Born in Baghdad: ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī and the Composition of *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*

Hadi Jorati*

In this article we scrutinize the process of composition of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* through a closer look at the manuscript corpus as well as clues from the text to shed some light on the process of its composition and early canonization, as well as the career of ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī (1226-1283), which is intertwined with it. To that end, a number of textual clues, stylistic observations, and other manuscript evidence is utilized to argue that despite its early canonization and wide acceptance in an assumed "final" form, the text of *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* suffers from numerous inner inconsistencies and is at least in parts of multiple authorship. We further make a case for it to have assumed its "final" form in Baghdad.

Keywords: Juwaynī, Ṭūsī, Baghdad, manuscripts, Ilkhanid, Qazvini

Introduction

Ever since the production of Muḥammad Qazvini's edition of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*,[1] which took place over a period of 25 years in the first half of the 20th century, it has been an indispensable source for historians of the Mongol Empire, in particular the history of the early campaigns of Chinggis Khan, the fall of the Khwarazmian Empire (1077-1231), and the western campaigns of Hülegü Khan in the 1250s. This was boosted after Andrew Boyle published an annotated translation of Qazvini's edition, together with a translation of Qazvini's substantial notes and the translator's own notes, in 1958.[2] Together with the other major Persian sources from the Ilkhanid period,[3] *Jahāngushā* provides valuable insights into the establishment of Mongol rule in Iran and its administration, both directly, through its

* Correspondence details: Hadi Jorati, History & Near Eastern Studies, University of Massachusetts Amherst, email-address: hadi.jorati@gmail.com

This article is part of the volume *The Mongols' Baghdad. Knowledge Transmission through Manuscript Cultures before and after the Conquest*, guest editors: Bruno De Nicola and Nadine Löhr. To read all related articles, please access https://doi.org/10.1553/medievalworlds_no22_2025.

1 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, ed. Qazvini. *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* remains one of the earliest and most important sources on the Mongol campaigns in the west from Chinggis Khan to Hülegü Khan and the establishment of the Ilkhanate, since the author, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī, was a Persian bureaucrat in the service of the Mongols in Khurasan and witnessed many of the events himself, as well as having access to various accounts and archives due to his position.

2 Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror*, and the reprint Boyle and Morgan, *Genghis Khan*.

3 Most notably, Rashīd al-Dīn, Waṣṣāf, Mustawfī, and Qāshānī.

eISSN-Nr. 2412-3196
DOI 10.1553/medievalworlds_no22_2025s172

accounts of events, and indirectly, as an object of study onto itself, through critical inquiry into the process of its creation and dissemination.

Unsurprisingly, many of the sources from the period of Mongol expansion in the west, or the decades before, as well as the tumultuous but relatively brief period of Ilkhanid central rule, suffer from a variety of issues. These range from a complicated history of composition and transmission of the narratives of the Mongol conquest, to the reception and interpretation of those narratives in later periods (such as Timurid or Safavid) or by rival entities and parallel administrations (such as the Mamluks of Syria and Egypt). Furthermore, with a number of historiographical accounts of the period, there are notable inconsistencies within the textual corpus of the same work among its numerous manuscripts copied across centuries or in quotations by other pre-modern sources, or even within the same codex. This is perhaps clearest in the case of the massive oeuvre of *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh* (henceforth *RJT*) produced by the Ilkhanid administrator and scholar Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍlallah Hamadānī (1247-1318), which has been a hotly debated topic among scholars, with some significant recent work on this issue.[4] This phenomenon is not confined to *RJT* or more generally to the Ilkhanid sources. Rather, in variations and degrees, it also appears in the Arabic sources of the Mamluk period. However, for the purpose of this study the focus will be limited to Persian sources of the Ilkhanid period.

While *RJT* provides an example par excellence of the complicated and convoluted textual histories of the Persian historiographies of the Ilkhanid period, such issues are by no means confined to that work. As noted by scholars who have shown the immense complexities of *RJT*, the root cause of these textual issues lies in the tumultuous politics of the Early Ilkhanid state and its effect on the process of composition and compilation of these works. As such, a prime candidate to showcase such issues, although far more limited in size than *RJT*, is ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*.

Yet, despite clear signs pointing to, and a certain degree of awareness of, the existence of similar issues with what is perhaps the most fundamental, certainly one of the earliest, firsthand sources on Ilkhanid Iran[5] – namely, the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* – we are still lacking a serious study on its manuscript tradition and the process of its composition by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī, as well as on its reception and canonization, based on manuscript evidence. Indeed, the unquestionably excellent work of Qazvini and Boyle, which led to the production of the English translation of *Jahāngushā* that is now widely available, perhaps lulled the field into treating it as a more or less "final" product of this uniquely important text and pushed aside the concerns about its murky history.

To find evidence of this complicated and problematic textual history, and the inconsistencies that are witness to it, one need not go too far. Apart from the specific issues which will be discussed in this paper, one notices that in Qazvini's edition a piece by a different author is included at the end of the third volume of *Jahāngushā*: the *dhayl* of the contemporary Persian

4 See Melville, Jāmeʿ al-Tawārīḵ; Mūsavī, Jāmīʿ al-Tawārīkh; and more substantially, Kamola, *Making Mongol History*.

5 Other than the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*, the earliest sources in Persian include the account of Jūzjānī in *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, and in Arabic the short treatise by Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-Baṭṭīṭī titled *Aḥwāl Mulūk al-Tatār al-Mughūl*.

Shīʿī polymath, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī,[6] containing an account of the fall of Baghdad and the end of the Abbasid Caliphate, punctuating the rather abrupt end of volume 3 with a report of the most significant event of that campaign. A closer look at the *Jahāngushā* soon uncovers Ṭūsī's pivotal role in the campaign on Baghdad, which is where Juwaynī was based in his capacity as governor of Iraq for nearly the rest of his career, having arrived in the entourage of Hülegü Khan. This should also point out the obvious fact that *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* as a whole, as available to us via Qazvini and Boyle, must have taken shape in Ilkhanid Baghdad.

ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī and the Mongols

A number of secondary sources include accounts of the life and career of the historian ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī,[7] though ultimately a more nuanced and critical study of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, as well as of several other members of the Juwaynī clan, is sorely lacking.[8] Born in 1226 CE into a distinguished family of scholars and administrators,[9] he entered the service of the Mongols at a young age,[10] probably when he was no older than 20. When his father Bahāʾ al-Dīn died, in 1253,[11] he had already served the Mongol administration of Khurasan for over ten years,[12] in the service of Arghūn Āqā. He had traveled with Arghūn Āqā[13] to Qaraqorum twice, first in 1247-1248 together with his father[14] as Arghūn Āqā's secretary, and the second time in 1249-1250, during which he stayed in Mongolia for over a year. His third trip to Mongolia was to attend the *quriltai* that appointed Möngke as the new Great Khan. Arghūn Āqā returned to Khurasan in September 1253, but ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn stayed behind in Qaraqorum until a new

6 The *dhayl* is appended to the end of the Qazvini edition, vol. 3, 280-292.

7 Short of a full bibliography, a few encyclopedia entries on this topic present a good digest. See Barthold and Boyle, ʿAṭā Malik Djuwaynī; Lane, Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din; Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abū al-Muẓaffar; also Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xi-lxxvi. More recently, Shabestarī, *Khāndān-e Juwaynī*.

8 On the issue of various competing fabricated genealogies of the Juwaynī family, see Qazvini's Introduction, vol. 1, summarized in Lane, Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din. Shabestarī's discussion also largely relies on the data presented by Qazvini. Also compare Rajabzadeh, Jovayni family; Āl-e Dāvūd, Juwaynī, Khānedān. More recently two articles by Murtaḍā Dāneshyār dealing with Juwaynī and *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* also present a brief discussion on this issue; see Dāneshyār, Tārikhnegārī,-yi Aṭā Malik Juwaynī; Dāneshyār, Molāḥaẓāt-i dar bāb-i ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī. The Juwaynī clan traced their genealogy back to fellow Khurasani Persian nobleman and administrator, Faḍl ibn Rabīʿ, the chamberlain (*ḥājib*) of Caliph al-Amin and before him his father, Hārūn al-Rashīd. Faḍl was the son of Rabīʿ ibn Yūnus, who was, in turn, the chamberlain to caliphs al-Manṣūr and al-Mahdī. For more on this, see Ibn Ṭiqtiqā, *Fakhrī*, trans. Whitting, 239-240; Ibn ʿInaba, *ʿUmdat al-Ṭālib*, ed. Rajāyī, 180-181.

9 Cf. Rajabzadeh, Jovayni family. His grandfather, Shams al-Dīn (senior) served Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh, and later his son Sulṭān Jalāl al-Dīn on the run, until he died in Akhlāṭ in 1229 (cf. Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xv-xx).

10 Cf. Khwāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, vol. 3/1, ed. Dabīrsiyāqī, 95.

11 Cf. Khosrobeygī, *Sāzmān-e Edārī-ye Khwārazmshahiyān*.

12 Cf. Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 6-7:
به ممارست اشغال و ملابست اعمال در اکتساب علم اهمال ... و از نصیحت پدر خویش بهاء الدین محمد غافل ماندم
و.. حالا ۰۱ سال میشود که پاي در راه اغتراب نهاده از تحصیل اجتناب نموده و اوراق علوم نسج علیه العنکبوت شده

13 On Arghūn Aqā, see Lane, Arghun Aqa: Mongol Bureaucrat.

14 During the first trip, they never reached Qaraqorum, but rather returned to Khurasan when they received, somewhere near Talas, the news that Güyük Khan had died. Cf. Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abū al-Muẓaffar.

yarligh was prepared appointing his father Bahāʾ al-Dīn as the *ṣāḥib dīwān*.[15] It was then that he started composing his book of history, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*.[16]

From 1256, with the arrival of Hülegü in Khurasan, ʿAṭā Malik served him instead. Arghūn Āqā left for the great *ordo*, after appointing his son Kerai Malik, Aḥmad Bitikchī, and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī in charge of the affairs of Iraq, Khurasan, and Māzandarān.[17] Juwaynī accompanied Hülegü Khan in the westward campaign, which culminated in the fall of Baghdad in 1258.[18] Instead of joining the Syrian campaign, he stayed in Baghdad and was appointed governor the following year (1259). He held that post almost continuously until his death in the plains of Mughān in Azerbaijan in March 1283, after a prolonged episode of rivalry with fellow Ilkhanid administrator Majd al-Mulk Yazdī, and was buried in Tabriz in the Charandāb cemetery.[19] During the intrigues of the Mongol court, he was dismissed and re-instated as the governor of Baghdad a number of times, and was even briefly put in charge of the *Awqāf* of Mecca and Medina, under Tegüder Aḥmad.[20]

Juwaynī's position under Hülegü Khan was already on the rise during the campaign in 1253. After its departure from Shafūrqān near Balkh, the entourage passed by several localities that had been laid waste during the first Mongol campaigns under Chinggis Khan. At Khabūshān (Qūchān), Juwaynī pleaded with Hülegü Khan to repair some of the damage, and in response Hülegü apportioned funds from his own personal treasury (*khazāna-yi khāṣṣa*) for rebuilding the city.[21] During the siege of Maymundiz, one of the most important Ismaili fortresses of the Rūdbār region, where the Ismaili imam Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh resided, Juwaynī was the head of the envoy who delivered the conditions of the surrender and the transcript of Hülegü Khan's *amān* to Khūrshāh.[22] Qazvini holds that Juwaynī also had the privilege of inspecting the castles, especially the library of Alamūt, after it surrendered, following the fall of Maymundiz.[23]

For the remainder of his career, Juwaynī served as the governor of Baghdad, in all for 17 years, in an autonomous capacity, according to his own account in *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*.[24] He

15 Cf. Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abū al-Muẓaffar.

16 Cf. Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxiii-xxv. Qazvini also adds, on the motivation of Juwaynī, that he started this book "upon insistence of dear friends" (*bi khwāhash-i dūstān*); Lane, Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din, and Mūsavī, Jahāngushā, have likewise interpreted this at face value, that perhaps some close confidant had enticed ʿAṭā Malik to start the composition. More likely, this is a formula, as it was used commonly in a number of prominent medieval Persian and Arabic texts, perhaps most notably in the *Gulastān* of Saʿdī of Shiraz, a contemporary of ʿAṭā Malik.

17 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxvi, corresponding to the text of *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 259; also cf. Bahār, *Sabkshenāsī*, vol. 3, 58, who reports the same, on the authority of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Khwāndamīr.

18 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xi-lx; Browne, *Literary History*, vol. 1, xix-xlvii; Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror*, xxx-xxxvii; and echoed in Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni.

19 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxv.

20 Amitai, Al-Nuwayri.

21 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxvii.

22 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxiii.

23 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxiii.

24 cf Juwaynī, *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*, ed. Mahyār, 60:
دست او را در حل و عقد امور و رتق و فتق مصالح جمهور مطلق گردانید

technically assumed this position under a Mongol overseer, Sughunjaq Noyan, the military commander in charge of Iraq and Fārs. Iraq was in this period an important and relatively prosperous province, with close ties to the central court where his brother, Shams al-Dīn was later appointed as a chief executive (vizier) under Hülegü and later Abaqa. When Abaqa Khan succeeded Hülegü in 1265, he confirmed ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn in his position as well.[25]

Together with his brother and other members of the Juwaynī clan, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was a patron of arts and scholarship, counting among his protégés many scholars and literary figures such as Saʿdī of Shiraz, Pūr-i Bahā Jāmi, Humām Tabrīzī, Badr al-Dīn Jājaramī, and Jamāl al-Dīn Kāshī.[26] Qazvini narrates an anecdote from Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī that Juwaynī would reward with 1,000 gold dinars any notable scholar who dedicated a book to him. A notable recipient of the generosity of ʿAṭā Malik and the Juwaynī clan was his contemporary scholar and fellow historian, Ibn Bībī, who recorded his debt to them at the end of his chronicle.[27]

Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā remains one of the only two major extant pieces authored by Juwaynī (the other being *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*).[28] Qazvini identified a third piece, attached to the beginning of one of the manuscripts from the Bibliothèque nationale de France that he examined, which he holds to be a separate item authored by Juwaynī.[29] More recently, Sajjādī mentions that he has identified some writings by Juwaynī, including correspondence, bound together with a copy of the *Rasāʾil* of Muntajib al-Dīn Juwaynī, in a Persian manuscript in St. Petersburg.[30]

The Composition of Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā

Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā has long been distinguished in Persian historiography for a host of reasons. Most notably, it is the earliest Persian source from within the Mongol Empire, containing firsthand accounts of various events the author witnessed himself, or narrated from sources to which he had exclusive access. *Jahāngushā* is also hailed for ushering in a new style of historiography in the Islamic East, that directly or indirectly influenced many later historians in the Persian tradition, including Rashīd, Waṣṣāf, Mīrkhwānd, and Khwāndamīr, to name a few, and in some sense nearly all later Persian historians.[31] Overall judgments of modern scholarship on Juwaynī and the *Jahāngushā* vary widely. Melville holds that Juwaynī

25 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xxxi. Also see Khwāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, vol. 3, ed. Dabīrsiyāqī, 108. For more details on the events of his governorship, see Eqbāl, *Tārīkh-e Mughūl*, 201-203.

26 Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i Adabiyyāt*, 1209-1213.

27 Lane, Jovayni,ʿAlāʾ-al-Din. On Ibn Bībī, see Duda, Ibn Bībī; Diyānat, Ibn Bībī; and Yazici, Ebn Bībī.

28 Composed ca. 680 AH around the time he was released from the first imprisonment under Abaqa. See Māhyār's introduction to his edition of Juwaynī, *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*, ed. Māhyār, 3-20; also Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abu al-Muẓaffar.

29 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xliii.

30 Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abu al-Muẓaffar.

31 This effect stretched into the Afsharid and even the Qajar period, with such texts as *Jahāngushā-yi Nādirī* by Mīrzā Mahdī Khan Astarābādī and *Rawḍat al-Ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī* by Riḍā Qulī Khan Hidāyat. Many historians of the Ilkhanid period or immediately following Juwaynī acknowledge, directly or indirectly, the influence of Juwaynī and *Jahāngushā*. One exception is Ḥamdullāh Mustawfī. For more on that see Lane, Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din.

gives a "rosy and idealized picture" of the harmony among the sons and descendants of Chinggis Khan;[32] Qazvini calls it "the most important, and the most trusted" source on the Mongol campaigns in Iran.[33] Bahār sums up Juwaynī's intentions as dual: "his first motivation is glorifying his patrons, … and a sober criticism of the state of affairs and the underlying factors to the Mongols' victory and dominance".[34]

Jahāngushā has also been of interest as a fine specimen of ornate Persian prose in the Medieval period. It has been the subject of literary and stylistic studies, by scholars such as E.G. Browne and Muḥammad Taqī Bahār who scrutinized its stylistic features and influence. It is helpful to consider the book from both angles, historical and literary, as a better understanding of one aspect also helps with the other. Minorsky made a fine observation that Juwaynī "represents the tradition of writing elaborated in Seljuq chancelleries" that came to maturity in this period and set the standard for all subsequent works of the same genre.[35] In contrast to the later works that are dedicated to a sovereign or at least are prepared with a royal audience in mind, it is not clear who Juwaynī's intended audience is. It is possible that it was partly prepared for the court, or perhaps for fellow administrators, his immediate circle of Persian notables in the Mongol administration, many of whom were, in fact, former officials in the Khwarazmian empire or came from the same background.

It is generally agreed that the composition of *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* took place between 1252 and 1260 CE (more accurately, 650-658 AH). Juwaynī mentions in the text explicitly that he started composing the text in 650 AH, but is unclear when it was concluded. The generally agreed upon "completion" date of 1260[36] would place the date two years after the Fall of Baghdad, which is the last event recorded in the book (according to Qazvini's edition) and one year after he assumed his post as the governor of Baghdad. If we accept the current scholarly judgment on the motivation for Juwaynī to record a history of the Mongol conquests – in particular, his volume 3, which records the conquests of Hülegü Khan – it is unclear why it should conclude at the fall of Baghdad, completely excluding the Syrian campaign, despite its overall success. A closer look at the topics covered in each volume reveals further that the volumes are, to a great extent, independent. It is likely that the project was initiated with a limited scope and grew only over time. Likewise, it is not clear if the scope of each volume or of the entire project was set early on. It is hence appropriate to consider the three volumes as three independent, though interconnected, compositions. The relevant question would then be when the book took its now widely recognized "definitive" form in three volumes, as suggested by both Qazvini's and Boyle's editions. Both historiographical and stylistic observations can provide further clues to the composition and division of the text.

32 Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni.

33 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, iv-vi.

34 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 53.

35 Minorsky, Pūr-e Bahā and his poetry.

36 See, for instance, Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni; Mūsavī, Jahāngushā. More to the point, Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, lxxxi-lxxxv.

There are quite a few summaries and digests of the contents of *Jahāngushā* available, in varying level of details, starting with that of Qazvini himself,[37] as well as that of Browne in his *Literary History of Persia*,[38] and more recently those of Melville (in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica*), Mūsavī (in *Dāʾirat al-maʿārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*), as well as that of Dāneshyār.[39] They can be summarized as follows.

In the first volume, the text starts with a ceremonial, almost formulaic introduction, on the occasion of composition – "*sabab-i taʾlīf*"[40] – and a brief expression on the goal of writing history, the "causes and conditions" (*ʿilal wa-asbāb*) of the Mongol campaign and conquest of Eastern Iran, which follows in detail, peppered with occasional observations on the "consequences" (*āthār*) of the campaigns or overall assessment of it. This includes observations that border on rhetorical, such as the assessment that the defeat of the Muslims at the hand of the Mongols was a "punishment for their sins". Even in chapter headings one can find such summary appraisals.[41]

Although the narrative of volume 1 is locally smooth, at times it rather "jumps" from one topic to the next.[42] One may observe that the transition between segments is abrupt, and the different segments do not necessarily follow a direct chronological order. Furthermore, there are a number of lacunae or errors in his presentation of the information on the Mongols. Mūsavī has identified at least five, ranging from incomplete information on Chinggis Khan's wives and brothers, to confusion about Mongol tribes,[43] and even corrupt transcriptions of personal names, which reflects the limitations of his sources.[44]

There are further clues to the sources Juwaynī used. For instance he mentions in the preamble (*dībācha*) that in his travels to Mongolia for certain things he had "studied" or "looked into" sources (*muṭālaʿa*), and other things he "observed" himself (*muʿāyana*), and the rest he has heard from "trusted sources" (*muʾtabarān wa maqbūlān)* that remain mostly unnamed, though on one occasion he identifies his source as his own grandfather, Shams al-Dīn (senior), on the authority of his father, Bahāʾ al-Dīn.[45] Mūsavī notes that Juwaynī's information

37 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, lxxx-lxxxiii.

38 Browne, *Literary History*, vol. 3, lxi-lxiii.

39 Dāneshyār, Molāḥaẓāt-i dar Bāb-i ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī.

40 His motive is often listed as wanting to "immortalize the glorious actions of the 'lord of the age,' *Pādshāh-e Vaqt*", i.e., Möngke Khan (see, e.g., Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni). I rather disagree with this interpretation, as this expression is all but a commonly used rhetorical device. See, for instance, the *dībācha* of Saʿdī's *Gulastān*. Also, I hold, there is the possibility that the term *pādshāh-e vaqt* refers to Hülegü Khan. (Mūsavī hints at something similar his entry in *DBE* on *Jahāngushā*.)

41 E.g., "evidence of the hidden divine purpose in the rebellion of Chinggis Khan" (*ḥaqīqat-e serr-e elāhī dar khurūj-e Changīz Khān*); see Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 16.

42 Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni, asserts that "it would be helpful if he made it clear what he was doing" and goes on to comment that Juwaynī conjoins and "juxtaposes" unconnected passages and that it could sometimes "create a powerful and occasionally cathartic literary effect".

43 For instance, Juwaynī appears to consider Saqiz and Naiman as two distinct tribes, rather than the Turkish and Mongolian names for the same tribe.

44 For more on this, see Mūsavī, Jahāngushā.

45 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 134.

on Küchlüg is defective.[46] Apart from the oral sources listed above, Juwaynī clearly also utilized written sources in the composition of volume 1. There are clues to some of his written sources, for instance he quotes or otherwise mentions the *Maqāmāt* of Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadānī[47] and al-Zamakhsharī's Qur'anic Exegesis, *al-Kashshāf*.[48]

Volume 2 contains an account of the Khwarazmian Empire, especially under the last two sovereigns, wars with the Ghurids and the Qarakhitai, various local dynasties of Central Asia and Iran, and the campaigns of Jalāl al-Dīn against the Mongols as well as the armies of the Abbasid caliph, through his last days. Melville comments that the coverage of Jalāl al-Dīn is rather "heroic" and more in line with the style of the champions of the *Shāhnāma* than a book of history.[49] Again Juwaynī inserts a comment on the causes of the Mongol campaign and the defeat of the Khwarazmian Empire, and puts the blame on various parties, including the senior administration, such as a certain Sharaf al-Dīn Khwārizmī, the Mustawfī, who harbored enmity towards Juwaynī.[50]

Juwaynī's sources for volume 2 appear to be mixed. In the preface of this volume he mentions two written sources he consulted, namely *Mashārib al-Tajārib* of Abulḥasan Bayhaqī (ibn Funduq) and *Jawāmiʿ al-ʿUlūm* of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. Elsewhere in this volume he mentions further written sources he had studied, consulted if not quoted, paraphrased, or otherwise used as a source, such as *Zubdat al-Tawārīkh* of Ṣadr al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn Nāṣir al-Ḥusaynī and *Tārīkh-i Yamīnī*.[51] Elsewhere in the same volume he mentions some of his oral sources: his own cousin, Shams al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad, and a teacher of his named Murtaḍā.[52] Mūsavī claims that Juwaynī's narrative of the early Khwarazmians in volume 2 of *Jahāngushā* runs "a close parallel" to that of Ibn Athīr in *al-Kāmil*.

Volume 3 is perhaps the most interesting, and presents a mix.[53] It starts with a new formal introduction (*dībācha*), and includes a short section on Tolui and his wife, the ascension of Möngke Khan and the opposition of Ögedeids, followed by an expansive account of the campaigns of Hülegü Khan in the west (Iran) culminating in the fall of the Ismaili fortresses of the Rūdbār region. In Qazvini's edition, attached to the end of volume 3 there is an appendix (*dhayl*) by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī,[54] though it is not included in Boyle's translation, but instead appears as a separate piece.[55] It is unclear why the *Jahāngushā* project concludes where it does. Scholars have suggested various interpretations, from Juwaynī's "pre-occupation with his new role as the governor of Baghdad, leaving no time for scholarly endeavors" to "the

46 Mūsavī, Jahāngushā.

47 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 8.

48 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 12.

49 Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni.

50 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 282-283.

51 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 122-144.

52 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 79.

53 See Bira, *Mongolian Historical Writing*, 84-93; see also Melville, Jahānngošā.

54 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 3, ed. Qazvini, 280-292; Wickens, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī on the Fall of Baghdad; Boyle, Death of the last Abbasid caliph. It is worth noting that the title of the *dhayl* is not *dhayl* "of Ṭūsī", but *dhayl-i Jahāngushā*, "according to Ṭūsī's copy"; see below.

55 Boyle, Death of the last Abbasid caliph. See also Wickens, Nasir Ad-Din Tusi on the fall of Baghdad.

events that followed" being too "painful" for him to include them in his book.[56] Volume 3 also stands out since nearly the entire account is based on Juwaynī's own firsthand observations, although there is some background information filled in, such as the history of the Ismailis, which is based on written accounts. Juwaynī also mentions, for instance, *Sargudhasht-i Sayyidinā* and *Tārīkh-i Jīl wa Daylam* (both without author attribution), which he presumably found in the library of Alamūt. Mūsavī holds there are also parallels with the text of Ibn Athīr in the part on the history of the Fatimids.

Scholars have pointed out issues with the text that suggest its problematic, or at least complicated, nature. Those include parallelism with various texts by different authors, self-referencing, and narrative passages in the text that occasionally end abruptly or seem to contradict other parts of the text.[57] Such concerns were already raised by Qazvini,[58] and later by Boyle, who notes in the introduction to the translation "several indications" that the work was unrevised and unfinished and expresses his uncertainty about whether this is the work's intended final form. He then adds that "it is nevertheless in a reasonably polished form with considerable erudition and sophistication".[59] Melville notes that even though the narrative is "essentially chronological" it includes several internal cross references (three instances being vol. 1, p. 199; vol. 2, p. 45; and vol. 3, p. 61).[60] This had been noted by Boyle, who takes it as an indication of the "unfinished" nature of the project.[61] On the other hand, Melville comments that despite his departure from strict annalistic chronography or even a completely direct line of time, Juwaynī still has a "sense of proper place" for things. He adds that the second volume contains a fair number of "flashbacks" that punctuate the flow of the narrative in a fairly logical manner, and that occasionally there are repetitions in Juwaynī's writing, which he takes to be "a feature of his style".[62] This leaves the judgment open as to whether the apparent "defects" in the text are signs of the unfinished nature of the work (either volume 3 or even the whole book) or if they are simply stylistic choices by the author.

From the clues to his sources offered by Juwaynī himself, and the process of writing his book, it is clear that his composition was spread across many different sittings, in different localities, sometimes while on long-distance travel "when the party would briefly stop to rest".[63] Paired with the observations listed above on the abundant textual issues and substantive lacunae, this raises the distinct possibility that the book, as available to us, never underwent the process of a final edit. I will argue in support of this position and will also scrutinize

56 Lane lists a few such judgments in Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din. He adds that "the 'missing piece' was provided by his confidant and fellow Persian scholar".

57 For instance, some information given on Sharaf al-Dīn Khwārizmī (Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 230) is negated elsewhere in the same volume.

58 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, lxxxiv-lxxxv

59 Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror*, xv-xxxvx.

60 Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni.

61 Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror*, xxxvi.

62 Melville, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni.

63 در اسفار بعيد يك ساعتي در فرصت نزول اختلاص ميكند و ان حكايات را سواد مينوسيد

(when I find an hour when the caravan has halted, to scribe an account of the events). Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 118.

the text to evaluate another hypothesis, that the text is of multiple authorship.[64] I will argue that despite its early canonization and widespread utilization, the text of *Jahāngushā* suffers from serious textual difficulties, resulting from a complicated process of composition, which is still poorly understood. Likewise, the canonization of *Jahāngushā*, both in its early reception by Juwaynī's immediate successors (such as Waṣṣāf) and in the modern period based on the texts produced by Qazvini and Boyle, needs to be scrutinized to shed light on the different layers of the text and the circumstances of its production. Narrative analysis paired with other clues from material evidence (manuscript corpus), as well as features of the text as the vehicle (grammatical, lexical, orthographical, and stylistic), can give us a better understanding of the process of composition and canonization of *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*.

Material Evidence I: Manuscripts Consulted by Qazvini

Qazvini based his edition of volumes 1 and 2 on seven manuscripts, all housed in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris:

Suppl. pers. 205 (manuscript A); Suppl. pers. 1375 (B); Suppl. pers. 1556 (C); Ancien fonds pers. 69 (D); Suppl. pers. 1563 (H); Suppl. pers. 207 (W); and Suppl. pers. 206 (Z). Among these, the most important ones for the purpose of this study are A, B, C, D, and H, and they will be discussed in more detail.

Qazvini chose MS A (Suppl. pers. 205) as his exemplar, since it was the oldest copy known to him, dated 4 Dhulḥajja 689 (8 December 1290), only eight years after Juwaynī had died, and it was a complete manuscript, though without explicit provenance. This is a most curious manuscript, and unique in many ways. The name of the copyist is recorded as Rashīd al-Khwāfī, which suggest an eastern Iranian provenance. The name of the copyist bears a striking resemblance to the name of a distinguished historian of the Timurid period, Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh ibn Luṭfullāh ibn ʿAbd al-Rashīd al-Hirawī (or al-Khwāfī), or Ḥāfeẓ-e Abrū,[65] which suggest the scribe was a grandfather of the famed historian. We also know from Ḥāfeẓ-e Abrū's own attestation in *Majmaʿ al-Tawārīkh al-Sulṭāniyya* that one of his main sources for that composition was *Jahāngushā*,[66] which further supports the hypothesis on the identity of the scribe. The manuscript bears the ownership seal of numerous owners between the 14th and 18th centuries CE,[67] with the oldest being from 724 AH and one from 911 AH[68] belonging to the Timurid sultan Ḥusayn Bayqarā.[69]

Qazvini notes that this manuscript includes numerous misspellings, especially of Mongol proper names, and even of Arabic poetry. Other features include a no-dot transcription (which he notes was common in old manuscripts from eastern Iran). Among the observations

64 See Jorati, *Science and Society*.

65 Cf. Āl-e Dāvūd, Ḥāfeẓ-e Abrū.

66 Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Majmaʿ al-Tawārīkh al-Sulṭāniyya*, ed. Zanjānī, 239-240.

67 Qazvini lists some dated 724, 727, 771, 775, 778, 780, 1113, 1136, and 1162 AH, suggesting it exchanged hands frequently during the 14th century CE, and then again during the 17th century CE; see Introduction, vol. 1, civ-cxi.

68 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cv-cxi.

69 The exact note reads من کتب فقیر امیر حسین بن بیقرا میرزا

by Qazvini on this manuscript is an orthographical peculiarity having to do with *dhāl-i muʿjama* (i.e., the letter *dāl* transcribed with a dot, identical to the letter *dhāl*, which is a feature of early Khurasani style when the letter *dāl* is preceded by a vowel – e.g., in *Gunbad* and *bāshad* – or by one of the "weak" letters *alif*, *yā* and *wāw* – e.g., in *uftād* or *Qubād*). He notes that the use of *dhāl-i muʿjama* is uncommon for this period. He then states, based on a quotation by the near contemporaneous Shams ibn Qays al-Rāzī,[70] that this excludes an eastern provenance. I argue to the contrary, that the same quotation is proof for eastern provenance, as the expression *dar lafẓ ārand* in the text he quotes from Shams al-Rāzī, which Qazvini has interpreted as referencing the text, should be understood to be referring to pronunciation, not transcription. Other orthographical features recorded by Qazvini – for instance, the transcribing (*ḍabt*) of the common conjunction مك as يك – are likewise features of the eastern (Khurasani) conventions.

MS B is likewise complete (i.e. it contains all three volumes according to Qazvini's edition),[71] and was copied in the early 14th century CE. Qazvini notes "numerous orthographical errors" and that some folios are in a different hand, and that elsewhere pages seem to have been inserted later, presumably to replace the missing parts.

MS C is another early copy, without an exact date but no later than the mid-15th century since it contains the ownership seal of the famed Mamluk-era scholar Shihāb al-Dīn al-Dimashqī, better known as Ibn ʿArabshāh (d. 1450), a contemporary of Timur and author of his biography, *ʿAjāyib al-Maqdūr*.[72] It is bound together with three other titles, all in the hand of the same unidentified copyist. They are Ṭūsī's *dhayl*;[73] Juwaynī's other composition, *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*; and a short piece titled *Risāla fī Tārīkh Saljūqīya*, which Qazvini identifies as a summary of Rāvandī's *Rāḥat al-Ṣudūr*. Qazvini observed that this copy contains marginal notes by Ibn ʿArabshāh, 25 of them in all, often simply translating chapter headings from Persian into Arabic, though in one instance he mentions that he will include an account of the Mongols in his "forthcoming" composition on the history of Timur. Since the definitive date of the composition of *ʿAjāyib al-Maqdūr* is held to be 840 AH, it places this copy before 1437 CE. Qazvini has also recorded various orthographical features of this copy. He concludes that the orthographical style is different from that of MS A, which suggests a divergence in time or locality.

MS D likewise contains all three volumes fully, copied by a certain Ḥalawy in Muḥarram 938 AH (August-September 1531). Qazvini notes that the text as it appears in this copy is "majorly divergent" from other copies (*tafāwuthā-yi bisyār dārad*). Yet, he interprets this as the intention of the copyist, who he believes was "summarizing and condensing" the book.[74] He takes frequent misspellings of Arabic, Turkic and Mongolian words as further evidence

70 در زبان اهل غزنین و بلخ و ماوراء النهر ذال معجمه نیست و جمله دالات مهمله در لفظ ارند. Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, lxxxvii-xcii.

71 Cf. Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cxi-cxii.

72 Cf. Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cxiii-cxxii.

73 Which Qazvini notes is "missing from most copies" (*az ghālib-i nusakh mafqūd ast*); see his Introduction, vol. 1, cxiii-cxxii.

74 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cxxiv.

that the copy was prepared "in a rush".[75] He also notes that volume 1 and 2 do not appear separately in this manuscript, but as if they were a single volume; at the end of volume 2, the copyist simply writes "the first volume of *Jahāngushā* is concluded" (*tamām shud mujallad-i avval az jahāngushā-yi juwaynī*).

MS H also contains all three volumes. It is from the early Qajar period, with the copyist named as a certain Jaʿfar Āṣifī. While Qazvini's judgment on the manuscript is that it is "extremely defective and without any real value", he notes that this copy was made from a very early exemplar, and, like in MS D, volumes 1 and 2 appear together as one volume – indeed, the note at the end of this joint volume (containing volumes 1 and 2) reads as "vol. 1 was finished in the month of Rajab 659 AH [June 1261]".[76] Qazvini notes that a large part of volume 3 (after the *Fatḥnāma*) is missing in this manuscript, which he takes as more evidence for the copy being defective and useless.

For the production of volume 3, which happened some 25 years after his edition of the first volume, Qazvini added five more manuscripts, though as he has already compared one of the new manuscripts against two others in the Bodleian, the manuscript pool can be considered as 13 in total.[77] He continued using MS A (Suppl. pers. 205) as his exemplar, changing the text with a variant only when it is "clearly corrupt".[78] Qazvini notes that the "defects" he had previously identified in his original seven manuscripts are even more common in the additional set. For instance, a few of the additional manuscripts are missing the entirety of the section on the Ismailis and others are missing parts of that section (from the end of the *Fatḥnāma*). Furthermore, these omissions are not noted by the copyist since the text simply ends in a prayer, often with the familiar triangular shaped ending, as if the manuscript was finished, indicating that the copyist believed the text to be complete. Puzzled by this, Qazvini suggests that perhaps the "incomplete" copies could be copies of defective originals, where a part was missing but left blank for future completion.[79] He dismisses the helpfulness of most of the newly added manuscripts but does comment specifically on one of them (his MS Hā, Suppl. pers. 2018, which was acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale de France after the completion of the edition of volume 1). MS Hā is a very early copy (copied 2 Rabīʿ I 700, that is, 15 November 1300), and is divided into only two volumes, in the manner of MS D from his original list, with the same definitive ending at the end of volume 2 declaring it volume 1. Qazvini decides that despite this, and despite what he calls "mistakes and considerable lacunae", this particular manuscript should be added to the list and consulted, since it has become clear to him that it is from an entirely different recension than all other manuscripts consulted by him. It also contains a curious note similar to an ownership mark, which appears on a

75 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cxxiv.

76 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, cxxiv: بعونه تعالي تم مجلد الاول في شهر رجب المرجب سنة ٦٥٩

77 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, x-lii.

78 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xxiv.

79 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, x-lii.

separate page in a different hand inserted between volumes 2 and 3, containing a few lines of poetry in Arabic, Persian and Uyghur, with a note dating it to 724 AH.[80]

One of the new manuscripts Qazvini examined for volume 3 (*nuskha-yi mīm*) is a copy in the hand of Iranian scholar Mojtabā Mīnovī,[81] made from a very early manuscript dated 698 AH from the reign of Ghazan. Qazvini deems it too defective to be useful but notes that at the end of the codex there is a note declaring it was copied from "Juwaynī's (personal) copy" or "Juwaynī's version" (*nuskha-yi ṣāḥib dīwān*).[82] Another curious fact about it is that the three volumes are bound together with a copy of *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān* and the *dhayl* of Ṭūsī, which Qazvini takes as an indication that the *dhayl* was meant to be part of the text of *Jahāngushā* as the codex appears to have bound together all writings by Juwaynī.[83] He notes, however, that Ṭūsī's *dhayl* does only appear in three of the 13 manuscripts he consulted, and where it is not present there is "no indication" that it is missing.[84] He even mentions that the exact same text, complete with the same orthography (*rasm*), and attributed to Ṭūsī appears at the end of the section on al-Mustaʿṣim in a manuscript of *Tārīkh-i Nīkpay*[85] in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Ancien fonds pers. 61, fols. 460v-462v). He decides that such inclusions were "common" and by itself this does not mean that Ṭūsī's *dhayl* is a separate piece, and that it is most likely meant to be part of the *Jahāngushā*.[86] To further drive home his point, he comments that Rashīd's composition *RJT* utilizes other texts in the same manner, and indeed "there are parts of *Jahāngushā* that appear in *RJT* with little or no change".[87] He mentions that he occasionally consulted manuscripts and printed versions of *RJT*, especially Suppl. pers. 1113, whose illustrations he used for the production of his edition, for a better reading of the text of *Jahāngushā* manuscripts, when possible. Furthermore, he comments that what appears to be an Arabic translation of Ṭūsī's *dhayl* "with a slight reduction" appears in the *Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal* of Bar Hebraeus, which he once again takes as an indication the *dhayl* was meant to be a part of *Jahāngushā*.[88]

In fact, the parallelism between the text of *Jahāngushā* and *RJT* in the sections that fall under volume 3 of *Jahāngushā* provides more clues to the question of authorship, as will be discussed below.

---

80 More precisely, to 26 May 1324, in Mardin, by a Central Asian copyist, Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn Ḥasan ibn Maḥmūd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Samarqandī, known as Muḥammad Bakhshī:
كتبه العبد الراجي رحمة ربه.. محمد بن عمر بن حسن بن محمود بن عبدالعزيز السمرقندي المعروف بمحمد بخشي بماردين المحروسة في تاريخ اول جمادي الاخر سنة اربع و عشرين و سبعمايه

81 On Mīnovī and his role in this process, see Omīdsālār, Minovi, Mojtaba.

82 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xxxii.

83 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, x-lii.

84 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xlii.

85 Nīkpay (Muḥammad ibn Masʿūd) apparently lived in the early 8th century, though not much more is known about him; cf. Mūnesī, Tārīkh-i Masʿūd Nīkpay; al-Hādī, Muʾallif-i Tārīkh-i Nīkpay kīst?

86 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xliii.

87 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xliii.

88 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xlv.

Material Evidence II: Iranian Manuscripts

Given the absence of a full study of the manuscript corpus of *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*, which is sorely lacking, I utilized the notes prepared by the project FANKHA (*Fihristgān-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Iran*), prepared under the supervision of Muṣṭafā Derāyatī,[89] on the manuscripts of *Jahāngushā* held in Iranian libraries. FANKHA remains the definitive reference source of its genre, as for each entry it also gives references to the same title in earlier lists: *Fihristwāra-yi Dastnawishtahā-yi Iran* (DENA), Āqā Buzurg Ṭihrānī's *al-Dharīʿa*,[90] Monzavī's *Fihristwāra*,[91] and Monzavī's *Fihrist*,[92] as well as printed versions.[93] *Jahāngushā* is listed under the letter *tā* in volume 6 (pp. 617-620). In all, Derāyatī names 44 manuscripts, listed chronologically (when dated). Of these, all are quite recent (from the Qajar period, 1794-1925), with the exception of the first eight manuscripts, which are:

No. 1 Tehran University no. 182F was copied from an exemplar dated 698 AH, with the ownership seal of Amja Husayn Pasha.

No. 2 Tehran University no. 4025/1F was copied from the Mīnovī collection dated 698 AH. The copyist is mentioned as Muḥammadshāh b Ali b Maḥmūd b Shādbakht Shaykh Ḥāfiẓ Iṣfahānī.

No. 3 Tehran Mīnovī 77/1 was copied in the Kūrān district of Isfahan.

No. 4 Tehran Majles no. 16427 was copied in 814 AH.

No. 5 Tehran Mahdavi no. 67/1 contains all three volumes in a single volume, and was copied in 849 AH.

No. 6 Tehran Sepahsālār no. 231 has parts of the *dībācha* missing. The conclusion of volume 1 is followed by eight folios that contain parts of al-Bayhaqī's *Mashārib al-Tajārib* and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's *Jāmiʿ al-ʿUlūm*, followed by a small portion of volume 3. It was copied in the 11th century AH, and was held by the *waqf* of Muḥammad Taqī Tihrānī.

No. 7 Qum Markaz Iḥyā no. 1805 contains only volumes 1 and 2, and was copied in the 11th century AH.

No. 8 Tehran Bunyād Lughatnāma Dihkhudā no. 108 was copied in 1011 AH. It contains only volumes 1 and 2.

Of the rest of the manuscripts in Derāyatī's list, many are lavishly bound, have leather covers, are in a good nastaliq calligraphy, and often contain ownership seals and mention the name of the copyist (or the patron, in the case of *waqf*). Their provenance varies: Tehran, Qum, Mashad, Isfahan, Hamadan, and so on. The last sentence of the various manuscripts varies widely; there are at least eight different formulae mentioned by Derāyatī. Some copies end

89 Derāyatī (ed.), *Fihristgān-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Irān FANKHA*, 617-620.

90 Āqā Buzurg Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīʿa ilā Taṣānif al-Shīʿa*.

91 Monzavī, *Fihristwāra*.

92 Monzavī, *Fihrist*.

93 The references for *Jahāngushā* appear in Derāyatī (ed.), *DENA*, vol 2, 696 (which lists 45 manuscripts); Āqā Buzurg Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīʿa*, vol. 3, 247-248; Monzavī, *Fihristwāra*, vol. 2, 945; Monzavī, *Fihrist*, vol. 6, 4306.

with prayers, while some end randomly at the end of an episode or even in the middle of an episode. Other notable manuscripts in Derāyatī's list include:

No. 9 Mashad Āstān Quds 4222 contains only the second half of volume 3 and ends with a prayer.[94]

No. 11 Qum Markaz Iḥyā no. 2096 ends with the same prayer as MS no. 9.

No. 18 Tehran Melli no. 7 contains the three volumes in a single volume and ends abruptly in the middle of the section on Ismailis.[95]

No. 21 Tehran Melli 2024 includes the same ending as Qazvini's edition (nos. 9-20 do not).

No. 24 Qum Mirʿashī no. 10915 is a lavish, artful copy.

No. 31 Tehran Salṭanatī no. 1729 ends abruptly in the middle of the section on the Ismailis.[96] It has gold decorations, and calligraphy by Maḥmūd b. Ḥāj Muḥammad Khūyī.

No. 32 Tehran Adabiyyāt no. 148/1, which includes Ṭūsī's *dhayl* on the conquest of Baghdad.

No. 33 Tehran Adabiyyāt no. 238/1 contains only volume 3, copied from a manuscript belonging to ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī.

No. 35 Tehran Nūrbakhsh no. 520/3 includes an abridgment of *Jahāngushā*.

No. 36 Tehran Majles no. 9311; adjoined to this manuscript is a dictionary of Turkic words used in the volume.

No. 37 Tehran Adabiyyāt no. 249 c. This manuscript was copied by Bhupali Hindi for E.G. Browne, and was collated with London, British Museum, Or. 155.

No. 38 Tehran Adabiyyāt no.141/1 b. This is the aforementioned manuscript copied in the hand of Muḥammad Qazvini from a very early original.

No. 42 Tehran Salṭanatī 755 ends abruptly in the middle of the section on Ismailis.[97]

No. 44 Tehran Majles no. 14189 ends with the events of the year 655 AH, and has considerable lacunae. It bears the ownership seal of Bahman Mīrzā, son of ʿAbbās Mīrzā Nāyib al-Salṭana.

This massive initiative by Derāyatī shows a relative dearth of early manuscripts of this most important early Ilkhanid source (only five manuscripts copied before the 11th century AH), which by itself is remarkable. Indeed, more than half of all extant manuscripts of *Jahāngushā* in Iranian libraries are from the Qajar period. There is clearly a resurgence of interest in this book in the Qajar period, as attested not just by the number of manuscripts produced, but also by the evidence of its ownership among Qajar notables, such as Bahman Mīrzā. Despite the relatively scant presence of *Jahāngushā* copies in Iran, the issues with volume

94 قطع دابر القوم اللذين ظلموا

95 و تشویش در دل تمامت خلق عالم تا به چه حد کشیده از مخاصمت ایشان شب و روز در مضیق زندان از ترس کارد زنان ایشان تمام شد تاریخ جهانگشاي جويني بتاريخ يوم الخميس في خامس عشرين ذي القعدة الحرام سنه ٥٤٢١

96 It ends with ذكر تتمه احوال ركن الدين و انتهاي كار ايشان

97 It ends with جمال الدين تفرشي كه يكي از اكابر عراق بود با جمعي معارضان او.... او را بشنامت قدم موسوم كردند

3 are already clear: Some manuscripts are missing part or all of the section on the Ismailis, without any apparent indication that the scribe considered the original defective. There is a wide divergence in particular on the formulaic ending, as well as on the inclusion or exclusion of Ṭūsī's *dhayl*. And even in the remainder of volume 3, there appears to be considerable variation among the copies, which may suggest that volume 3 is especially problematic.

Textual Evidence I: Orthographical, Lexical, Grammatical, Stylistic Observations

A pioneering and rather unique study of the text of Juwaynī from the standpoint of stylistics, grammar and lexicon was carried out by the early 20th-century scholar Muḥammad Taqī Bahār in his seminal work on Persian prose stylistics, *Sabkshināsi*.[98] It appears in the third volume of his book,[99] immediately followed by a section on Waṣṣāf and one on Ḥasan Niẓāmi's *Tāj al-Maʾāthir*.[100]

Bahār, who was a contemporary of Qazvini, arranges his assessment of *Jahāngushā* into three parts – lexical (part A), syntactic (B), and stylistic (C) – and occasionally combines these with observations on the orthography, as recorded by Qazvini and based on Qazvini's notes on his manuscript base. In the section on *Jahāngushā*, after a brief historical introduction, he lists nine lexical features,[101] which he classifies as "the old Khurasani style of the Munshīs with minor variations and innovative departures", recording a few instances of departure from that style.[102] He goes on to note that some of the lexical departures appear to be "features of the old local dialect of the region of Tarshīz".[103] In part B, he lists seven syntactic features of the text of *Jahāngushā*,[104] noting that even though it is based on the Seljuq chancellery style, occasionally it presents clear departures, such as the use of singular pronoun for plural nouns of non-human living things (*ghayr dhawī al-ʿuqūl*).[105]

The most important part of Bahār's assessment, however, is his observations on stylistic features and oddities of the text. He first notes that Juwaynī's style is marked by what he brands as "excessive" elisions – of subjects in verbal sentences, of pronouns, of verbs that have a parallel earlier in the text (sometimes substantially earlier), occasionally even of verbs that do not have an earlier parallel in the text, and even of references in passing – which Bahār observes is "not a feature of High Seljuq prose," and is "rather sloppy".[106] He identifies several features which he considers "blemishes" or at least clear departures from the norm. He stops short of drawing a conclusion from this, though his observations

98 On this important composition by Bahār, and the history of its composition and prints, cf. Smith, Sabkšenāsī.

99 The section on *Jahāngushā* appears in vol. 3, 51-99.

100 A translation of this text appears in Elliot and Dawson, *History of India*, originally published between 1867 and 1877 in London.

101 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 53-60.

102 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 51.

103 Today Kāshmar, near Juwayn.

104 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 60-64.

105 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 63.

106 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 67.

would be consistent with the hypothesis of an "unedited" text, or at any rate of a text that is not "final".[107]

Bahār observes that on a number of occasions the stylistic features of the text resemble Arabic prose,[108] and that the text exhibits various other features of Arabic – for instance, the text includes excessive broken plurals (which can be categorized as a lexical feature) sometimes even of Persian words (e.g. *runūd* from Persian *rand*), or branding Arabic-style infinitives from Persian words (e.g. *taḥarmuz*, from *ḥarāmzāda*). He comments that such features are much more distinctively present in *Jahāngushā* than in other Persian texts of the same period, such as *Tarikh-i Yamīnī* (from Iran proper), *Marzubān Nāma* (from the Caspian coast) or *Tāj al-Maʾāthir* (from the subcontinent). He then adds that "*Jahāngushā* is not a composition which is consistent in style", and lists a number of what he calls "lexical peculiarities", which I hold are features that are consistent with a text that has not been through a final revision and edit.

He further notes that said "peculiarities" are more frequent in volume 2 and especially volume 3, which I argue can be understood as corresponding to different degrees of insufficient editorial process. It is perfectly normal that a scholar in a senior executive or advisory position (such as Juwaynī, who occupied such posts continuously from a rather early age, and even alludes to it in his preamble to volume 1 of *Jahāngushā*) would have delegated substantial portions of a composition to his secretarial staff. The authorial voice and intent is most present in the editing stage, which is the crucial part done by the scholar at the end of the process. The circumstances of early drafts can vary considerably, and in some sense "authorship" is established at the final stage.

Bahār further notes certain "defects" in the composition of *Jahāngushā*, including occasional misquoting (or corruption) of Persian poetry in the text (without attribution). Bahār notices that a line of Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān is misquoted in *Jahāngushā*, and he calls this "clearly bad style, if not the result of scribal error" and adds that "this is the kind of error which is rather rare for a scholar of Juwaynī's stature".[109] He notes though, that there are other instances of such corruptions in the prose of the Mongol period in Iran; for instance, a corrupted version of Waṭwāṭ's famed *dubaytī* with the opening hemistich "*gar khaṣm-i tu ay shāh buwad Rustam-i Gurd*" appears in Mustawfī's *Tarikh-i Guzīda*, in what Bahār deems a "corrupt recording". He then adds that there are so many instances of such "sloppy errors, reminiscent of scribal errors, as if the text was never edited".[110]

Bahār's overall summary of the style of *Jahāngushā* is that the text comes "in *three* distinct [stylistic] registers" (my emphasis). He conjectures that "some of it may simply be a compilation of pieces by other authors available to him" and adds that, "seemingly, the majority of volume 2 and the sections on the Carmatians in volume 3 are in a style that is not similar

107 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 68.
108 Bahār, *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3, 69.
109 Bahār, Sabkshināsi, vol. 3, 70.
110 Bahār, Sabkshināsi, vol. 3, 70.

to that of ʿAṭā Malik". He then asserts that these three registers mix within the third volume, sometimes in the same chapter.[111]

Since the only critical edition of *Jahāngushā* remains that of Qazvini,[112] which was also the basis for Boyle's translation and hence all subsequent work on *Jahāngushā*, we are at the mercy of evidence from the manuscripts Qazvini consulted. Fortunately, he took copious notes, and even prepared extensive descriptions of the manuscripts he consulted, and this is appended to the preamble to volume 1 (from 1912),[113] with a separate description appended to the preamble to volume 3, which was based on a slightly wider pool of manuscripts.

Qazvini's notes on the text and the manuscripts he used cover a wide range of topics, from a synopsis of the text and the topics covered by Juwaynī and its parallelism with historiographical texts by other authors, to cross-referencing within the text of Juwaynī. Qazvini hints at the uncertainties raised by other scholars around the text of Juwaynī,[114] and mentions a number of omissions and inconsistencies in the text, suggesting that the product is perhaps "unedited".[115] He offers an explanation: this should be expected, since during the campaign Juwaynī simply would have had no time,[116] and as the governor of Baghdad, he would simply be "too busy governing", which is why no event after the fall of Baghdad appears in the book. After all, even the report on the fall of Baghdad, which is crucial to this study, Qazvini mentions in his introduction as being "by Ṭūsī";[117] though later, at the end of volume 3, he simply says it was "from Ṭūsī's copy" (*az rū-yi nuskha-yi*).

Crucially, for the purposes of this study, Qazvini gathered a number of clues to the external circumstances of the composition of the book and the life of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī based on the text, as well as clues to the non-linear composition of the text, some of which have been mentioned before.

For instance, that the book was started after Juwaynī's visit to Qaraqorum in 650 AH when he attended the court of Möngke Khan,[118] and was already in progress by 651 AH, which is when his father Bahāʾ al-Dīn died, as a mention of his father in volume 1 is followed by a prayer wishing him a long life.[119] Yet, towards the end of volume 2, he explicitly says that his

111 Bahār, Sabkshināsi, vol. 3, 71.

112 Though there are other prints of *Jahāngushā*, for instance one by Khalīl Khaṭīb-e Rahbar (Tehran: Mahtāb, 1371 Sh. [1992 CE]) and numerous others, most recently by ʿAbbāsī and Mehrakī (Tehran: Zuwwār, 1385 Sh. [2006-2007 CE]). Most are simply modifications of Qazvini, and do not introduce any new material, even as unedited text.

113 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 3, xcii-xciv.

114 In a lengthy footnote, Qazvini disagrees with Quatremere, who suggested that *Jahāngushā* probably had more volumes, and agreed with the article of Browne, Note on the contents, 27-43.

115 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xciii.

116 Which is why, according to Qazvini, the book was composed "here and there", not in a continuous flow, pointing to Juwaynī's own text (*Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, 118) mentioned earlier:
محرر این کلمات را با انکه طرفه العیني زمان تحصیل میسر نیست جه مکر در اسفار بعید ... ان حکایات را سوادي مینویسد

117 Qazvini, Introduction, vol. 1, xcviii.

118 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 2.

119 لا زالت دوحة الفضل بمكانه ناضرة و عيون المكارم اليه ناظرة... مد الله في عمره مدا و جعل بينه و بين النوائب سدّا

father had passed away.[120] Qazvini further notes that Juwaynī was born in the year 623 AH, and he mentions in volume 1 that he was 27 when he started composing the book,[121] so there are at least two pieces of evidence that he started composing the *Jahāngushā* between 650 and 651 AH. Qazvini then concludes that, since the last date mentioned in the book is 658 AH, the book was finished in 1260 CE.[122] On the other hand, Möngke Khan is mentioned in the preamble to both volumes 1 and 3, in terms that suggest he was alive. This is the clearest indication that the process of composing the book, despite its more or less chronological progression, was not itself progressive.

Textual Evidence II: Narrative Inconsistencies

In the process of examining manuscript evidence from the Iranian manuscripts listed above, as well as the 13 manuscripts Qazvini consulted, we have already observed problems with the narrative structure, some of which have already been pointed out by Qazvini, Boyle and Bahār. However, their objections do not appear to exhaust all the problems of textual inconsistencies and complications of *Jahāngushā*. To better understand and utilize the textual issues with *Jahāngushā*, it is helpful to also briefly revisit the textual issues with Rashīd's text, *RJT*. On this work, the *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, and its complicated and fascinating history and numerous textual puzzles and complications we refer the reader to the many studies on this topic in the literature, most recently the excellent work of Kamola.

To illustrate the issues at hand with *Jahāngushā*, the following provides a comparison and brief analysis of five excerpts from *Jahāngushā* and *RJT*, all of which contain reports of the fall of Alamūt to Hülegü Khan. As will become clear, it is somewhat misleading to associate any of the pieces definitively with either composition in its presumed final form. However, in order to label them for the purpose of this analysis, the five snippets are chosen from the manuscript corpus of *Jahāngushā* and *RJT* as follows:

I *Dhikr-i Ḥarakat-i Hūlākū bi Bilād-i Gharbī* (*Jahāngushā*), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Suppl. pers. 205, fols. 146r-149v.
II *Nuskha-yi Fatḥnāma-yi Alamūt* (*Jahāngushā*), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Suppl. pers. 205, fols. 150r-154r.
III *Dhikr-i Salṭanat-i Ruknuddīn Khūrshāh* (*Jahāngushā*), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Suppl. pers. 205, fols. 169v-174v.
IV *Dhikr-i Ayyām-i Dawlat-i Khūrshāh* (*RJT*), partial ed. Dāneshpazhūh and Zanjānī, pp. 114-142.
V *Dāstān-i Hūlākū Khān* (*RJT*), partial ed. Alizade, vol. 3, pp. 20-56.

120 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 101.

121 Juwaynī, Jahāngushā, vol. 2, ed. Qazvini, 6: و تلفت سبع الي عشرين من – حججي و كف العقل من غلوايي

122 The passage to which Qazvini is referring appears in the first volume: Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 75:
تا جنانك غايت وقت كه شهور سنه ثمان و خمسين و ستمايه است عمارت و رونق ان بقاع ... با قرار اصلي رفته

Texts I-III are from the same manuscript, the exemplar of Qazvini's edition of *Jahāngushā* published in the third volume of his edition. Texts IV and V are from two different editions of *RJT*, by Alizade and by Dāneshpazhūh and Zanjānī, respectively, based on distinct, mutually exclusive sets of manuscripts. While Dāneshpazhūh and Zanjānī relied on manuscripts in Iranian libraries, as well as some in Istanbul,[123] the Soviet scholar Alizade based his edition primarily on two manuscripts in St. Petersburg (of Central Asian provenance) as well as one in Tashkent. All five texts examined present an account of the fall of the fortress of Alamūt to the armies of Hülegü Khan.

Text IV, even though it is labeled as *RJT*, is nearly identical with a section of *Jahāngushā*, corresponding to text III on the list. This is, by itself, no surprise. It has long been acknowledged that the text of *RJT* collects and "borrows" from various earlier compositions in certain sections. The secretarial and scribal process would involve several steps – abridgments, expansions, paraphrases and total revisions – before the text was finally used in a new composition. Thus the textual corpus goes through a multi-stage process, whereby multiple "final" products may be produced. These "final" products, together with other texts which were perhaps from earlier stages of the project, not necessarily the final form for any specific production, could each initiate a separate chain of transmission, given the right circumstances, to create a corpus of interrelated texts, various overlapping or interdependent members of which may be held to be just as definitive or authentic as others. This appears to be the case for certain sections of *RJT*, at least, including the section on the Ismailis. I hold that a similar verdict also passes for *Jahāngushā*.

To illustrate the parallelism raised above, in its most basic form, consider, for instance, the following three passages from volume 3 of *Jahāngushā* and the corresponding section from *RJT*.

Passage A: The reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Jalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan

Text III:

علاء الدين محمد در سن نه سالگی بود كه بجای او بنشست و جلال الدين در منتصف رمضان سنة ثمان و عشرة و ستّمائة وفات كرد و همين يك پسر بيش نداشت علاء الدين كه ذكر رفت جلال الدين را مرض موت اسهال بوده است

"ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad was nine years old when he succeeded Jalāl al-Dīn, who passed on the fifteenth of Ramaḍān of 628 AH. He [Jalāl al-Dīn] had only this one son, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, mentioned above. As for Jalāl al-Dīn, the cause of his death was dysentery."

Text IV:

علاء الدين بايام نه سالگی به جای پدر بنشست و جلال الدين همين يك پسر علاء الدين بيشتر نداشت و جلال الدين را مرض موت اسهال بوده است

"ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was about nine years old when he succeeded his father Jalāl al-Dīn, who had only this one son. Jalāl al-Dīn died of dysentery."

123 In particular, three from the Topkapı Saray Library in Istanbul.

Passage B: On Rukn al-Dīn Khārshāh's succession

Text III:

ركن الدين خورشاه پسر مهين علاء الدين بود و در هنگام طفوليت او علاء الدين هنوز در سن شباب بود چه در زاد ميان ايشان هژده سال بيش تفاوت نبود ركن الدين هنوز طفل بود كه علاء الدين نا انديشيده گفتى كه امام خواهد بود و ولى عهد منست چون ركن الدين بزرگتر شد مخاذيل متابعان ايشان ميان او و پدر در تعظيم و مرتبة فرقى نمى نهادند و حكم او چون حكم پدرش نافذ بود

"Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh was the eldest son of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, so when he was a child ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was still in his youth, since they were separated only by eighteen years, Rukn al-Dīn was only a baby when ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn had decreed, without giving it much thought, that Rukn al-Dīn would be his successor. When Rukn al-Dīn grew to adulthood, the wretched folks who follow them [i.e., the Ismaili imams] would offer the same obedience and respect to father and son alike, and would execute his commands just like they would for his father."

Text IV:

و بايام طفوليت ركن الدين علاء الدين گفتى كه او ولى عهد منست و امام شما خواهد بود چون ركن الدين بزرگتر شد متابعان ايشان ميان او و پدر در مرتبه و تعظيم فرقى نمى نهادند و حكم او چون حكم پدرش نافذ بود

"When Rukn al-Dīn was a child, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn would say 'he will be my successor and your imam'. When Rukn al-Dīn grew older, their followers would honor and rank father and son exactly the same, and Rukn al-Dīn's commands were followed like those of his father."

Passage C: On Ḥasan-i Māzandarānī (ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn's assassin)

Text III:

منفرد شدند كه حسن مازندرانى كه اخص الخواص علاء الدين بود و ملازم ليل و نهار و حقه اسرار او او را كشته است و نيز گفتند كه منكوحه حسن كه معشوقه علاء الدين بودى ... آن سر با ركن الدين باز گفت بر جمله بعد از يكهفته حسن را بكشتند و جثه او بسوختند و طفلى دو سه از آن حسن دو دختر و پسرى ايشان را هم بسوختند حسن مازندرانى را در وقت كودكى لشكر مغول از مازندران برده بودند و در عراق از ميان لشكر گريخته بوده است و بملك علاء الدين رفته امردى مليح بوده است علاء الدين چون او را بديده دوست داشته است و بخود نزديك گردانيده پيش او محل اعتماد تمام شده.....و مع هذا از جنون و بدخويى پيوسته بتخيلات و تعليلات او را رنجانيدى و مى زدى ضربهاى عنيف دندانهاى او بيشتر شكسته بود و از آلت ذكوريت او پاره اى بريده....و علاء الدين در مقاربت و مباشرت با زن حسن از او تحاشى نكردى

"They all agreed that ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was killed by Ḥasan-i Māzandarānī, who was the closest person to him, and his confidant, accompanying him day and night. They also said Ḥasan's wife was ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn's romantic partner ... (missing text). This secret was communicated to Rukn al-Dīn, and one week later Ḥasan was killed, and his body set on fire, alongside two or three babies of Ḥasan's. This Ḥasan-i Māzandarānī was taken captive by the Mongols when he was a child in Māzandarān, but he had escaped them when they were in Iraq[-i ʿAjam] and took refuge in the territory of [the Ismaili imam] ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn. Ḥasan was a cute beardless boy, and when ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn met Ḥasan, he liked him and made him his confidant. Despite that, since ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was afflicted with madness and had horrible conduct, he would constantly torture Ḥasan and he would give him terrible physical beatings, [to the point that] many of Ḥasan's teeth were broken from those beatings, and part of his penis was cut off. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn would conduct erotic liaisons with Ḥasan's wife or have sex with her and would not hide it from Ḥasan at all."

Text IV:

معلوم کردند که حسن مازندرانی که اخص الخواص علاء الدین بود و ملازم لیل و نهار و حقه اسرار او او را بکشته است و هرچند آن کار بامر رکن الدین بود بعد از یك هفته حسن مذکور را بکشتند و جثه او را بسوختند و پسری و دو دختر طفل او را نیز بسوختند

"They declared it was Ḥasan-i Māzandarānī, who was the closest person to ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn and his companion, who had killed him, although [everybody knew that] he was following Rukn al-Dīn's orders. After a week the said Ḥasan was killed and his body set on fire. Two or three children of his, still babies, were also set on fire with him."

This demonstrates that text IV could simply be an abridgment of text III, perhaps notes taken by a scribe. Generally, text IV repeats, with minor changes or even verbatim, the text of III. Occasionally, text IV paraphrases text III in simpler language, usually omitting some details.

Text V, on the other hand (corresponding to the Alizade edition), is more detailed. It includes additional information on the circumstances of the campaign, and often runs a close parallel to text I, which is the most expansive narrative in the *Jahāngushā* corpus. For example:

Passage D

Text V:

چون از آب بگذشت بر طرف رودخانه جهت تفرج طوفی می فرمود از میان بیشه شیران پیکارپیشه ظاهر شدند فرمان داد تا سواران بر مدار ایستاده جرگا کشیدند و چون اسبان از شیران می رمیدند بر بختیان مست سوار شدند و ده شیر را شکار کردند روز دیگر از آنجا کوچ کرده در مرغزار شفورقان نزول فرمود

"After crossing the river, they went on a stroll by the river bank. Suddenly several lions appeared to come out of the woods nearby. He [Hülegü] ordered cavaliers to surround the area and hunt the lions. Since the horses were scared of the lions [and made it impossible to ride them] they mounted drunken camels instead and managed to hunt ten lions. The next day they left the area until they arrived at the meadows of Shafūrqān, where they made camp."

Text I:

چون لشکر از آب بگذشت پادشاه بتماشا بر کنار رود طوفی می کرد خود شیران بسیار در آن بیشه بودند فرمود تا لشکر بر مدار بایستادند و ترکه بستند اسبان از هیبت شیران هراس می یافتند بر بختیان مست سوار شدند و ده شیر مرغزار را شیران کارزار شکار کردند ... روز دیگر از آنجا کوچ کردند و بمرغزار شفورقان نزول کردند

While the Persian text of I and V above are very slightly divergent in terms of choice of words, the translation is identical. A discussion of whether the lexical divergence of the two falls outside the scope of our argument.

Elsewhere the parallelism between the texts of *Jahāngushā* and *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh* is less pronounced. This raises questions about the authorial process of both texts and their circulation. Clues may be gathered already from the sections showcased above.

So far we have demonstrated that the divergent texts of two separate sections of Qazvini's edition of *Jahāngushā* run parallel to texts from two different editions of *RJT* based on mutually exclusive manuscripts. In each of the two editions of *RJT* consulted for the purpose of this comparison, the report on the Ismailis appears only at one place, unlike in Qazvini's edition of *Jahāngushā*, which contains three reports on this.

There is more evidence of the convoluted textual structure of *Jahāngushā*, and clues to what the cause may be, from the narratives included in it. The first clue is self-referentiality. In Qazvini's edition, the author(s) of *Jahāngushā* refer to the work itself, from within the text of *Jahāngushā*, sometimes in detail. Already in the preamble (*dībācha*) of *Jahāngushā* in volume 1, on the very first page, a definitive start of the project as well as the book itself is mentioned:[124]

سباس و ثنا معبودي را كه واجب الوجودست بسجودي كي وجود او واهب انوار عقل وجود است.. جنين كويد جون در شهور سنه خمسين و ستمايه بخت مطاوعت نمود و سعادت مساعدت كرد... معهذا جون بجند نوبت ديار ماوراالنهر و تركستان تا سرحد ماجين و اقصي جين كه مقر سرير مملكت .. جنكيزخان است و واسطه عقد ملك ايشان مطالعه افتاد و بعضي احوال معاينه رفت و از معتبران و مقبولان قولان وقايع گذشته را استماع افتاد از التزام اشارت دوستان ... مقرر و محقق كشت در قيد كتابت كشيد و مجموعه اين حكايات را بتاريخ جهانكشاي جويني موسوم كردانيد

"In year 750 AH … since on several occasions a visit to the lands of Transoxiana and Turkestan was made possible, as well as to the borders of China and Aksai Chin, which is the seat of the rule of Chinggis Khan. [In those trips] some of their affairs I observed firsthand, and others were narrated to me by those who can be trusted and whose words are widely accepted, I obliged the demands of my companions, to compose … a book, and I made the title of the entirety of those narratives *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā.*" (abbreviated translation)

It is worth noting that the text specifies the title not as *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*, but, somewhat redundantly, as *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā-yi Juwaynī*. The bigger issue, though, is the obvious redundancy in the text of *Jahāngushā*, where essentially the same narrative is repeated three times. The three narratives vary, not just in structure and level of details, but also stylistically. They include different levels of ornate embellishments, with *Fatḥnāma* (text II) being the most "stylized", text I being in chancellery style ornate high prose, and text III the most straightforward or least ornate high prose, closest to text V from *RJT*. There are clues from the lexicon. For instance, while text I refers to Hülegü's sons by their name suffixed with *-uġūl*, text III refers to them as *pādshāhzāda* followed by their name.[125] Finally, and most importantly, there are clues from the narratives of texts I to V. Consider the following three instances, from texts I, II and III, all from Qazvini's *Jahāngushā*, all reporting on the fall of the Ismailis:

1. In text I, corresponding to p. 100 in volume 3 of Qazvini's edition, and to fol. 147v of the Paris manuscript, the text reads: "It was so cold that many riding animals perished, and these two lines which I had once written to my father, glory to his dust, when I was at Qaraqorum describe it well".[126] A few lines down on the next page the

124 Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 1, ed. Qazvini, 1. The Persian texts in the body of this article have been recorded in the orthographic rendition of Qazvini's edition.

125 *Pādshāhzāda* should be understood as "prince". It consists of *pādshāh* (king) plus the suffix *zāda* (born to; son of).

126 از شدت برودت چهارپای بسیار تلف شد و دو سه بیت که از اردوی بزرگ از مقام قراقوروم به پدرم طاب ثراه نوشته بود حسب حال شد. Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 3, ed. Qazvini, 100.

text reads: "Amir Arghūn [...] appointed his son Kerai, Aḥmad Bitikchī, and the author of these lines, to accompany the King [Hülegü] to Khurasan and Iraq".[127]

2. In text II, in the preamble to *Fatḥnāma*, the text reads: "The least of the servants of the kingdom, the fortunes of which never cease to rise, ʿAṭā Malik ibn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī al-Mustawfī, wants to reach to the whole world with the good news [...]".[128] Elsewhere in the *Fatḥnāma*, corresponding to fol. 152r, the text reads: "the bearer of the good news [of Khūrshāh surrendering] was ordered to compose a *yarligh* in a style different from those before, a copy of which is preserved in Juwaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā-yi Juwaynī*",[129] repeating, once more, the self-reference, and the redundant designation of the title.

3. In text III, corresponding to fol. 173v, the text reads: "when I was at the foot of the fortress of Lambasar, with the desire to examine its library, whose fame has spread to every corner of the world, I petitioned the king that one may not let the magnificent library of Alamūt perish and be lost. He [Hülegü] was pleased with that speech and appointed me to examine the library. Whatever I found, Qur'anic codices, and exquisite books, I saved, in the manner of *bringing the living out of the dead*,[130] and observational instruments, such as Armillary Spheres, and Thrones, Astrolabes Solipartium, Astrolabes Bipartium, and Radial Astrolabes[131] [I rescued]. As for the rest, whichever was not in accordance with the transmitted sciences [i.e., Traditions, Jurisprudence, etc.], or the intellectual sciences [i.e., Mathematics, Philosophy, etc.], I burned [...]".[132]

There are distinct yet conflicting clues to the authorship in these text extracts from the three different sections. To begin with, the narrative of text I provides us with two clues that the author is Juwaynī himself. First, there is a reference to Juwaynī's father. And second, there is the confirmation that the author was appointed by Arghūn Āqā to accompany Hülegü in

---

127 امیر ارغون در این منزل خیمه بزرگ از کرباس منقش به نقشهای لطیف .. بنهاد و خدمات بسیار بتقدیم رسانید و از انجا بحکم فرمان متوجه حضرت منکو قاان شد و پسر خود کرای ملك و احمد بیتکچی و محرر این مقالات را در خدمت پادشاه بتدبیر مصالح ملك خراسان و عراق نصب فرمود

128 کمینه بنده دولت روزافزون عطا ملك ابن محمد الجوینی المستوفی میخواهد که این بشارت بدور و نزدیك اقالیم عالم برساند.

Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 3, ed. Qazvini, 115.

129 مبشر این بشارت را فرمان شد تا بر وفق ملتمس ایشان مکتوب برلیغی که سواد ان با سواد حکایات دیگر که نه لایق این حکایات بود <و> در تاریخ جهانگشای جوینی مسطور است بنوشت.

Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 3, ed. Qazvini, 129.

130 Qur'an, Sūrat al-Rūm, 30:19. Full verse according to Arberry's translation: "He brings forth the living from the dead, and brings forth the dead from the living."

131 Highly technical vocabulary; five different types of observational instruments. Cf. Hartner, Asturlab.

۱۳۲ بوقتی که در پای لمسر بودم بر هوس مطالعه کتابخانه که صیت ان در اقطار شایع بود عرضه داشتم که نفایس کتب الموت را تضییع نتوان کرد پادشاه ان سخن را پسندیده فرمود و اشارت راند تا بمطالعه ان رفتم و انچ یافتم از مصاحف و نفایس کتب بر مثال یخرج الحی من المیت بیرون اوردم و الات رصد از کراسی و ذات الحلق و اسطرلابهای تام و نصفی و شعاع دیگر که موجود بود برگرفتم و باقی انچ تعلق بضلالت و غوایت ایشان داشت و نه بمنقول مستند بود و نه بمعقول معتمد بسوختم.

Juwaynī, *Jahāngushā*, vol. 3, ed. Qazvini, 269-270.

his western campaign, together with two other senior administrators: this list is confirmed by the *RJT*.

In contrast, there is some confusion in the narrative of text II, and it fails to identify the author definitively. First there is a clue that the composer may be either Juwaynī himself or somebody commissioned by him to compose the ornate text, but it is not clear which of these is the case. This ambivalence persists in the second reference in text II, since it refers to *Jahāngushā*, ostensibly from within it, as an existing, separate, composition, while it also alludes to Juwaynī being commissioned to write this very text (the *Fatḥnāma*), raising the possibility that this piece may not have been intended as part of the original composition. It may be observed that the relationship between the *Fatḥnāma* and the rest of the body of *Jahāngushā* is much like that of Ṭūsī's *dhayl* and the body of the text, only with the difference that the *dhayl* is explicitly tagged, unlike this section. While this is usually interpreted as indicating that the *dhayl* was composed by Ṭūsī, which is a distinct possibility, it is also worth noting that the exact wording of the manuscript, as recorded by Qazvini is *Dhayl-i Jahāngushā, az nuskha-yi … Ṭūsī*, roughly translating to "Addendum to *Jahāngushā*, from … Ṭūsī's copy".

Text III is likewise not free of ambiguity. The first-person narrative appears to suggest that the author must be Juwaynī; that is, if we assume that the sole author of the entire text of *Jahāngushā* as available to us in Qazvini's edition is, indeed, Juwaynī. However, two clues from the text suggest otherwise. The first is the author's claim that he examined the Alamūt library to decide which books should be saved and which burned. Various anecdotal accounts mentioned by Arab and Persian historians alike put the number of codices in the tens of thousands. Even if that is held to be an exaggeration, there is no doubt that the number was extraordinary. Given the fact that a single codex could often include numerous titles, and the phenomenon of *Safīnas* that could include tens of titles within one bound volume, the Alamūt library could be estimated as housing more than ten thousand book titles. Furthermore, in pre-modern Arabic and Persian book culture, the absence of book covers containing large text indicating the title and author, would mean that identifying all book titles housed in a library would require a careful, individual examination of each codex, a task which would be much easier for somebody already familiar with the library, not an outsider. Thus it is obvious that Juwaynī would not have been the ideal person to carry out this task, and this must have been just as obvious to those present at the gathering where this decision was made. Aside from the lack of feasibility of an outsider (Juwaynī) performing this task, there is also no clear indication of the motivation behind it. There are no reports of similar events, where libraries were inspected volume by volume, with the purpose of extracting the "good" titles and destroying the rest. It is unclear why it should happen for this particular library. This suggests that the person who examined the library could have been someone other than Juwaynī.

In addition to this, the reference in text III to five types of specialized observational instruments, each mentioned separately, is a distinction that would be lost to anyone other than a scholar specializing in, or at any rate intimately familiar with, astronomy and the art of astronomical observations. However, there is no indication that Juwaynī ever received advanced specialized education in the subjects of the quadrivium or indeed other specialized field of science like alchemy, or that he would be intimately familiar with varieties and distinctions among observational instruments. Indeed he entered government service at a relatively early age, which would have severely limited his chances of receiving advanced education in any topic not closely related to the art of the government. Even a professionally

trained mathematician would typically receive such education at an age beyond the age at which Juwaynī joined the administration. It is likewise unclear why saving observational instruments, highly specific advanced instruments of use only to a professional mathematician, should be a priority, especially as the campaign was still on the march westward (towards Baghdad). There are no reports known of a similar incident of the Mongols saving observational instruments in particular, following a conquest. Even if that was a priority, a more natural choice as the "savior" of the instruments would have been one of the several astronomers in Hülegü Khan's retinue, for instance the most senior astronomer in his camp at the time, a certain Ḥusām al-Dīn Munajjim, or indeed the mathematician already in charge of that very observatory and library, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī.

Unlike text II, where the identity of a second author, potentially commissioned by Juwaynī, remains unknown, a distinct possibility for a second author of text III is worth examining. In the remainder of this paper, I will argue that there is evidence to believe the likely author of parts of volume 3, including the snippet above on the examination of the library and the observatory, is Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, who came to develop a close relationship with the Juwaynī clan, particularly ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, an alliance that continued until the end of the former's life.

To be clear, the evidence for mixed or multiple authorship of the version of *Jahāngushā* at hand does not refute its prime association with Juwaynī as *the* author. *Jahāngushā* was a project Juwaynī envisioned,[133] and to have employed scribal assistance or even to commission specific pieces from others or include pieces by others would have been perfectly normal in his time period and circumstances. One such author involved in the process of composition and canonization of *Jahāngushā* has already been identified as the author of the *dhayl*, the mathematician and philosopher Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, a contemporary of Juwaynī and, like him, a Persian hailing from a noble lineage in Khurasan. If we agree with Qazvini that Ṭūsī's appendix (*dhayl*) was intended to be included in *Jahāngushā*, even though it is not composed by Juwaynī, there is nothing that precludes other pieces from having a similar origin. As I have argued above, in agreement with earlier scholars, the text of *Jahāngushā* in Qazvini's edition appears to be unfinished, which only raises the likelihood of the inclusion of pieces by other authors. Another piece of corroborating evidence is the special relationship between Juwaynī and Ṭūsī.

ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī and Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī

While Juwaynī was in the service of the Mongols for decades before they met, Ṭūsī was safely stationed with the Ismailis in their Rūdbār fortresses, apparently in a secure and high-ranking position in the entourage of the Ismaili imam ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad III (r. 1221-1255), in charge of an observatory in Alamūt. After the assassination of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn and the ascension of his son Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh to the throne, Ṭūsī maintained his high position at court. It was in that capacity that he first met Juwaynī and Hülegü Khan during the siege of Maymundiz by the Mongols and the negotiated surrender of the Ismaili imam Rukn al-Dīn. Rashīd confirms that Ṭūsī was a senior member of the negotiating party on behalf of

133 As he mentions explicitly, in the *dībācha* of vol. 1 and again in vol. 3.

the Ismailis, and that he had already joined the Mongol camp prior to the fall of the fortress of Maymundiz, the seat of the Ismaili imam and the first of the Rūdbār fortresses to fall to the Mongols.[134] He writes: "prior to that [i.e., Khūrshāh surrendering], he had sent his other brother Irānshāh, and a son of his named Tirkiyā [or *also* a son of his, named *Kiyā*], in the company of Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn, and Khwāja Aṣīl al-Dīn [Zūzanī], plus a group of [lesser] administrators, and other notables and generals, with countless gifts." He then adds that they were received favorably by Hülegü Khan.[135] Even before the arrival of the Mongols, Ṭūsī was involved in the exchange of letters between the two camps. It would be natural if Juwaynī, as a personal secretary to Hülegü Khan and a senior administrator in his entourage, would be involved at the other end of this interaction, so the two had already corresponded in their respective capacities as senior administrators and secretaries. In any case Ṭūsī and Juwaynī definitely met prior to the surrender of Alamūt, where the library was based, since Alamūt surrendered only after Maymundiz. Apart from numerous affinities between the two, most notably their noble Persian Khurasani origins, there is ample evidence that they forged a close relationship in the entourage of Hülegü Khan and maintained it for decades, even when ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn assumed his position as the governor of Baghdad in 1259 and Ṭūsī retired to his senior position in Maragha.[136]

There are numerous indications of this special relationship from a multitude of sources, both Ilkhanid and Mamluk, some of which were recorded by Rażavī[137] and by Jorati. Perhaps most curiously, the anecdote narrated by Salāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī in his *al-Wāfī bi-l-Wafayāt* speaks in the same breath of this special relationship as well as Ṭūsī's newly found special status with Hülegü Khan as a chief astronomer and trusted adviser. It appears in its totality in the first volume of *al-Wāfī bi-l-Wafayāt*.[138] Al-Ṣafadī writes:

> It was narrated to me that ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn had fallen into disfavor with Hülegü Khan, in a matter in which he was suspected of wrongdoing, and Hülegü had ordered him killed. His brother [Shams al-Dīn Juwaynī] came to Ṭūsī and pleaded with him if he could have that annulled. Ṭūsī replied: "The Ilkhan, and his people, when they order something done, there is no way to have it canceled, especially if the news of it has already spread." Shams al-Dīn said we must find a trick. So Ṭūsī at once went to Hülegü, while holding in his hand a level staff, an astrolabe and prayer beads, and behind him someone carrying an incense burner making a cloud of smoke, with flames flaring. Hülegü's confidants standing at the entrance to his tent saw him like that. When Ṭūsī arrived at the tent he increased the amount of incense burning, raising the astrolabe, looking into it as if making an observation of the sky, then lowered it. When they saw Ṭūsī do all that, they informed Hülegü Khan of the situation, then returned to Ṭūsī and asked, "What has made you do this?" He answered, "Where is the Ilkhan?" They replied, "He is inside." He said, "Is he in good health?" They

134 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 3, ed. Alizade, 34-35.

135 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 3, ed. Alizade, 36-37.

136 For more on this, see Jorati, *Science and Society*.

137 Rażavī, *Aḥwāl wa Āthār Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī*.

138 Al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī bi-l-Wafayāt*, vol. 1, ed. Arnāwūṭ, 147-148. A translation may be found in Jorati, *Science and Society*.

> said yes, then Ṭūsī prostrated, praising God, stood up, and asked them again then repeated the prostration, then he said, "I want to see him with my own eyes", so they went inside to Hülegü Khan and informed him of this, even though that was during a time that the Ilkhan would not see anybody. Hülegü Khan ordered that Ṭūsī be brought inside. When Ṭūsī saw Hülegü Khan he fell to prostration, and remained like that for a long time. Hülegü wanted to know what the matter was Ṭūsī replied, "I saw that Fate had decreed that at this hour a terrible calamity shall befall upon the Ilkhan, so I moved quickly and performed that which was necessary with the astrolabe and burned the incense and prayed to God with special prayers that I know, pleading with God to turn that calamity away from the Ilkhan. It is necessary that the Ilkhan should write to all his servants at once and send the *īlchīs* to every country in his kingdom to release from captivity anyone who is arrested and condemned to death, and give them a full pardon, so that God may not let the terrible things happen to him which is in the Fate. And if I had not seen the face of the Ilkhan myself, I would not have believed he is still safe." So Hülegü Khan ordered that everything that Ṭūsī said should happen, and the *ṣāḥib dīwān* (i.e., ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Juwaynī) was released among a larger group, without Ṭūsī even mentioning his name.

This anecdote is only one among many attestations in the primary sources of the period to a special relationship between the two, not the least of which was their respective positions, both being patrons of the Imami community in Iraq. This community constituted the base of local support for Juwaynī, an outsider who had taken over the administration of Iraq without being able to rely on the traditional Sunni Hanbali aristocracy who were in charge under the last Abbasid caliph al-Mustaʿṣim. Equally, Ṭūsī, who was of Imami background himself, had already made visits to Ḥilla during the Mongol campaign on Baghdad and met with senior Imami figures to secure their support for the new Mongol government, and he was instrumental in the peaceful surrender of Kūfa and Ḥilla.[139]

Given this special relationship, whatever its cause may have been – prior affinities, strategic alliance, or natural convergence in the face of common adversaries – and, as argued above, the status of *Jahāngushā* as an essentially unfinished text that took on its "final" form some time after ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn had already assumed his new position as the governor of Baghdad, the presence of pieces penned by Ṭūsī or for Ṭūsī in the essentially unfinished collection of texts that came to be seen as the third volume of *Jahāngushā* in a presumed final form would be natural.

Conclusion: Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā *in Baghdad*

Many of the scholars listed above, from Qazvini and Bahār to Minorsky and Boyle, seem to have been aware of or at times even implied the complicated textual structure of the *Jahāngushā*. Furthermore, there is overwhelming evidence from the text itself for pauses in composition and expansion of the project. That evidence includes, as argued above, abrupt section endings and disjointed narratives, chronological confusion, stylistic oddities and textual peculiarities, erroneous or conflicting information, and self-referencing in unusual

139 Cf. Jorati, *Science and Society*, ch. 4.

forms, all suggesting that various parts of the text were added later or never underwent a final editing process. Based on these arguments, it is clear that *Tarikh-i Jahāngushā* is a composition which was never completed in a strict sense. Rather, it assumed a certain form early on, and was canonized in that form by near-contemporaneous historians. It is also clear, based on manuscript evidence, that the various "final" forms in circulation were held as definitive. Evidence for this claim is manifold: (a) manuscript evidence recorded by Qazvini, and Derāyatī, that scribes held a multitude of variations of the text (in particular for volume 3) as the "final" form; and (b) manuscript and textual evidence of confusion about how many volumes the project consisted of. While one may assume that inconsistencies of type (a) may have arisen over time, through scribal errors and faulty manuscripts, type (b), attested by manuscript evidence, is further confirmed by early evidence from other medieval texts that refer to *Jahāngushā*. For instance, Waṣṣāf considers *Jahāngushā* to be in three volumes, while Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī knows it in two volumes, as I have argued elsewhere.[140]

Since the last date mentioned in the text of *Jahāngushā* is already after the appointment of Juwaynī as the governor of Baghdad, it follows that any manuscript of *Jahāngushā* which can be considered to be complete belongs to a recension that originated in Baghdad. It would be a matter of great curiosity and consequence to any discussion on Juwaynī and Ilkhanid historiography to draw a full picture of the manuscript base of *Jahāngushā* in order to be able to attempt to answer questions about its distribution and canonization, as the manuscript base of *Jahāngushā* consulted for this article is somewhat meager on early copies.

Parallel to that, the confusion around whether the text of Ṭūsī on the fall of Baghdad should be held as an integral part of *Jahāngushā* or not, paired with the argument that makes a case for multiple authorship of parts of volume 3, with parts potentially written by Ṭūsī or for Ṭūsī, leaves unclear the exact role of Ṭūsī in the composition, circulation, and canonization of *Jahāngushā*. There is evidence of a sustained close relationship and strategic alliance between Ṭūsī and Juwaynī, which also involved a clear Baghdadi connection. Ṭūsī was a senior Ilkhanid administrator in Maragha, as well as a patron and ally of the Imami community of Iraq, who were the base of support of Juwaynī in Baghdad. It is in this dual capacity as an ally of Juwaynī and patron of the Imamis of Iraq that Ṭūsī made two visits to Baghdad, in the 1260s and 1270s – indeed, at a relatively advanced age – during the second of which he died and was buried in al-Kāẓamayn. *Jahāngushā* may be understood as a text in flux, one that morphed into an assumed final form which may or may not have been envisioned by the author, and which evolved into a corpus of largely consistent yet divergent texts in which the roles of various parties remain to be fully understood. This topic deserves a serious study dedicated exclusively to it.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Stefan Kamola and the anonymous referee for constructive comments.

140 Cf. Jorati, *Science and Society*.

References

Abbreviations

DBE *Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*. (The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia), online edition (Tehran, 1996-). Available at https://cgie.org.ir.

EI *Encyclopedia of Islam New Edition Online* (Leiden). Available at https://referenceworks.brill.com/display/db/eieo.

EIr *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (London, 1982-); online edition (New York, 1996-). Available at https://iranicaonline.org.

Primary Sources

Āqā Buzurg Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīʿa ilā Taṣānif al-Shīʿa*, 25 vols. (Beirut, 1983).

al-Baṭṭiṭī, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, *Aḥwāl Mulūk al-Tatār al-Maghūl*, ed. Rasūl Jaʿfariyān (Qum, 2015).

Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Majmaʿ al-Tawārīkh al-Sulṭāniyya*, ed. Muḥammad Mudarrisī Zanjānī (Tehran, 1985).

Ibn ʿInaba, *ʿUmdat al-Ṭālib al-Ṣughrā fī Anasāb Āl Abī Ṭālib*, ed. Rajāyī (Qum, 2009).

Ibn Ṭiqtiqā, *Kitāb al-Fakhrī fi Ādāb al-Sulṭānīya* (Beirut, 2007). English translation: C.E.J. Whitting, *Al Fakhri: On the System of Government and the Moslem Dynasties, Composed by Muhammad Son of Ali Son of Tabataba, Known as the Rapid Talker, May God Have Mercy on Him* (London, 1947).

Juwaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*, ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvini, *The Taʾríkh-i-Jahán-gushá of ʿAláʾu ' d-Dín ʿAṭá Malik-i-Juwayní (composed in A.H. 658 = A.D. 1260)*, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series 16 (Leiden, 1912-1937). English translation: John Andrew Boyle, *The History of the World-Conqueror by ʿAla-ad-Din ʿAta-Malik Juvaini* (Cambridge, MA, 1958); reprint: John Andrew Boyle and David O. Morgan, *Genghis Khan: The History of the World-Conqueror* (Seattle, 1997).

Juwaynī, *Tasliyat al-Ikhwān*, ed. ʿAbbās Māhyār (Tehran, 1982).

Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī (Kabul, 2017).

Khwāndamīr, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, ed. Muḥammad Dabīrsiyāqī (Tehran, 2001).

Mīrzā Mahdī Khan Astarābādī, *Jahāngushā-yi Nādirī* (Tehran, 1962, reprinted 2013).

Mustawfī, Ḥamdullāh, *Tārīkh-i Guzīda*, ed. Rawshan (Tehran, 2015).

Qāshānī, *Tārīkh-i Ūljāytū: Tārīkh-i pādshāh-i Saʿīd Ghiyasʾ al-Dunyā va al-Dīn Ūljāytū Sulṭān Muḥammad*, ed. Mahīn Hamblī (Tehran, 1969).

Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, ed. A. Alizade, vol. 3 (Baku, 1957).

Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʾ al-tavārīkh : qismat-i Ismāʾīlīyān va Fāṭimīyān va Nizārīyān va Duʾāyān va Rāfīqān*, ed. ed. Dāneshpazhūh and Zanjānī (Tehran, 1977).

Riḍā Qulī Khan Hidāyat, *Rawḍat al-Ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī* (Tehran, 1960).

al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, *al-Wāfī bi-l-Wafayāt*, ed. Aḥmad Arnāwūṭ (Beirut, 2000).

Secondary Sources

Āl-e Dāvūd, Ḥāfeẓ-e Abrū, *DBE*.

Āl-e Dāvūd, Juwaynī, Khānedān, *DBE*.

Amitai, Reuven, Al-Nuwayri as a historian of the Mongols, in: Hugh Kennedy (ed.), *Historiography of Islamic Egypt (c.950-1800)* (Leiden, 2001) 23-36.

Bahār, M.T., *Sabkshināsi*, vol. 3 (reprinted) (Tehran, 1958).

Barthold, Vasily V., and John A. Boyle, ʿAṭā Malik Djuwaynī, *EI*.

Bira, Shagdaryn, *Mongolian Historical Writing from 1200-1700 [Mongol'skaya istorigrafiya]*, translated from Russian by John Krueger and revised and updated by the author (second edition), (Bellingham, 2002).

Boyle, John A., The death of the last Abbasid caliph: A contemporary Muslim account, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 6/2 (Autumn 1961) 145-161.

Browne, Edward G., *A Literary History of Persia*, 4 vols. (London, 1906; reprinted 1999).

Browne, Edward G., Note on the contents of the Taʾrikh-i-Jahan-Gusha: Or History of the world-conqueror, Changiz Khan, by ʿAta Malik Juwayni, *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (January 1904) 27-43.

Dāneshyār, Murtaḍā, Molāḥaẓāt-i dar bāb-i ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī, *Āyīna-yi Mīrāth* 20/71 (2022) 127-148.

Dāneshyār, Murtaḍā, Tārikhnegārī,-yi Aṭā Malik Juwaynī, *Bayhaqnāma* 2/4 (2019) 47-57.

Derāyatī, Muṣṭafā (ed.), *DENA: Fihristwāra-yi Dastniwashtahā-yi Īrān*, 12 vols. (Tehran, 2010).

Derāyatī, Muṣṭafā (ed.), *Fihristgān-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Irān FANKHA*, vol. 6 (Tehran, 1391 Sh. [2012 CE]) 617-620.

Diyānat, Ibn Bībī, *DBE*.

Duda, Ibn Bībī, *EI*.

Elliot, Henry Miers, and John Dowson, *The History of India as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period* (London, 1867-1877).

Eqbāl, ʿAbbās, *Tārīkh-e Mughūl* (Tehran, 2009).

al-Hādī, Y., Muʾallif-i Tārīkh-i Nīkpay kīst?, *Guzārish-i Mīrāth* 2/1-2 (1394 Sh. [2015 CE]) 6-10.

Hartner, Willy, Asturlab, *Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed*., vol. 1 (Brill, 1960) 722-728.

Jorati, Hadi, *Science and Society in Medieval Islam*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University, 2014).

Kamola, Stefan, *Making Mongol History: Rashid al-Din and the Jamiʿ al-Tawarikh* (Edinburgh, 2019).

Khosrobeygī, H., *Sāzmān-e Edārī-ye Khwārazmshahiyān* (Tehran, 2009).

Lane, G.A., Arghun Aqa: Mongol bureaucrat, *Iranian Studies* 32/4 (Autumn 1999) 459-482.

Lane, G.A., Jovayni, ʿAlāʾ-al-Din, *EIr*.

Melville, Charles, Jahānngošā-ye Jovayni, *EIr*.

Melville, Charles, Jāmeʿ al-Tawārīḵ, *EIr*.

Minorsky, Vladimir, Pūr-e Bahā and his poetry, in idem, *Iranica: Twenty Articles/Bist maqāla-ye Minorsky* (Tehran, 1964) 292-305.

Monzavī, Aḥmad, *Fihrist-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Fārsī* (Tehran, 1969).

Monzavī, Aḥmad, *Fihristwāra-yi Kitābha-yi Fārsī* (Tehran, 2003).

Mūnesī, H. Sh., Tārīkh-i Masʿūd Nīkpay, *Zabān wa Adab* 35 (1387 Sh. [2008 CE]) 84-98.

Mūsavī, M. Jahāngushā, *DBE*.

Mūsavī, M. Jāmīʿ al-Tawārīkh, *DBE*.

Omīdsālār, M., Minovi, Mojtaba, *EIr*.

Qazvini, Mírzá Muḥammad, Introduction, in: Mírzá Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdu'l-Wahháb-i-Qazwíní, *The Taʾrīkh-i-Jahán-gushá of ʿAláʾu ' d-Dín ʿAṭá Malik-i-Juwayní (composed in A.H. 658 = A.D. 1260)*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1912) xv-cxli.

Qazvini, Mírzá Muḥammad, Introduction, in: Mírzá Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdu'l-Wahháb-i-Qazwíní, *The Taʾrīkh-i-Jahán-gushá of ʿAláʾu ' d-Dín ʿAṭá Malik-i-Juwayní (composed in A.H. 658 = A.D. 1260)*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 1937) x-xxxii.

Rajabzadeh, H., Jovayni family, *EIr*.

Rażavī, M.T.M., *Aḥwāl wa Āthār Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī Mulaqqab bi Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn* (Tehran, 1956).
Ṣafā, Dhabīḥullāh, *Tārīkh-i Adabiyyāt*, vol. 3 (7th edition), (Tehran, 1990).
Sajjādī, Juwaynī, Abū al-Muẓaffar, *DBE*.
Shabestarī, N.M., *Khāndān-e Juwaynī* (Tehran, 1386 Sh. [2007 CE]).
Smith, Matthew, Sabkšenāsī, *EIr*.
Wickens, G.M., Nasir ad-Din Tusi on the fall of Baghdad: A further study, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7/1 (Spring 1962) 23-35.
Yazici, Tahsin, Ebn Bībī, *EI*.