessel hitherto built in Scotland was called the Bishop's *barge*.<sup>2</sup> But what is more to the purpose is, that we do not find mention of the word till the Crusades had introduced it, through the Arabic language, into our vocabulary,<sup>3</sup> and then only as a large ship, used chiefly on military expeditions. So, in the very old Romance of Richard Cœur de Lion :—

Among you partes<sup>4</sup> every charge,  
I brought in shippes and in *barge*,  
More gold and silver with me,  
Than has your lord and swilke<sup>5</sup> three.

Again, a little further on :—

Against hem comen her navye,  
Cogges,<sup>6</sup> and dromounds,<sup>7</sup> many galley,  
*Barges*, schoutes, and trayeres fele,<sup>8</sup>  
That were charged with all weal,  
With armour, and with other vitail,  
That nothing in the host should fail.<sup>9</sup>

Coupling this early and distinctive use of the term with the fact of its being first used during the Holy Wars, and with the unsatisfactory guesses of our lexicographers, we may safely conclude that the English *Barge* is no other than the Arabic *Bárija*, however much it may now be diverted from the original design of its invention.

<sup>1</sup> Rymer's *Fœdera*, Vol. XI. p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Mac Pherson's *Annals of Commerce*, Vol. I. p. 689.

<sup>3</sup> Admitting that the *g* in the Low-Latin *Barga* may have had the soft pronunciation of *j*, and that *Barga* is thence derived, we can still refer its origin to the Arabs in Spain.      <sup>4</sup> Divide.      <sup>5</sup> Such.      <sup>6</sup> Cock-boats.

<sup>7</sup> Large vessels of burthen. This word, though a Greek etymology is assigned to it, is probably itself Arabic.—MacPherson, *Annals of Commerce*, Vol. I. p. 352.

<sup>8</sup> Many long-boats.

<sup>9</sup> Ellis, *Early English Metrical Romances*, pp. 315, 324.

---

STEPHEN AUBIN, PRINTER, HARTFORD.

•