

THE HISTORY OF INDIA.

THE
HISTORY OF INDIA,

AS TOLD

BY ITS OWN HISTORIANS.

THE MUHAMMADAN PERIOD.

THE POSTHUMOUS PAPERS

OF THE LATE

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

EDITED AND CONTINUED

BY

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

CHAFF COLLEGE, BANSHUHATTA.

VOL. V.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER AND CO., 57 AND 59, LUDGATE HILL.

1873.

[All rights reserved.]

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS,



PRINTERS, WESTFORD.

P R E F A C E.

IN this volume the history of the Afghán dynasty is completed. The reign of Humáyún is also finished, and the annals of Akbar's reign are carried on to the thirty-eighth year. .

The Afghán *Tárikhs* are of no great literary value, but they are the best authorities for the period of which they treat. The first of them, the *Tárikh-i Saláttin-i Afághana*, has never before been translated; but the other, the *Makhzan-i Afghání* or *Tárikh-i Khán-Jahán Lodi*, is the book translated by Dorn in his work entitled "*The History of the Afgháns.*"

Some notices of the first reign of Humáyún are given by the Afghán historians, and his overthrow and expulsion are described by them from the Afghán side of the question in this and the preceding volume. The *Humáyún-námá* of the veteran historian Khondamír gives some curious accounts of the regulations established by Humáyún in the early part of his reign. This is followed by a few extracts from the valuable *Tárikh-i Rashidí* of Mirzá Haidar, the brave and adventurous cousin of the Emperor Bábar. The work is a general history of the Mughal Kháns, and does not contain

much about India; but the Mirzá was a vigorous writer, and what he has recorded of his Indian experience is very vivid and interesting. Some few passages have been extracted from the Memoirs of Humáyún, written by his personal attendant Jauhar, and translated into English by Major Stewart. But the general history of this reign has been drawn from the *Tabakát-i Akbari* of Nizámu-d dín Ahmad. Sir H. Elliot's intention has thus been carried out; for he had fixed upon the narrative given in the *Tárikh-i Saláatin-i Afághana*, which proves to have been copied verbatim from the *Tabakát*.

Sir Henry Elliot had made no provision for the important reign of Akbar, nor did he leave any notes indicating the MSS. he intended to employ. So it has fallen to the Editor to select and translate some history in illustration of this period. The rule of this work has been to prefer original contemporary writers, or, in the absence of actual contemporaries, those nearest in point of time. This rule reduced the choice to two works—the *Tabakát-i Akbari* of Nizám Ahmad, and the *Akbar-nama* of Abú-l Fazl; for the *Muntakhabu-Tawárikh* of Badáúni is avowedly founded on the *Tabakát*, and the *Akbar-namá* of Shaikh Illáhdád Faiz Sirhindí contains very little that has not been borrowed either from the *Tabakát* or the greater *Akbar-náma* of Abú-l Fazl. The latter work is of considerable length and is written in a very ornate style; so the *Tabakát* seemed best suited to the requirements of this work.

It has accordingly been translated in full, and only such passages as are trivial and irrelevant have been passed over. The reputation of the *Tabakát-i Akbari* stands very high in India, and European writers also have joined in its praises. As a contemporary history, it is certainly of very high authority, though it does not exhibit much literary ability. The narrative is often disjointed and fragmentary, but the language is manly and simple, and in striking contrast to the polished phrases of Abú-l Fazl. The *Tabakát* extends only to the thirty-eighth year of Akbar's reign; the history of the latter end of the reign will be drawn from the works of Abú-l Fazl, Shaikh Illáhdád, and other writers, and will appear in the next volume.

In addition to the *Tabakát-i Akbari*, some extracts have been made from the *Tárikh-i Alfi*, a general history compiled under the direction of the Emperor Akbar, and more copious selections have been taken from the *Muntakhabu-t Tawárikh* of 'Abdú-l Kádir Badáúni. The latter writer introduces into his work much original matter; and all that he says about the personal affairs of the Emperor and his religious opinions is of great interest. Extracts from the two *Akbar-námas* relating to the earlier part of the reign will appear in the next volume; so that although the history of the first thirty-eight years of the reign is comprised in the present volume, it will not be quite complete until those passages are printed. The *Ain-i*

Akbari is the greatest monument of the reign of Akbar, and a new translation by Mr. Blochmann is now in course of publication in the Bibliotheca Indica, enriched with copious notes. That work supplies many of the deficiencies of the historians, and Mr. Blochmann's labours have happily made it quite unnecessary to do more here with the *Ain-i Akbari* than to refer to his valuable production.

The notes in the Appendix are entirely the work of Sir H. Elliot, and are printed exactly as he left them.

The following is a list of the articles in this volume with the names of the respective writers:—

XXXIV.—*Tārīkh-i Salātīn-i Afāghana*—"Ensign" C. F. Mackenzie, and a little by Sir H. M. Elliot.

XXXV.—*Tārīkh-i Khān-Jahān Lodī*—"Ensign" C. F. Mackenzie and Sir H. M. Elliot.

XXXVI.—*Humáyūn-nāma*—Sir H. M. Elliot's *munshī*.

XXXVII.—*Tārīkh-i Rashidī*—Editor.

XXXVIII.—*Tazkiratu-l Wāki'āt*—Major Stewart.

XXXIX.—*Tārīkh-i Alfī*—Sir H. M. Elliot and the Editor.

XL.—*Tabakāt-i Akbarī*—Editor.

XLI.—*Tārīkh-i Badā'ūnī*—Sir H. M. Elliot and the Editor.

APPENDIX.—The whole by Sir H. M. Elliot.

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

	PAGE
XXXIV.— <i>Tárikh-i Salátin-i Afghana</i> , of Ahmad Yádgár	1
XXXV.— <i>Makhzan-i Afghání</i> and <i>Tárikh-i Khán-Jahán Lodí</i> , of Ni'amatu-lla	67
XXXVI.— <i>Humáyún-náma</i> , of Khondamír	116
XXXVII.— <i>Tárikh-i Rashídí</i> , of Haidar Mirzá Dughlat	127
XXXVIII.— <i>Tazkiratu-l Wák'át</i> , of Jauhar	136
XXXIX.— <i>Tárikh-i Alfí</i> , of Mauláná Ahmad and others	150
XL.— <i>Tabakát-i Akbarí</i> , of Nizámu-d dín Ahmad, Bakhahí	177
XLI.— <i>Muntakhabu-i Tauárikh</i> ; or, <i>Tárikh-i Badáúní</i> , of Mullá 'Abdu-l Kádir Badáúní	477

APPENDIX.

A.—On the Capture of Nasibín by means of Scorpions	550
B.—On Kusdár	557
C.—On Fire-worship in Upper India	559
D.—On the Knowledge of Sanskrit by Muhammadans	570

CORRIGENDUM

Vol. V. p. 116, lines 4 and 5, dele the words "in all probability."

ADDENDUM.

Vol. IV. p. 289. "Shaikh Zain was one of the most learned men of the time, and translated in an elegant style the memoirs written by the late Emperor Bábar."—Badáúni, Text, vol. i. p. 341.

APPENDIX.

[The following Notes are reprinted from the old volume of 1849, with such additions and notes as were added to them by Sir H. Elliot in his private copy.]

NOTE A.

On the capture of Nasibin by means of Scorpions.

The Nasibin,¹ mentioned in the text (*suprà*, p. 152), is the Nisibis of classical authors, the position of which, on the frontier of the Persian and Roman Empires, made its occupation of so much importance in the estimation of the contending parties, from the time that Lucullus plundered it, till its capture by the Arabs, when it continued as frequent a source of contention between them and the Greeks as between them and the Persians at a later period. It was surrounded by a treble inclosure of brick walls defended by a deep ditch, and was considered so impregnable that Asiatics, as will be presently seen, are fond of resorting to supernatural means to account for its capture. Sapor made three separate attacks upon the town A.D. 338, 346, 350, and the disappointed monarch, after urging his attacks above sixty, eighty, and a hundred days, was repulsed each time with loss and ignominy;² but it was at last ceded to him by Jovian³ in 363, and it remained henceforth with

¹ Mannert says the town is called Nisibin, or Nissabin, but neither mode of orthography is consistent with Abû-l Fidâ. Vide *Geogr. d. Arabif. texte Arabs*, p. 283.

² Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. iii. p. 139.

³ In speaking of this humiliating treaty, Eutropius gives us a good notion of the political honesty of the Romans, by censuring Jovian for not immediately breaking the treaty, and renewing the war, as the Romans had done on all former occasions, immediately he had escaped from the dangerous position which had compelled him to conclude it.—*Histor. Rom. Breuiar.*, x. 17. The capitulation of Closter-Seven, during the Seven Years' War, for a suspension of arms in the north of Germany,

the Persians (if we except two short intervals), as it had remained for the two previous centuries with the Romans, a strong bulwark against hostile encroachments.

On the third occasion of Sapor's attack, unusual means were resorted to, to obtain possession of the place. At the stated season of the melting of the snows in Armenia, the course of the river Mygdonius was, by the labour of the Persians, stopped below the town, and the waters were confined on every side by solid mounds of earth. On this artificial lake, a fleet of armed vessels, filled with soldiers and heavy engines of war, was launched, and the accumulated pressure of the waters made a portion of the walls give way. Nevertheless, the monarch failed of success, and Nisibis retained its character as an inexpugnable stronghold.¹

Under one of his predecessors, Sapor I., the Shâhpûr of the Persians, Mirkhond informs us that a miracle placed the town in the hands of the Persian Monarch. Wearied with the siege, Shâhpûr commanded his army to unite in supplication to the Supreme Being for its conquest, and while they were imploring the aid of heaven, the wall fell down before them, and their faith and devotion received a signal reward.²

Nisibis is now but a small and insignificant place, with scarcely more than one hundred houses, but it is surrounded with ruins which attest its former magnificence.³

The facts above related, with reference to the many obstinate defences of Nasibin, show how natural it was that a credulous Oriental writer should resort to the marvellous to account for such

and the convention of El-Arish in 1800, for the evacuation of Egypt by the French armies, have called forth the opinion of modern jurists on the general question. See Vattel, pp. 219, 231, 236; Wheaton's *Elements of International Law*, vol. ii. pp. 120-122; Flassan's *Histoire de la Diplomatie Française*, tom. vi. pp. 97-107; and MM. de Koch and Schoell's *Histoire abrégée des Traités de Paix*, tom. iii. pp. 48, 50; v. 304, 311.

¹ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. iii. p. 141.

² Malcolm, *History of Persia*, vol. i. p. 77. After being taken by the Arabs, it fell to the arms of the Seljûks, Turkomans, Tartars, and Mughals.—Rampoldi, vol. iii. p. 369; vol. vi. p. 517.

³ *Jahdn-numd*, p. 438. Niebuhr, *Voyages*, vol. ii. pp. 300-309. Compare also Mannert, *Geographie d. Griech. und Röm.*, vol. v. ii. pp. 216-219. Ritter, *Erkunde von Asien*, vol. vii. i. pp. 128-136. *L'Univers. Pitt. Asie*, ix. *Babylonie*, 332. *Ency. Met.* "Mesopotamia."

unusual success as attended the arms of the Arabs in the seventeenth year of the Hijrî.

The passage against which the captious opponent of 'Abdu-l Kâdir took exception runs thus in the *Târikh-i Alfî*, in the Annals of the seventh year after the death of Muhammad. Very few of the Arabic historians notice the circumstance recorded in it, nor do Ockley, Gibbon, or Marigny mention it.¹

"The army of Islâm sat eight months before the fort of Nasibin. Now, in and around that city, there were exceedingly large black scorpions, and no man who was bitten by them escaped with his life. The Arab General consequently gave orders that a thousand small jars should be filled with these reptiles, inclosed in loose mould around them, and that they should be thrown at night into the city by the engines. As the jars broke when they fell on the ground, the scorpions crawled out, and killed every one whom they stung. In the morning the garrison were so dispirited, and found themselves reduced to such extremities, that they could no longer hold the fort. The Musulmâns, taking advantage of their consternation, made a sudden assault, broke open the gates, and slew several who had escaped the venom of the scorpions. It is said that in the time of Noshirwân, the fort of Nasibin was captured in precisely the same way."

If we concur with the objector, and hesitate to receive this narrative as true, we may perhaps be able to explain it in some other more rational manner. In the first place, it may occur to us as not altogether improbable, that this story owes its origin to the use of the propelling machine called the "Scorpion," which we learn from Vegetius² was so called, because it threw small javelins with fine points which occasioned death. Others say because the darts were poisoned.³

¹ See Price, *Retrospect*, vol. i. p. 93.

² *De re militari*, iv. 32.

³ Eschenburg, *Manual*, p. 544. See Smith's *Dict. v. Tormentum*. Sam. Pitiscus, *Lexicon Antiquitatum Romanorum*, in which the classical references are full, and Basil Faber, *Theaurus Eruditionis Scholastica*, v. Scorpio. In Grose's *Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 16, there is a diagram. Meyrick's *Antient Armour*, vol. ii. p. 157, shows that a kind of cannon was also called a scorpion, called by the English a hand-cannon. The annals of Placentia for 1444 have "scorpione seu balistra." The quotations given do not bear out the fact of the scorpion being used solely for gunpowder. It

Later writers may have copied the statement, and put an interpretation upon it suited to their own comprehensions. It is to be observed that the Scorpion was used, even in Europe, as late as 1428 A.D.¹

There seems to be another way of accounting for this improbable story, if we reject the literal meaning of the words, by supposing that a combustible composition, formed of some bituminous substances, was used upon the occasion. We know from several excellent authorities, that for many years before the invention of gunpowder, such substances were used in warfare, and, what is still more remarkable, that the cases in which they were enveloped were known by the name of *Scorpions*. Casiri² gives us the following extract from an Egyptian Geographer, called Shahábu-d dín,³ who flourished about A.D. 1250. "Bodies, in the form of *Scorpions*, bound round, and filled with nitrous powder, glide along, making a gentle noise, then they explode, and throw out flames.⁴ But there are others which, cast into the air, stretch along like a cloud, roaring horribly as thunder roars, and on all sides vomiting out flames, they burst, and burn, and reduce to cinders whatever comes in their way."⁵ It is also a very curious coincidence, that the ancient Indian weapon, or rocket, called *sataghní*, with the etymological meaning of the hundred-slayer, should also signify a *Scorpion*.⁶

As there will be occasion again to allude to the early use of gunpowder in the East, there is no need to dwell upon this passage from the Egyptian author with any reference to that subject. It is merely adduced here, to show the undoubted use at an early period of a combustible called a *Scorpion*.

Now, it is remarkable that Dion Cassius, in speaking of the expedition of Alexander Severus against Atra, which was close to

may have been the old scorpio. In the Glossary he contradicts himself by saying scorpion is a "poisoned arrow"; but under scorpionarius, it is shown that it was a hand-weapon, as it is used by one man only.

¹ Muratori, *Script. Ital.*, tom. xxi. 215. ² *Biblioth. Arab. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 7.

³ Berington gives his name as Ebn Fadhl, but that only shows his parentage.—*Literary History of the Middle Ages*, p. 438. [See Vol. III. *suprd*, p. 573.]

⁴ The early Crusaders used to describe the Greek fire as hissing through the air like serpents.

⁵ Different translations are given.—*Hist. de l'Art*, p. 67.

⁶ See Wilson's *Sanscrit Dictionary*, s.v. and Halhed's *Code of Gentoo Laws*, p. LII.

Nisibis, says that, in the last extremity, the Atreni defended themselves by throwing naphtha¹ both upon the besiegers and upon their engines, by which they were burnt and destroyed. According to Price, naphtha was discharged in pots at Khwárizm.²

Three hundred years before this, the same author tells us, that when Lucullus was besieging Tigranocerta, not fifty miles³ from Nisibis, "the barbarians" defended themselves by throwing naphtha balls against the engines. "This substance is bituminous, and so inflammable that it burns to ashes everything on which it impinges, nor is it easily extinguished by anything wet."⁴

Nor can we wonder that these noxious implements "fed with naphtha and asphaltus" should have been so frequently and so early used in Mesopotamia; for from the Persian Gulf to the Euxine, from the Dead Sea, where asphaltum floats on the water, to Bákú on the Caspian,⁵ where naphtha streams spontaneously through the surface of the soil, and where a boiling lake emits constant flames, the whole country is impregnated with bituminous matter, which is especially abundant on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates⁶—so that if the Scorpions alluded to by 'Abdu-l Kádír

¹ τὸ νάφθα τὸ ἀσφαλτῶδες (Dionis *Hist. Rom.* lxxv. 11), "of which," he adds, "I have already written"—alluding probably to the passage mentioned in the next paragraph of the text.

² Price, *Retrospect*, vol. ii. p. 516.

³ Tacitus says thirty-seven miles.—*Annal.* xv. 4.

⁴ Dionis, *Fragmenta* 178, ex Xiphilino. The same author, in his life of Caligula, tells us of that Emperor's having a machine, which projected a stone, accompanied with thunderings and lightnings.

⁵ "Near unto Bachu is a very strange and wonderful fountain underground, out of which there springeth and issueth a marvellous quantity of black oyl."—John Cartwright's *Preacher's Travels* in Churchill, vol. vii. p. 731. See also Geoffrey Duchet in *Hakluyt*, vol. i. p. 450. "This oyle is blacke, and is called Nefte." Properly Bagh kuh, the mountain garden, according to P. de Valle, *Letter* iv. in Pinkerton, vol. ix. p. 46. Naphtha was sent as a present from Baghdad, anno 586.—*Mod. Univer. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 206; Weil, vol. iii. p. 413.

⁶ Rich, *Fundgruben des Oriens*, vol. iii. p. 161. See also respecting the immortal fire in Lycia, Plin. *Nat. Hist.*, ii. 106. Salmasius, *Exercitiat. Plinian.* pp. 244, 245; Beckmann's notes to the treatise *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, attributed to Aristotle (quoted sometimes as Pseudo-Arist.), p. 283; Marsden's *Marco Polo*, p. 52; Fraser's *Mesop. and Assyria*, p. 347; *Jahán-numí*, vol. i. p. 565, ii. p. 18; J. A. St. John's *Anc. Greece*, vol. iii. pp. 403-5; Hakluyt's *Voyages, Navigations*, etc., vol. ii. p. 582; Smith's *Dict. Geog.*, p. 383; Drummond's *Origines*, vol. i. p. 166.

were combustible, there would be no great improbability in the narrative.

But if we reject these solutions as too elaborate and remote, we must fall back upon the literal interpretation, and, improbable as it is, there are many reasons to encourage us to maintain that it is strictly true.

In the first place, the application of living scorpions to such an improbable purpose would not be altogether a novel stratagem. The *Tārīkh-i Yamīnī* tells us, that Khalaf defended himself in the fort of Ark¹ by throwing from his catapults wallets of snakes upon the besieging army.

M. de Sacy,² in abstracting the passage from the translation of Jarbādkhāni, says, "ils lançoient sur les troupes de Hossain des cruches remplies de scorpions et de reptiles venimeux." For this I can find no authority in the original; but Rashīdu-d dīn also says in his *Jāmi'u-i Tawārīkh*, that scorpions, as well as snakes, were used upon the occasion. At folio 8 of his History of Sultān Mahmūd we read: "When Khalaf had borne down the 'riders of crocodiles' (*nihang-sawar*) and the footmen, he continued to harass the besiegers with crafty arts and stratagems. Wherever they established themselves, he, with slings and catapults, cast upon them pots full of snakes and scorpions, and their places of security he converted into places of ambush."³

Abū-l Fidā, Mirkhond, and the *Tabakāt-i Nāsiri* have nothing on the subject.

Cornelius Nepos and Justin inform us, that by means precisely similar Hannibal dispersed the superior fleet of Eumenes:

"Imperavit (Hannibal) quam plurimas venenatas serpentes vivas colligi, easque in vasa fictilia conjici. Harum cum confecisset magnam multitudinem, die ipso, quo facturus erat navale prælium, classarios convocat, hisque præcipit, omnes ut in unam Eumenis regis concurrant navem, a cæteris tantum satis habeant se defendere; id facile illos serpentium multitudine consecuturos."⁴

¹ [The ark is the citadel or chief fort.]

² *Notices et Extraits*, tom. iv. p. 338. ³ "az māman i eshān makman mi-sakht."

⁴ Cornelius Nepos, *Hannibal*, 10. See also Justin, *Hist. Philipp.*, xxxii. 4. Serpentes came afterwards to be the name of a kind of cannon. "In a letter from the Master of the Knights Hospitallers at Jerusalem to the Pope on the siege of

Then again we find the Atreni, noticed above, making use of this very mode of defence against the troops of the Roman Emperor. Herodian says¹ (and Gibbon² has declared his account of this reign to be rational and moderate, and consistent with the general history of the age), "They cast upon them large birds and poisonous animals³ which fluttered before their eyes, and penetrated every part of their bodies that was exposed," * * * "so that more perished by these means than by direct attacks of the enemy."⁴

Frontinus also speaks of this mode of warfare in his book of stratagems;⁵ and we read of something like it being practised by the Soanes, a people of Colchis, near Caucasus, who endeavoured to suffocate, with poisonous exhalations, those enemies, with whom they could not contend in close combat;⁶ this was done at Nice in the first Crusade, and again at Antioch.⁷ At the sieges of Jotopata

Rhodes by the Turks in 1480, we find *colubrinis et serpentinis deturbant fatigantque*. Colubrina, a culverine, is derived from coluber, like as the serpentine from serpentinus. This latter was made of copper, as in a deed, dated 1461, mention is made of a serpentine de cuivre.—Meyrick, vol. ii. p. 207. These names must have been derived from the form of the mouth, *ib.* 288, as with the basilisk, the flying dragon. See quotations from Bymer, in "Artillery," *Penny Cyclop.*; Ellis's *Metrical Romances* (Bohn), pp. 229, 307, 328, 310. There is an important passage about ducentos serpentes in *Hist. de l'Artill.*, p. 65; Bohn's *Chron. of the Crusades*, pp. 196-7. See also extract copied at p. 2 of Gloss. MS. Meyrick, *Antient Armour*, vol. i. p. 71, translates this, 200 combustible serpents, etc. Bahadin, p. 165.

¹ This passage and the one given from Dion Cassius refer to the same expedition. We need not stay to inquire whether the difference of the accounts arises from omission or contradiction.

² See *Decline and Fall*, vol. i. p. 267.

³ The *ἰβελῶν φηρίων* refers most probably to scorpions, and though it must be confessed the use of *ἰβελῶν* is ambiguous, yet, when coupled with *θηρίων*, the poisonous nature of the missile is evident.

⁴ Herodiani, *Histor. Roman.* lib. iii. c. 9. A curious use of mangonels in throwing gold is recorded by Waasáf on 'Aláu-d dín, and alluded to by Mir Khursu in *Khazainu-l Futúh*. [See *supra*, Vol. III. pp. 41, 158.] The infidels hurled on the Crusaders at Maarah "lapides, ignem, et plena apibus alvearia calcem quoque vivam, quanta poterant jaculabantur instantiâ, ut eas à muro propellerent."—*W. Tyr.* l. vii. c. 9; *Mod. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 247; Southey's *Common-places Book*, 4th series, p. 26; Mackay's *Pop. Delusions*, vol. ii. p. 27; *Anc. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iv. p. 4. For throwing of carcasses, see Froissart, vol. i. c. 60, c. 107. There are also instances of men and horses in Froissart. Camden says dead horses were thrown by the Turks at Negroponte.—Grose, *Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 17.

⁵ Sex. Jul. Frontini, *Stratagematic*, lib. iv. c. 7; *Ency. Met. Hist. Rom. Rep.*, p. 422.

⁶ Strabo, *Geograph.* lib. xi. c. 2; D'Herbelot, v. Acrab.

⁷ Michaud, vol. i. pp. 102-3, and pp. 131, 140.

and Jerusalem, dead bodies of men and horses were thrown by the war-machines on the besieged.¹

Moreover, we know from unquestionable testimony, that scorpions abound so much in the neighbourhood of Nasibín as to be the object of special remark by Oriental Geographers.

Istakhri, or the author translated by Ouseley, speaking of Kurdan, close to Nasibín, says, "It produces deadly scorpions; and the hill on which it stands abounds in serpents, whose stings occasion death."² Abú-l Fidá, quoting Azízí, says, "At Nasibín there is an abundance of white roses, but a red rose is not to be seen. There are also deadly scorpions."³ Edrisí also notices, in his geographical work, the deadly scorpions of Nasibín.⁴

Taking, therefore, into consideration these concurrent testimonies to the fact of venomous reptiles being sometimes used in warfare, and to their abundance in the vicinity of Nasibín, we may pronounce in favour of 'Abdú-l Kádir and his Arab authorities, and declare him justified in exclaiming, "that he had not been guilty of any fabrication, that he had seen the anecdote in books, and had written accordingly; and that, as the accuracy of his statement has been fully verified, he is, by God's grace, relieved from the charge of invention."

NOTE B.

On Kúsdár.

A passage in the *Táríkh-i Alfí*, which speaks of Kúsdár being "near the dominions of Násiru-d dín Subuktigin,"⁵ would seem to imply that Kúsdár was a city of India, and it is so called by Abú-l Fidá and Kazwíní. The compiler of the *Táríkh-i Alfí* copies the whole of his narrative, with only a few verbal alterations, from the *Bauzatu-s Safá*, but the first clause is an addition of his own, from

¹ Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* lib. iii. c. 7-9.

² Ouseley's *Oriental Geography*, p. 66. [Mordtmann's rendering is, "There are many deadly scorpions there; and the hill of Mardín close by abounds in serpents of the most deadly kind."—*Das Buch der Länder*, pp. 46, 47.]

³ *Géographie de Aboulféda*, p. 283.

⁴ *Recueil d. Voy. et d. Mém.*, tom. vi. p. 150. See Quatremère's *Observations, Journ. des Sav.*, Jan., 1851.

⁵ [See the old vol. of 1849, p. 163. The passage hardly seems to warrant the inference drawn from it.]

which it appears that KUSDÁR was by him thought to be the first city conquered in India; but as it was so remote from Jaipál's possessions, it does not seem probable that its capture could have inspired him with such fear for his own safety as the text represents, nor is it proper at any period to place the borders of India so far to the west.¹ The last instance of its being mentioned as a portion of India is where, in the second part of the *Táj'u-l Ma-ásir*, it is said to have been included in the dominion of Shamsu-d dín after his capture of Bhakkar. The name of this town is so differently spelt by different authors that it is not often easy to recognize it in its various disguises. Its position is sufficiently indicated by the *Tárikh-i Yamíni*,² which, speaking of a period subsequent to that noticed in the text, tells us that when Mahmúd thought it necessary to chastise the Governor of KUSDÁR, because he would not pay his tribute, he gave out that he was going on an expedition to Hirát, and had marched as far as Bust on that route, in order to disguise his intention, when he suddenly turned off towards KUSDÁR, and came so unexpectedly upon it, that the rebellious Governor came out and supplicated for pardon, and was reinstated after paying a considerable fine, as a penalty for his disobedience.

KUSDÁR lies to the south of Bust, and is the present Khuzdar of our maps, the capital of Jhálawán in Bilúchistán.³ It is spelt both *كردار* and *قصدار*, according to Abú-l Fidá, but both he and Sádik Isfahání prefer the former. The latter, however, is the most usual mode of spelling it.

Von Hammer⁴ says that Wilken is correct in writing it KUSDÁR, but this is by no means authorized by either of the two Geographers mentioned above. Sádik Isfahání⁵ spells it Kisdár, and Abú-l Fidá⁶ KUSDÁR, and to his authority we must defer, as he is so very

¹ The *Bahru-l Buldán* places Kábul in India. See also Reinaud's *Memoire*, pp. 12, 39, 176.

² See also *Tárikh-i Yamíni*, Lith. Ed. p. 316.

³ Masson, *Balochistan, Afghánistan, and Panjab*, vol. ii. p. 41. There is a Kooshder in Burnes's map, between Kelat and Dadur, which may perhaps be the place. The alteration of the first letter is suspicious.

⁴ *Gemäldeaal der Lebensbeschreibungen*, vol. iv. p. 106.

⁵ *Takwímu-l Buldán*, p. 122.

⁶ *Géographie de Aboulféda*, Texte Arabe, pp. 348, 349. At page 384 Mckran is said to be in Hind.

careful in specifying the vowel-points. Briggs calls it in one place Kandahar, in another Khoozdar.¹ The Nubian Geographer calls it Kardán Fardán,² and Kazwíní Kasrán Kasrán.³ M. Petis de la Croix calls it Custar, and M. Silvestre de Saoy Cosdar.⁴

When Ibn Haukal visited the valley of Sind, he found KUSDÁR under a separate government, and during the whole period of Arab occupation it was considered a place of importance. He describes it as a city and district between Túrán and Sind. KUSDÁR is frequently mentioned by Biláduri.⁵ He quotes an Arabic poet, who thus rapturously speaks of its merits.

"Almonder has descended into his tomb at KUSDÁR, deprived of all commerce with people endowed with reason.

"What a beautiful country is KUSDÁR! how distinguished its inhabitants! and how illustrious both for his worldly policy as well as his religious duties was the man who now lies buried in its soil!"⁶

NOTE C.

On Fire-worship in Upper India.

Nizámu-d dín Ahmad mentions no other event of Ibráhím's reign but the following: "The Sultán turned his face towards Hindústán, and conquered many towns and forts, and amongst them was a city exceedingly populous, inhabited by a tribe of Khurásání descent, whom Afrásiyáb had expelled from their native country. * * It was so completely reduced by the power and perseverance of the Sultán, that he took away no less than 100,000 captives." Abú-l Fidá and the *Tabakát-i Násiri* are silent. The *Tárikh-i Alfí* says, "Ibráhím next marched against Derápúr in Hindústán, a place which many great emperors found it impracticable to conquer. Several histories state that this place was inhabited by the descendants of the people of Khurásán, who for their disloyal and rebellious conduct had been

¹ Briggs' *Firíhta*, vol. i. pp. 16, 123. ² *Geographia Nubiensis*, pp. 64, 67, 68.

³ Gildemeister, *De rebus Indicis*, p. 174.

⁴ *Notices et Extr. des MSS.*, tom. iv. pp. 332, 391.

⁵ [See *suprà*, Vol. I. p. 118.]

⁶ Reinaud, *Fragments Arabes et Persans*, p. 188. Compare also Pottinger, *Travels in Beloochistan*, p. 36. C. Ritter, *Ersk. von Asien*, vol. vi. part i. pp. 714, 716. Gildemeister, *De rebus Indicis*, pp. 26, 209. *Wien Jahrbücher*, no. lxxiii. p. 31. Mirchondi, *Historia Gasnevidarum*, p. 146. Massan's *Kelat*, p. 377.

long before banished the country by Afrásiyáb, Emperor of Turán.²⁴ The *Muntakhabu-i Tawárikh* has nothing more on the subject than is contained in the *Tabakát-i Akbari*. The *Bauzatu-s Safá* is the same as the *Tárikh-i Alfí*, except that the former omits the name of the place. Firishta adds a few particulars not to be found in the others. He says :—“The King marched from thence to another town in the neighbourhood, called Derá, the inhabitants of which came originally from Khurásán, and were banished thither with their families by Afrásiyáb, for frequent rebellions. Here they had formed themselves into a small independent state, and, being cut off from intercourse with their neighbours by a belt of mountains nearly impassable, had preserved their ancient customs and rites by not intermarrying with any other people. The King, having with infinite labour cleared a road for his army over the mountains, advanced towards Derá, which was well fortified. This place was remarkable for a fine lake of water about one *parasang* and a half in circumference, the waters of which did not apparently diminish, either from the heat of the weather or from being used by the army. At this place the King was overtaken by the rainy season; and his army, though greatly distressed, was compelled to remain before it for three months. But as soon as the rains abated, he summoned the town to surrender and acknowledge the faith. Sultán Ibráhím’s proposal being rejected, he renewed the siege, which continued some weeks, with great slaughter on both sides. The town, at length, was taken by assault, and the Muhammadans found in it much wealth, and 100,000 persons, whom they carried in bonds to Ghazní. Some time after, the King accidentally saw one of those unhappy men carrying a heavy stone, with great difficulty and labour, to a palace which he was then building. This exciting his pity, he commanded the prisoner to throw it down and leave it there, at the same time giving him his liberty. This stone happened to be on the public road, and proved troublesome to passengers, but as the King’s rigid enforcement of his commands was universally known, no one attempted to touch it. A courtier one day having stumbled with his horse over the stone, took occasion to mention it to the King, intimating that he thought it would be advisable to have it removed. To which the King replied, ‘I commanded it to be thrown down and left there; and there it must remain as a monu-

ment of the calamities of war, and to commemorate my sense of its evils. It is better for a king to be pertinacious in the support even of an inadvertent command than that he should depart from his royal word.' The stone accordingly remained where it was; and was shown as a curiosity in the reign of Sultán Bairám several years afterwards."

The position of this place is very difficult to fix. Firishta says that in the year 472 π. Ibráhím marched in person to India, and conquered portions of it never before visited by the Musulmáns. He extended his conquests to Ajodhan, now called Pattan Shaikh Farid Shahr Ganj. He then went to Rúdpál, situated on the summit of a steep hill, which a river embraced on three sides, and which was protected by an impervious wood, infested by serpents. He then marched to Derá, which Briggs seems to place in the valley of the Indus, because he adds in a note, "Derá seems a common name in the vicinity of Multán for a town." The reading of the *Tárikh-i Alfí* with respect to the two first places is much the most probable,—namely, a fort in the country of Júd¹ and Damál.

The *Rauzat-u Safá* does not mention the first place, and speaks of the second as if it were on the sea-shore. The third place he does not name. In Firishta it is Derá, and in the *Tárikh-i Alfí* Derápúr. This would seem to be the place called Derabend, near Torbela, on the Upper Indus.² It is possible that the Dehrá of Dehrá Dún may be meant; but, though the belt of mountains, the inaccessible jungle, the seclusion of the inhabitants, and the identity of name, are in favour of this supposition, we are at a loss for the inexhaustible lake and the impregnability of the position.

All the authors, however, who mention the circumstance, whether they give the name or not, notice that the inhabitants were banished

¹ This country is frequently mentioned by the early historians. It lies between the Indus and the Jailam, and is the Ayud of the old travellers. It is the old Sanskrit name, and occurs in the Puranic lists, and on the Allahabad pillar, under the name of *Yaudheya*. Wilford says it is the Hud of the Book of Esther. It occurs also in the marginal legend of the reverse of the Bactro-Pehlevi Coins. See *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, vol. vi. p. 973; *As. Researches*, vol. viii. p. 349; Lassen, *Zeitschrift f. d. K. d. Morgenlandes*, vol. iii. p. 196.

² Vigne, *Kashmir*, vol. i. p. 122. See also Abbot's paper on Nikaia, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, 1852.

by Afrásiyáb; and this concurrent tradition respecting their expulsion from Khurásán seems to indicate the existence of a colony of fire-worshippers in these hills, who preserved their peculiar rites and customs, notwithstanding the time which had elapsed since their departure from their native country.

Putting aside the probability, which has frequently been speculated upon, of an original connexion between the Hindú religion and the worship of fire,¹ and the derivation of the name of Magadha from the Magi, there is much in the practical worship of the Hindús, such as the *hom*, the *gáyatrí*, the address to the sun² at the time of ablution, the prohibition against insulting that luminary by indecent gestures,³—all which would lead an inattentive observer to conclude the two religions to bear a very close resemblance to one another. It is this consideration which should make us very careful in receiving the statements of the early Muhammadan writers on this subject; and the use of the word *Gabr*, to signify not only, especially, a fire-worshipper, but, generally, an infidel of any denomination, adds to the probability of confusion and inaccuracy.⁴

Khusrú, in the *Khazáinu-l Futúh* (p. 76), calls the sun the *kíbla* of the Hindús, and it is quite evident that throughout his works *Gabr* is used as equivalent to Hindú. In one passage he speaks of the *Gabrs* as worshippers both of stones and fire.

European scholars have not been sufficiently attentive to this double use of the word, and all those who have relied upon M. Petis

¹ *Calc. Rev.* vol. xxi. pp. 107, 128; *Mod. Trav., India*, vol. i. p. 120; Rampoldi, viii. n. 39; Mickle's *Camoens*, p. 356; Dr. Cox's *Sacred Hist. and Biog.*, p. 120; R. P. Knight's *Symbolic Language*, "Fire."

² See Wilson, *Rig-Veda*, Pref. pp. 28, 29, and *Index*, voce "Agni"; Elphinstone's *India*, vol. i. p. 78; also Lucian's description of the circular dance peculiar to Indian priests, in which they worship the sun, standing with their faces towards the east.—*De Saltatione*. See also Bohlen, *Das alte Indien*, vol. i. pp. 137, 146; Ersch and Grüber, *Encyclopædie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, art. *Indien*, pp. 166, 172; Drummond's *Origines*, vol. iii. p. 430.

³ Hesiod enables us to disguise it in a learned language,

Μηδ' ἀντ' ἡελίοιο τετραμμένος ὄρθος ἄμικρον.

Op. et Di. v. 672.

See also *Menu*, iv. 52; *Rámáyana*, ii. 69; Bohlen, *Das alte Ind.*, vol. i. p. 139; *Akhdk-i Jaldí*, p. 293.

⁴ "A Christian is called amongst them Gower, that is, unbeliever and uncleane, esteeming all to be infidels and pagans which do not believe as they do, in their false, filthy prophets, Mahomet and Murtezalli."—A. Jenkins, *Hakluyt*, vol. i. p. 291.

de la Croix's translation of Sharafu-d dín, have considered that, at the period of Tímúr's invasion, fire-worship prevailed most extensively in Upper India, because *Gabr* is used throughout by the historians of that invasion to represent the holders of a creed opposed to his own, and against which his rancour and cruelty were unsparingly directed. There is distinct mention in the *Matla'u-s Sa'dain* of fire-worshippers, as distinct from the Hindús; and the Kashmirians, according to Firishfa, were fire-worshippers at the time of the Muhammadan invasion.¹ The men of Deogír are called fire-worshippers in the *Tárth-i 'Aláí*.

But though the word is used indiscriminately, there are certain passages in which it is impossible to consider that any other class but fire-worshippers is meant. Thus, it is distinctly stated in Tímúr's Memoirs, and by Sharafu-d dín, that the people of Tughlikpúr² believed in the two principles of good and evil in the universe, and acknowledged *Ahrimán* and *Yezdan* (*Ormuzd*). The captives massacred at Loni³ are said to have been *Magians, as well as Hindús*, and Sharafu-d dín states that the son of Safi the *Gabr* threw himself into the fire, which he worshipped.⁴

We cannot refuse our assent to this distinct evidence of the existence of fire-worshippers in Upper India as late as the invasion of Tímúr, A.D. 1398-9. There is, therefore, no improbability that the independent tribe which had been expelled by Afrásiyáb, and practised their own peculiar rites, and whom Ibráhím the Ghazni-vidé attacked in A.D. 1079, were a colony of fire-worshippers from Irán, who, if the date assigned be true, must have left their native country before the reforms effected in the national creed by Zoroaster.

Indeed, when we consider the constant intercourse which had prevailed from the oldest time between Persia and India,⁵ it is

¹ Briggs, vol. iv. p. 449.

² [See *suprà*, Vol. III. pp. 431 and 494, and see the Editor's note upon this passage at page 506 of Vol. III. A further instance of the confusion of Bráhmical and Zoroastrian institutions may be found at p. 530, *suprà*, where Badáúnt, in treating upon Parsí fire-worship, declares the Hindú *hom* to be "a ceremony derived from fire-worship," evidently meaning Zoroastrianism.]

³ [See *suprà*, Vol. III. pp. 436 and 497.] Price's *Chronological Retrospect of Mah. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 254.

⁴ [See vol. III. p. 506.]

⁵ Troyer, *Rájá Tarangini*, vol. ii. p. 441.

surprising that we do not find more unquestionable instances of the persecuted fire-worshippers seeking an asylum in Northern India as well as in Gujarát. The instances in which they are alluded to before this invasion of Tímúr are very rare, and almost always so obscurely mentioned as to leave some doubt in the mind whether foreign ignorance of native customs and religious rites may not have given a colour to the narrative.

The evidence of the Chinese traveller, Hiuen-tsang, to the existence of sun-worship at Multán in 640 A.D., is very decisive. He found there a "temple of the sun, and an idol erected to represent that grand luminary," with dwellings for the priests, and reservoirs for ablution;¹ yet he says the city was inhabited chiefly by men of the Bráhmanical religion. A few centuries before, if Philostratus is to be believed, Apollonius, after crossing the Indus, visited the temple of the sun at Taxila, and Phraotes, the chief of the country, describes the Indians as in a moment of joy "snatching torches from the altar of the sun," and mentions that he himself never drank wine except "when sacrificing to the sun." After crossing the Hyphasis, Apollonius goes to a place, which would seem to represent Jwála Mukhí, where they "worship fire" and "sing hymns in honour of the sun."² When the Arabs arrived in the valley of the Indus, they found the same temple, the same idol, the same dwellings, the same reservoirs, as had struck the Chinese, but their description of the idol would lead us to suppose that it was a representation of Budh. Bírání, however, whose testimony is more valuable than that of all other Muhammadans, as he was fully acquainted with the religious system of the Hindús, plainly tells us³ that the idol of Multán was called *Aditya*,⁴ because it was consecrated to the sun, and that Muhammad bin Kásim, the first invader, suspended a piece of cow's flesh from its neck, in order to show his

¹ *Journal Asiatique*, 4th series, tom. viii. p. 298, and *Foe Koue Kí*, p. 393.

² Philostrati *Vita Apollonii*, lib. ii. capp. 24, 32, lib. iii. cap. 14, ed. G. Olcarius (Leip. 1709), pp. 77, 85, 103; *Hist. Sikhs* (Calc. 1846), p. 20.

³ M. Reinaud, *Fragments Arabes et Persans*, p. 141.

⁴ See Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. i. p. 761; *Anthologia Sanscritica*, p. 172; *As. Res.*, vol. i. p. 263; Vans Kennedy, *Ancient and Hindu Mythology*, p. 349.

contempt of the superstition of the Indians, and to disgust them with this double insult to the dearest objects of their veneration.¹

Shortly before Bírúní wrote, we have another instance of this tendency to combine the two worships. In the message which Jaipál sent to Násiru-d dín, in order to dissuade him from driving the Indians to desperation, he is represented to say, according to the *Tárikh-i Alfi*: "The Indians are accustomed to pile their property, wealth, and precious jewels in one heap; and to kindle it with the fire, *which they worship*. Then they kill their women and children, and with nothing left in the world they rush to their last onslaught, and die in the field of battle, so that for their victorious enemies the only spoil is dust and ashes." The declaration is a curious one in the mouth of a Hindú, but may perhaps be considered to indicate the existence of a modified form of pyrolatry in the beginning of the eleventh century. The practice alluded to is nothing more than the *Jauhar*, which is so frequently practised by Hindús in despair, and was not unknown to the nations of antiquity. Sardana-palus performed it, on the capture of Babylon. "He raised a large pyre in his palace, threw upon it all his wealth in gold, silver, and royal robes, and then placing his concubines and eunuchs on it, he, they, and the entire palace were consumed in the flames."² The Saguntines did the same, when their city was taken by Hannibal;³ Juba also had prepared for a *Jauhar*,⁴ and Arrian gives us an account of one performed by the Bráhmans, without noticing it as a practice exclusively observed by that class.⁵ The peculiarity of the relation consists in Jaipál's declaration that the Indians *worshipped the fire*, not in the fact of their throwing their property and valuables into it. The practice of self-cremation also appears to have been common at

¹ There is nothing in the various origins ascribed to the name of Multán which gives any colour to the supposition that the city was devoted to the worship of the sun; nor is there anything at present to indicate that worship. See Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. i. p. 99; *Zeitschrift f. d. K. d. Morg.*, vol. iii, p. 196; Tod, vol. i. pp. 69, 119; Reinaud's *Mém.*, pp. 98, 100. The universality of Sun-worship is shown in Squier's *Serpent Symbol in America*, and Macrob. *Saturn*, i. c. 22.

² Diodorus Siculus, ii. 27.

³ Polybius, iii. 17; Livy, xxi. 14.

⁴ Merivale, vol. ii. p. 378; Cox's *Sacred Hist. and Biog.*, p. 242.

⁵ *De Exped. Alex.*, vi. 7. See also *Encyc. Metr.*, "Rom Rep." and "Greece"; Herod. on the Syrians; Q. Curtius, ix. 14; Niebuhr's *Lectures*, vol. ii. pp. 82, 169, 247, 269; Michaud's *Crusades*, vol. i. p. 429; Layard's *Nineveh*, vol. ii. p. 218; Arnold, vol. iii. pp. 66, 429; *Mod. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 195, xi. p. 63.

an earlier period; and there were conspicuous instances of it when foreign nations first became acquainted with India. One occurs in Vol. II. p. 27, where this very Jaipál, having no opportunity of dying in the field of battle, committed himself to the flames. Other histories tell us that it was then a custom amongst the Hindús that a king who had been twice defeated was disqualified to reign, and that Jaipál, in compliance with this custom, resigned his crown to his son, lighted his funeral pyre with his own hands, and perished in the flames. The Greeks and Romans were struck with the instances which they witnessed of the same practice. Calanus, who followed the Macedonian army from Taxila, solemnly burnt himself in their presence at Pasargadæ, being old and tired of his life.¹ Zarmanochegas, who accompanied the Indian ambassadors sent by a chief, called Porus, to Augustus, burnt himself at Athens, and directed the following inscription to be engraved on his sepulchral monument:—"Here lies Zarmanochegas, the Indian of Bargaosa, who deprived himself of life, according to a custom prevailing among his countrymen."²

Strabo correctly observes, on the authority of Megasthenes, that suicide is not one of the dogmas of Indian philosophy; indeed, it is attended by many spiritual penalties:³ and even penance which endangers life is prohibited.⁴ There is a kind of exception, however, in favour of suicide by fire and water,⁵ but then only when age, or infirmity, makes life grievous and burdensome. The former has of late years gone quite out of fashion, but it is evident that in ancient times there were many devotees ready to sacrifice themselves in that mode.

Quique suas struxere pyras, vivique calentes
 Conscendere rogos. Proh! quanta est gloria genti
 Injecisse manum fatia, vitæque repletos
 Quod superest, donasse Diis.———

Pharsalia, iii. 240.

¹ Diodorus Sic. xvii. 107; Valerius Max. I. viii. *Extern.* 10; Cicero, *Tusc.* ii. 22; Grier, 108, Index, v. "Calanus"; Elphinstone's *India*, vol. i. pp. 90, 461, 462, 471.

² Suetonius, *Augustus*, 21; Strabo, *Geograph.* xv. 1; Valentyn, vol. i. p. 60; Ritter, *Erdk.*, vol. iv. part 1, p. 439.

³ Rhode, *Religiöse Bildung der Hindus*, vol. i. p. 451; Bohlen, *Das alte Indien*, vol. i. pp. 286-290; C. Müller, *Frag. Hist. Græc.* p. 139; his *Scip. rerum Al. mag.* pp. 51, 57.

⁴ See Wilson's note to Mill's *British India*, vol. ii. p. 417.

⁵ Colebrooke, *Asiatic Researches*, vol. vii. p. 256; where an instance is adduced from the *Raghuvansa* and *Ramdyana*.

It was, therefore, a habit sufficiently common amongst the Indians of that early period, to make Lucan remark upon it as a peculiar glory of that nation. All this, however, may have occurred without any reference to fire as an object of worship; but the speech of Jaipál, if not attributed to him merely through Muhammadan ignorance, shows an unquestionable devotion to that worship.

But to continue, Istakhrí, writing a century earlier than this transaction, says, "Some parts of Hind and Sind belong to *Gabrs*, but a greater portion to Kafirs and idolaters; a minute description of these places would, therefore, be unnecessary and unprofitable."¹ Here, evidently, the fire-worshippers are alluded to as a distinct class; and these statements, written at different periods respecting the religious creeds of the Indians, seem calculated to impart a further degree of credibility to the specific assertions of Sharafudín, Khondamír, and the other historians of Tímúr's expedition to India. But the people alluded to by them need not have been colonies of refugees, fleeing from Muhammadan bigotry and persecution. There are other modes of accounting for their existence in these parts. They may have been Indian converts to the doctrine of Zoroaster, for we read that not only had he secret communication with the Bráhmans of India,² but when his religion was fully established, he endeavoured to gain proselytes in India, and succeeded in converting a learned Bráhman, called Tchengrihatchah by Anquetil du Perron,³ who returned to his native country with a great number of priests. Firdúsí tells us that Isfandiyár⁴

¹ Ouseley's *Oriental Geography*, p. 146.

² Bactrianus Zoroastres, cum superioris Indiæ secreta fidentius penetraret, ad nemorosam quamdam venerat solitudinem, cujus tranquillis silentiis præcelsa Brachmanorum ingenia potiuntur: eorumque monita rationes mundani motus et siderum, purosque sacerorum ritus, quantum colligere potuit, eruditus, ex his, quæ didicit, aliqua sensibus Magorum infudit.—Ammian. Marcell. *Julianus*, xxiii. 6, 33. See *Anc. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iv. p. 301; Guigniant's *Notes to Crozer's Religions*, tom. i. pp. 689, 690.

³ *Zendavesta*, vol. i. ch. 2, p. 70.

⁴ He is said, according to the *Zinatu-t Tawárikh*, to have been the first convert made by Zoroaster, and Gushtásp, his father, was persuaded by the eloquence of the prince to follow his example. The king ordered twelve thousand cow-hides to be tanned fine, in order that the precepts of his new faith might be engrossed upon them. In this respect what a contrast is there to Hindú exclusiveness! The Pundits withheld their sacred books from Col. Polier, for fear that he should bind them in calfskin. Polier, *Mythologie des Indous*, tom. ii. p. 224; Ovid, *Fasts*, i. 629; Biley, p. 40.

induced the monarch of India to renounce idolatry and adopt fire-worship, insomuch that not a Bráhmañ remained in the idol-temples. A few centuries afterwards, we have indisputable testimony to the general spread of these doctrines in Kábul and the Panjáb. The emblems of the Mithraic¹ worship so predominate on the coins of the Kanerkis, as to leave no doubt upon the mind that it was the state-religion of that dynasty.²

Ritter entertains the supposition, that as the Khiljí family came from the highlands which afforded a shelter to this persecuted race, they may have had a leaning to these doctrines, and he offers a suggestion, that the new religion which 'Aláu-d dín wished to promulgate may have been that of Zoroaster,³ and that this will account for the Panjáb and the Doáb being full of his votaries at the time of Tímúr's invasion. But this is a very improbable supposition, and he has laid too much stress upon the use of the word *Gabr*, which, if taken in the exclusive sense adopted by him, would show not only that these tracts were entirely occupied by fire-worshippers, but that Hindús were to be found in very few places in either of them.

After this time, we find little notice of the prevalence of fire-worship in Northern India; and its observers must then have been exterminated, or they must have shortly after been absorbed into some of the lower Hindú communities. Badáúni, however, mentions the destruction of fire-altars one hundred years later by Sultán Sikandar in A.H. 910. It may not be foreign to this part of the inquiry to remark, that Abú-l Fazl speaks of the *Gubree* language as being one of the thirteen used in the *súba* of Kábul (*Ain-i Akbari*, vol. ii. p. 1263). The *Gubree* language is also mentioned in Bábar. There is a "Gubber" hill and pass not far from Bunnoo, inhabited by the Battani tribe; and on the remotest borders of Rohilkhand, just under the hills, there is a tribe called

¹ Using this word in its usual, though not proper, acceptation. The real Mithraic worship was a fusion of Zoroastrianism and Chaldaism, or the Syrian worship of the sun. See the authorities quoted in Guizot's and Milman's notes to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. i. p. 340; *Anc. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iv. pp. 160, 157.

² Lassen, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, vol. ix. p. 456, and H. T. Prinsep, *Note on the Histor. Results from Bactrian Coins*, p. 106.

³ See Ritter, *Erkunde von Asien*, vol. iv. part 1, pp. 577-79.

Gobri, who retain some peculiar customs, which seem to have no connexion with Hindú superstition. They are said to have preceded the present occupants of the more cultivated lands to the south of the Tarái, and may possibly be the descendants of some of the *Gabrs* who found a refuge in Upper India. The name of *Gobri* would certainly seem to encourage the notion of identity, for the difference of the first vowel, and the addition of a final one, offer no obstacle, any more than they do in the name of *Gobryas*,¹ who gave information to Socrates on the subject of the Persian religion, and is expressly declared by Plato to be an *ἀνὴρ μάγος*. According to J. Cunningham, there is a wild tribe called *Magyas* between Málwa and Gujarát, who are used as *shikáris*. They are supposed to have been fire-worshippers, but they have no pyrolatrous observances at present.

There is another inferior Hindú tribe, to the west of the upper Jumna, and in the neighbourhood of the Tughlikpúr mentioned above, who, having the name of *Magh*,² and proclaiming themselves of foreign extraction (inasmuch as they are descendants of Rájá Mukhtesar, a Sarsutí Bráhmaṇ, King of Mecca, and maternal grandfather of Muhammad !!),³ would seem to invite the attention of any

¹ Plato, *Axiochus*, Tauchnitz, vol. viii. p. 204. The same name is common in Herodotus, Xenophon, Justin, and other authors, who deal in Persian History. The warmth of an Irish imagination ascribes to the Greeks a still greater perversion of the original word.

"Hyde," says the enthusiastic O'Brien, "was the only one who had any idea of the composition of Cabiri, when he declared it was a Persian word somewhat altered from Gabri or Guebri, and signifying fire-worshippers. It is true that Gabri now stands for fire-worshippers, but that is only because they assumed to themselves this title, which belonged to another order of their ancestors. The word is derived from *gabh*, a smith, and *ir*, sacred, meaning the sacred smiths, and Cabiri being only a perversion of it, is of course in substance of the very same import. * * * * Gobhan Saer means the sacred poet, or the Freemason-Sage, one of the Guebhres, or Cabiri." — *Round Towers of Ireland*, pp. 354, 386. See *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, vol. xi. pp. 134-5.

² *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, vol. vii. p. 754.

³ See Quatremère's observations in the *Journal des Savants*, January, 1851. This is not at all an uncommon paternity for the lower tribes to assume. There is nothing in which Hindú ignorance is more betrayed, than in these silly attempts to enrol the false prophet amongst their native heroes. See especially Wilford's absurd and dirty story, showing how Muhammad was of Bráhmaṇical descent. (*As. Res.* vol. ix. p. 160.) Wilson considers that the story was manufactured especially for Wilford, but it is traditionally current among the ignorant in some parts of Upper India. (*Note to Mill's India*, vol. ii. p. 176.) The reputed Bráhmaṇical origin of Akbar is more reason-

inquirer after the remnant of the stock of Magians; but all their customs, both religious and social, are of the Hindú stamp, and their only peculiarity consists in being the sole caste employed in the cultivation of *mendhi* (*Lawsonia inermis*).¹

NOTE D.

On the knowledge of Sanskrit by Muhammadans.

It is a common error to suppose that Faizí (v. p. 479) was the first² Muhammadan who mastered the difficulties of the Sanskrit,—that language, “of wonderful structure, more perfect than Greek, more copious than Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either.”

Akbar’s freedom from religious bigotry, his ardent desire for the cultivation of knowledge, and his encouragement of every kind of

able, inasmuch as it can be attributed to gratitude, and is not opposed to the doctrine of transmigration; but why Muhammad should also be chosen, whose votaries have proved the most unrelenting persecutors of Hindús, can only be ascribed to the marvellous assimilating powers of their mental digestion, fostered by the grossest credulity and ignorance of past events, which can, as Milton says, “corporeal to incorporeal turn,” and to that indiscriminate craving after adaptation, which induces them even now to present their offerings at the shrines of Muhammadans, whose only title to saint is derived from the fact of their having despatched hundreds of infidel and accursed Hindús to the nethermost pit of Hell.

¹ See also Shea and Troyer, *Dabistan*, vol. i. pp. c. cxxv.; *Asiatic Researches*, vol. ix. pp. 74, 81, 212, vol. xi. p. 76, vol. xvi. p. 16; Dr. Bird, *Journ. As. Soc. Bombay*, no. ix. p. 186; Rammohun Roy, *Translation of the Yads*, pp. 29, 73, 109–118; Malcolm, *History of Persia*, vol. i. pp. 488–494; Wilson, *Vishnu Purana*, pp. xl. 84, 397; *North British Review*, no. ii. p. 376; Klaproth, *Mémoires Relatifs à l’Asie*, tom. ii. p. 81; Ouseley, *Travels in Persia*, vol. i. pp. 102–146; Ritter, *Erkunde von Asien*, vol. iv. pt. 1, pp. 489, 574, 614–619; Rhode, *Religiose Bildung der Hindus*, vol. i. p. 42, vol. ii. p. 290; Moor’s *Hindú Pantheon*, pp. 295–302; Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. i. pp. 30, 149, 153, 188, 217; F. Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie*, vol. i. pp. 518–524; Reinaud’s *Mémoire sur l’Inde, passim*; Reinaud’s *Fragments Arabes et Persans*, p. 46; Elphinstone’s *History of India*, vol. i. pp. 78, 90, 461–2, 471, 489; *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1849, pp. 105–7, 1862, p. 447; *Journ. Roy. Asiatic Society*, vol. xii. pp. 26, 27; *Calcutta Review*, vol. xxi. p. 160, vol. xxv. p. 45; Grote’s *Greece*, vol. iv. p. 299, vol. v. p. 397; J. H. Hottingeri *Thesaurus Philologicus seu Clavis Scripturæ*, 1849, p. 66; Buxtorf, *Lex.*, p. 704; *Mod. Trav. in India*, vol. i. p. 145, vol. iv. pp. 201 to 206; Tod, vol. i. pp. 102, 112, 217, 232; Fergusson’s *Anc. Arch. Hind.*, p. 6; R. S. Poole’s *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, p. 205; Cory’s *Ancient Fragments*, p. 272; Maisey’s *Report on Sanchi Topes*, Note B; Cunningham’s *Bhilsa Topes*.

² Elphinstone’s *History of India*, vol. ii. p. 317; *Biographical Dictionary*, L. U. K., vol. i. p. 683; Dow’s *Hindoostan*, vol. i. p. 6; Briggs, vol. iv. p. 451. Gladwin mentions translations made before the time of Akbar in the *Lin-i Akbari*, vol. i. p. 103, vol. ii. p. 153.

learning, and especially his regard for his Hindú subjects, imparted a stimulus to the cultivation of Indian literature, such as had never prevailed under any of his predecessors. Hence, besides Faizí, we have amongst the Sanskrit translators of his reign 'Abdu-l Kádir, Nakíb Khán, Mullá Sháh Muhammad, Mullá Shabrí, Sultán Hájí, Hájí Ibráhím, and others. In some instances it may admit of doubt, whether the translations may not have been made from versions previously done into Hindí, oral or written. The word Hindí is ambiguous when used by a Muhammadan of that period. Nizámu-d dín Ahmad, for instance, says that 'Abdu-l Kádir translated several works from the *Hindí*. Now, we know that he translated, amongst other works, the *Rámáyana* and the *Singhásan Battísí*.¹ It is much more probable that these were in the original Sanskrit, than in Hindí. 'Abdu-l Kádir and Firishta tell us that the *Mahá-bhárata* was translated into Persian from the *Hindí*, the former² ascribing the work chiefly to Nakíb Khán, the latter to Faizí.³ Here again there is every probability of the Sanskrit being meant. In another instance, 'Abdu-l Kádir tells us that he was called upon to translate the *Atharva Veda* from the *Hindí*, which he excused himself from doing, on account of the exceeding difficulty of the style and abstruseness of meaning, upon which the task devolved upon Hájí Ibráhím Sirhindí, who accomplished it satisfactorily. Here it is evident that nothing but Sanskrit could have been meant.⁴ But though the knowledge of Sanskrit appears to have been more generally diffused at this time, it was by no means the first occasion that Muhammadans had become acquainted with that language. Even if we allowed that they obtained the abridgment of the *Pancha Tantra*, under the name of Fables of Bidpai, or *Hitopadesa*,

¹ [See *suprá*, pp. 513 and 539.]

² His account, which will be seen at p. 537, is very confused, and it is not easy to gather from it what share each of the coadjutors had in the translation. The same names are given in the *At-i Akbari*; Sprenger's *Bibl.*, pp. 59, 63.

³ The author of the *Siyaru-l Muta-akhhirin* (vol. i.) ascribes it to 'Abdu-l Kádir and Shaikh Muhammad Sultán Thánesarí. The name of the translator is not mentioned in Abú-l Fazl's preface, but the work is said to have been done by several men of both religions.

⁴ In the *Ashika* and *Nuh-sipahr* of Amír Khusrú there are two important passages, showing that in the former Hindí means Sanskrit; and Amír Khusrú in the same work says that he himself had a knowledge of the language.

through the medium of the Pehlevi,¹ there are other facts which make it equally certain that the Muhammadans had attained a correct knowledge of the Sanskrit not long after the establishment of their religion; even admitting, as was probably the case, that most of the Arabic translations were made by Indian foreigners resident at Baghdád.

In the *Khalifate* of Al-Mámún, the Augustan age of Arabian literature, the treatise² of Muhammad bin Músa on Algebra, which was translated by Dr. Rosen in 1831, and the medical treatises of Mikah and Ibn Dahan, who are represented to be Indians,³ show that Sanskrit must have been well known at that time; and even before that, the compilations of *Charaka* and *Susruta*⁴ had been translated, and had diffused a general knowledge of Indian medicine amongst the Arabs. From the very first, we find them paying particular attention to this branch of science, and encouraging the profession of it so much, that two Indians, Manka and Sálîh by name,—the former of whom translated a treatise on poison into Persian,—held appointments as body-physicians at the Court of Hárúnu-r Rashîd.⁵ The Arabians possessed during the early periods of the *Khalifate* several other Indian works which had been translated into Arabic, some on astronomy,⁶ some on music,⁷ some on judicial astrology,⁸ some on interpretation of dreams,⁹ some on the religion and theogony of the Hindús,¹⁰ some on their sacred scrip-

¹ See Mémoire prefixed to S. de Sacy's edition of *Calilah wa Dimnah*, Paris, 1816. See also *Biographie Universelle*, tom. xxi. p. 471.

² Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. ii. pp. 444-500.

³ *Biographical Dictionary*, L. U. K., vol. ii. p. 242.

⁴ Dix, *Analecta Medica*, pp. 126-140.

⁵ *Journal of Education*, vol. viii. p. 176; Royle, *Antiquity of Hindú Medicine*, p. 64; *Oriental Mag.*, March, 1823; D'Herbelot, *arts. Kitab al Samoum and Mangheh*; Abú-l Faragî, *Hist. Dynast.*, p. 238; Dietz, p. 124; Price, vol. ii. p. 88; *Biog. Dic.*, L. U. K., vol. ii. p. 300; *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, vol. vi. p. 107; Reinaud's *Aboulfeda*, vol. i. p. 42; Rampoldi, vol. iv. pp. 451, 478; *Mod. Univ. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 155; *Cosmos (Sabine)*, vol. ii. notes 328, 340-1, 350-5-6; Wüstenfeld, *Arab Artze*, p. 19; Mitter, *Erskunde*, vol. iv. part 1, pp. 529, 626.

⁶ Casiri, *Bibliotheca Eecurialensis*, vol. i. p. 246.

⁷ Casiri, *ibid.*, p. 427.

⁸ Hottinger, *Promptuarium*, p. 254; Reinaud's *Aboulfeda*, vol. i. pp. 42, 46, 49.

⁹ Casiri, *Bibliotheca Eecurialensis*, vol. i. p. 401.

¹⁰ Giedemeister, *de rebus Indiciis Scriptt. Arabb.*, pp. 104-119; De Guignes, *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.*, tom. xxvi. p. 791 et seq.

tures,¹ some on the calculation of nativities,² some on agriculture,³ some on poisons,⁴ some on physiognomy,⁵ and some on palmistry,⁶ besides others, which need not be here enumerated.

If we turn our eyes towards India, we find that scarcely had these ruthless conquerors gained a footing in the land, than Bírúní exerted himself with the utmost diligence to study the language, literature, and science of India, and attained, as we have already seen, such proficiency in it, as to be able to translate into, as well as from, the Sanskrit. Muhammad bin Isráíl-al Tanúkhí also travelled early into India, to learn the system of astronomy which was taught by the sages of that country.⁷ There seems, however, no good authority for Abú-l Fazl's statement in the *A'in-i Akbari*,⁸ that Abú Ma'shar (Albuzar) visited Benares at an earlier period;—and the visit of Ibn-al Baithár to India, four centuries afterwards, rests solely on the authority of Leo Africanus.⁹

Again, when Fíroz Sháh, after the capture of Nagarkot, in the middle of the fourteenth century, obtained possession of a valuable Sanskrit Library, he ordered a work on philosophy, divination, and omens to be translated, under the name of *Daláil-i Fíroz-sháhi*, by Maulaná 'Izzu-d dín Khálid Khání,—and to have enabled the translator to do this, he must have acquired no slight knowledge of the original, before his selection for the duty.

In the Nawwáb Jalálu-d daulá's Library at Lucknow, there is a work on astrology, also translated from the Sanskrit into Persian in Fíroz Sháh's reign. A knowledge of Sanskrit must have prevailed pretty generally about this time, for there is in the Royal Library at Lucknow a work on the veterinary art, which was translated

¹ D'Herbelot, *Arts. Anbertkend, Ambahoumatah, Behergir*. See also *Ketab alkhasi, Ketab Roi al Hendi*, and several other articles under *Ketab*. Rampoldi, vol. iv. p. 328.

² Háji Khalfa, vol. i. p. 282; Diez, *Analecta Medica*, p. 118; D'Herbelot, art. *Cancah*.

³ Gildemeister, ix.

⁴ Dietz, p. 118; D'Herbelot, *Ketab Roi al Hendi*.

⁵ D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.*, tom. iv. p. 725; Diez, *Analecta Medica*, p. 117.

⁶ Háji Khalfa, vol. i. p. 263.

⁷ Casiri, *Bibl. Escorial.*, vol. i. p. 439.

⁸ *A'in-i Akbari*, vol. ii. p. 288; Gildemeister, 79.

⁹ Hottingeri, *Bibl. quadrup.* ap. Gildemeister, *Scriptt. Arabb.*, p. 80; *Mod. Univer. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 274; Reinaud's *Aboulfeda*, vol. i. p. 55; *Mémoire*, pp. 6, 289, 316, 336.

from the Sanskrit by order of Ghiyásu-dín Muhammad Sháh Khilji. This rare book, called *Kurrutu-l Mulk*, was translated as early as A.H. 783 (A.D. 1381), from an original, styled *Sálotar*, which is the name of an Indian, who is said to have been a Bráhmaṇ, and the tutor of Susruta. The Preface says that the translation was made "from the barbarous Hindí into the refined Persian, in order that there may be no more need of a reference to infidels." It is a small work, comprising only 41 pages 8vo. of 13 lines, and the style is very concise. It is divided into eleven chapters and thirty sections. The precise age of this work is doubtful, because, although it is plainly stated to have been translated in A.H. 783, yet the reigning prince is called Sultán Ghiyásu-dín Muhammad Sháh, son of Mahmúd Sháh, and there is no king so named whose reign exactly corresponds with that date. The nearest is Ghiyásu-dín 'Azím Sháh bin Sikandar Sháh, who reigned in Bengal from A.H. 769 to 775.¹ If Sultán Ghiyásu-dín 'Tughlik be meant, it should date sixty years earlier, and if the King of Málwa who bore that name be meant, it should be dated 100 years later; any way, it very much precedes the reign of Akbar.² The translator makes no mention in it of the work on the same subject, which had been previously translated from the Sanskrit into Arabic at Baghdád, under the name of *Kitábu-l Baitarat*.

From all these instances it is evident that Faizí did not occupy the entirely new field of literature for which he usually obtains credit.³ The same error seems to have predated the history of European scholarship in Sanskrit. We read as early as A.D. 1677,

¹ There is something respecting this reign in the History of Mecca which relates to India, and shows great communication between Bengal and Arabia.

² It is curious, that without any allusion to this work, another on the veterinary art, styled *Sálotari*, and said to comprise in the Sanskrit original 16,000 *shlokas*, was translated in the reign of Sháh Jabán, "when there were many learned men who knew Sanskrit," by Saiyid 'Abdu-lla Khán Bahádur Firoz Jang, who had found it amongst some other Sanskrit books, which during his expedition against Mewár, in the reign of Jahángir, had been plundered from Amar Singh, Ráná of Chitor, and "one of the chief *samúdras* of the hill-country." It is divided into twelve chapters, and is more than double the size of the other.

³ Faizí's *Lildavati* has many omissions, and the translation in some passages departs so far from the original "as induces the suspicion that Faizí contented himself with writing down the verbal explanation afforded by his assistants."—Dr. Taylor's *Lildavati*, p. 2.

of Mr. Marshall's being a proficient in the language, and without mentioning the dubious names of Anquetil du Perron¹ and Father Paolino,² others could be named, who preceded in this arduous path the celebrated scholars of the present period. Thus, Holwell says that he read and understood Sanskrit, and P. Pons, the Jesuit (1740), knew the language. In such an inquiry as this also must not be omitted the still more important evidence afforded by the *Mujmalat Tawárikh*, from which Extracts have been given in Vol. I. p. 100.

¹ See *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. i. p. 412; *Edinb. Rev.*, vol. i. p. 75; Heeren's *Historical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 129, and *Calcutta Review*, vol. xxiv. p. 471.

² Böhlen speaks of his *Grammatica Sanscædamicæ*, Rom. 1799, as "full of the grossest blunders;" Sir William Jones designates him as "homo trium litterarum," and Leyden is even less complimentary in his strictures: "The publication of his *Vyacarana*, Rom. 1804, has given a death-blow to his vaunted pretensions to profound Oriental learning, and shown, as was previously suspected, that he was incapable of accurately distinguishing Sanskrit from the vernacular languages of India. Equally superficial, inaccurate, and virulent in his invective, a critic of his own stamp would be tempted to retort on him his own quotation from Ennius:—

Simia quam similis turpiissima bestia vobis."

See *Das alte Indien*, vol. ii. p. 471; *As. Res.*, vol. x. p. 278; *Journ. Asiatique*, tom. ii. p. 216; Heeren, *Histor. Res.*, vol. ii. p. 195; M. Abel-Rémusat, *Nouv. Mém. Asiat.*, tom. ii. pp. 395-315; *Quart. Or. Mag.*, vol. iv. p. 158.

[Addition to the note on the Autobiography of Timúr in Vol. IV. p. 559.

Since the publication of Vol. IV., I have had access to a copy of the first volume of the *Matlá-us Sa'dáin* belonging to Professor Cowell; but I have not discovered in it any reference to the works from which the author drew his life of Timúr.

Timúr's "Testament" is given in the *Zafar-náma*, so the statement in p. 562 of Vol. IV. requires correction.—J. D.]

END OF VOL. V.